

# Mitcham's Corner Development Framework

## Summary of Representations & Council's Response

### 1. Introduction and Background

1.1.1

## 1. Introduction and Background

### Paragraph 1.1.1

#### Representation(s)

**31341** Mr Ben Rowlings [5884]

#### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Object Not Specified None

#### Summary:

Can we encourage a more public/open display (in the location now) of plans, so all the community can view and comment?

#### Response

Comments noted. The Council ensured that the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework SPD and supporting documents were made available for viewing online, at the Customer Service Centre (Regents Street) and locally at Milton Road Library. Two exhibitions were also held in on the 14 September and 5 October 2016 at Victoria Homes Pavilion, Victoria Road for people wishing to ask any questions, raise any comments or talk to council officers. The Mitcham's Corner Development Framework is available to download from [www.cambridge.gov.uk/mitchams-corner-spd](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/mitchams-corner-spd).

The Council's Statement of Community Involvement, found at: <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/statement-of-community-involvement> outlines the Council's consultation procedure for documents and planning applications. The nature and extent of consultation will vary depending on the size, scale, location and nature of the proposed development and will be decided upon once received. Neighbour notification letters are sent out to resident's within the immediate vicinity of the planning application. You can view planning applications by visiting the Customer Service Centre or by visiting the Public Access system: <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/monitor-anapplication>.

#### Action

No action required.

#### Representation(s)

**31265** Transport for London (Mr Richard Carr) [5863]

#### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Support Not Specified None

#### Summary:

Thank you for consulting Transport for London (TfL). I can confirm that due to the local focus of the consultation TfL does not have any comments.

#### Response

Comments noted.

#### Action

No action required.

---

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31264</b> Energetics Design & Build (Energetics Design and Build) [5861]	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

Based on the information provided, I can confirm that Energetics does not have any plant within the area(s) specified in your request.

*Response*

Comments noted.

*Action*

No action required.

=====

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31266</b> Environment Agency (Mr Tony Waddams) [1273]	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

Due to resource pressures we are no longer able to provide you with comprehensive bespoke advice on Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).  
Notwithstanding the above I attach a copy of the Agency's 'Planning Application Guidance' document and constraint plan for the applicant's assistance.

*Response*

Comments noted. This has been taken on board in the assessment of the Development Framework.

*Action*

No action required.

=====

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31303</b> AMEC FOSTER WHEELER E&I UK (Mr Robert Deanwood) [5844]	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

We have reviewed the above consultation document and can confirm that National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation.

*Response*

Comments noted.

*Action*

No action required.

=====

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31350</b> Historic England (Ms Alice Eggeling) [5886]	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

Summary of comments, difficult to find logical place for summary due to online submission format, I hope this is of use.

*Response*

Comments noted and addressed specifically in the relevant part of the Development Framework.

*Action*

No action required.

=====

---

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31466	Natural England (Miss Carla Jackson) [5507]	Support	Not Specified	None
<p><i>Summary:</i></p> <p>Whilst we welcome this opportunity to give our views, the topic of the Supplementary Planning Document does not appear to relate to our interests to any significant extent. We therefore do not wish to comment.</p> <p>Should the plan be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then, please consult Natural England again.</p>				
<p><i>Response</i></p> <p>Comments noted.</p>				
<p><i>Action</i></p> <p>No action required.</p>				

## Representation(s)

31514 Dr Jocelynne Scutt [5920]

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

Support Not Specified None

### Summary:

I generally support the submissions made by the Friends of Mitcham's Corner:

FMC are delighted at the progress that has been made in recent years in thinking about Mitcham's Corner. After being largely ignored for many years, the area's importance and potential is being recognised: it has been designated as an Opportunity Area and given its own section in the Local Plan; it has received much media attention and been assigned a Co-ordinator; and a sense of community and purpose has grown among local stakeholders. The development framework is another major step forward, and we are pleased to give it our full support. We urge the Council to approve it as a binding Supplementary Planning Document associated with the Local Plan, and begin the process of identifying funding.

31513 Friends of Mitcham's Corner (Mrs Anne Cooper ) [5919]

Support Not Specified None

### Summary:

FMC are delighted at the progress that has been made in recent years in thinking about Mitcham's Corner. After being largely ignored for many years, the area's importance and potential is being recognised: it has been designated as an Opportunity Area and given its own section in the Local Plan; it has received much media attention and been assigned a Co-ordinator; and a sense of community and purpose has grown among local stakeholders. The development framework is another major step forward, and we are pleased to give it our full support. We urge the Council to approve it as a binding Supplementary Planning Document associated with the Local Plan, and begin the process of identifying funding.

## Response

**Comments noted. The draft Development Framework will be taken to Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee in January 2017 with the intention to agree the final version of the Development Framework. However, the document cannot be adopted as an SPD until the Local Plan 2014: Proposed submission is adopted. The Development Framework will still be a material consideration to guide the decisions on planning matters prior to adoption as an SPD.**

**The Mitcham's Corner Development Framework supports Policy 21: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission, However the Local Plan examination is still underway and therefore a final Inspectors Report has not yet been published. Modifications have been put forward to the policy in the Local Plan and these may need to be reflected in the Development Framework, therefore the document cannot be adopted as an SPD before the adoption of the Local Plan 2014.**

**The delivery will depend on adequate funds to realise the project and ultimately any changes in highway layout would need the support of City Deal. A number of other proposals have emerged during the Tranche 1 project development process which includes Mitcham's Corner. There are commitments to consider these as part of the Tranche 2 prioritisation process.**

## Action

No action required.

=====

---

## Paragraph 1.1.2

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31411** Telereal Trillium [5900]

Object

Not Specified

None

*Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]*

#### Summary:

'Located to the north east of the City Centre...' rather than 'north west'.

---

### Response

Comments noted. The text has been amended to read "Located north of the City Centre".

### Action

Amend text in 1.1.2 to read "Located north of the City Centre".

=====

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31301** Mr David Taylor [846]

Support

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

I welcome the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework for obvious reasons. It closely resembles my own proposals for the area which you have included in your public presentations.

---

### Response

Comments noted.

### Action

No action required.

=====

## Paragraph Figure 1 & 2: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area designated within the emerging Local Plan and location plan

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31249** Paul Robison [5858]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

In the same way as you have enlarged the defined boundary to include the area by the river behind Barclays car park, I would strongly suggest that you enlarge the boundary to include the Jesus Lock pedestrian/cyclist river crossing and landing area on Jesus Green. This is a feeder for much of the traffic through M. Cnr and it would be sensible to deal with in the same development framework.

---

### Response

Comments noted. The Council considered this as part of the Local Plan examinations and the Council's statements to the Planning Inspectors' matter CC2: City Centre and areas of Major questions notes that "The Council is not convinced that there is any planning merit in including this part of the riverbank in the Opportunity Area. This is already designated as a Protected Open Space under Policy 67 and Appendix C of the Local Plan. This means that there is a clear presumption against the loss of such Protected Open Space due to its environmental and/or recreational importance." (The text can be found in paragraphs 148 to 150 at the following address: <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/matter-cc2-city-centre-and-areas-of-major-change>).

### Action

No action required.

=====

Figure 1 & 2: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area designated within the emerging Local Plan and location plan

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31342</b> Historic England (Ms Alice Eggeling) [5886]	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

General Comments rather than support or object as required to choose through online response.

We are encouraged to note that you have included some listed and locally listed buildings within the map entitled Figure 1: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area designated within the emerging Local Plan. We appreciate that you have not included all of the listed and locally listed buildings within the wider area but request that, as a minimum, the cluster of listed buildings forming Jesus College is identified on this map. Jesus Green forms the southern bank of the River Cam opposite the opportunity area and the significance of this open space should be clearly linked to the setting of the college. The relationship between Jesus College and the development within the opportunity area will need to be considered as part of any subsequent applications for development and this should be reflected within the SPD.

We are pleased to note that the preservation and enhancement of the historic environment is reflected in the vision statement and that this is recognised as an opportunity to promote positive change.

*Response*

Comments noted. The views from Jesus Green have been highlighted in Figure 1 as "Important Views". In addition Figure 18: Opportunities and Constraints and Figure 44: Composite Plan illustrate the sensitive views from Jesus Green which will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area.

*Action*

No action required.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31354</b> Dr may block [2364]	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

Future development of Wychwood. I see that this development is currently outside the plan. Why should this be? The handout suggests that in future there will be three buildings on this site. What provision is being made to accommodate this quantity of people spilling out onto the very narrow road Springfield Rd which exits directly onto Mitcham's corner roundabout or Herbert Street - already realistically a single lane road.

*Response*

Concerns noted. Whichcote House was not included within the Opportunity Area as the site has an approved planning application on it (15/1302/FUL) for the demolition and replacement of the existing graduate accommodation on the site. We are aware that a further application has been submitted for the retention and extension of Whichcote House. However due to the timing of this application and the fact that the Local Plan 2014 has not been adopted, the decision on the application will be made using the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Site R3: Cambridge City Football Stadium (now known as Mitcham's Park) was excluded from the Opportunity Area for the same reasons. This site is currently under construction and some units are now occupied.

As the planning applications for these sites have been approved, there is no possibility of the levy of monies for the future improvements to the Opportunity Area.

Issues such as access will have been discussed and approved as part of the Development Management Process. The full committee report and decision on this site can be found at:  
<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=181&MId=2779&Ver=4>

*Action*

No action required.

Figure 1 & 2: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area designated within the emerging Local Plan and location plan

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31412</b> Telereal Trillium [5900] <i>Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]</i> <i>Summary:</i> A black line is meant to indicate 'Building frontage'. However, this is not the case. Grey lines mark the base layer of the plan. The only black line is associated with the 'Remnants of Historic High Street'. Suggest 'Building Frontage' is removed from key. Key includes 'Opportunity for New Urban Space'. However, there is no such area shown on Figure 1. Suggest that this is removed from the Key.	Object	Not Specified	None

### *Response*

Concerns noted. The Council has noted this omission. The black line to indicate building frontage will be reinstated as part of the final draft of the Development Framework before being taken to committee in January.

### *Action*

The black line to indicate building frontage will be reinstated as part of the final draft of the Development Framework before being taken to committee in January.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31478</b> Dr Caroline Stephens [5917]	Object	Not Specified	None

### *Summary:*

The opportunity area should include the space (currently dotted line) down to the river and whichcote now that it has been sold.

### *Response*

Comments noted. The space down to the River is to be included within the Opportunity Area.  
Concerns noted. Whichcote House was not included within the Opportunity Area as the site has an approved planning application on it (15/1302/FUL) for the demolition and replacement of the existing graduate accommodation on the site. We are aware that a further application has been submitted for the retention and extension of Whichcote House. However due to the timing of this application and the fact that the Local Plan 2014 has not been adopted, the decision on the application will be made using the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Site R3: Cambridge City Football Stadium (now known as Mitcham's Park) was excluded from the Opportunity Area for the same reasons. This site is currently under construction and some units are now occupied.

As the planning applications for these sites have been approved, there is no possibility of the levy of monies for the future improvements to the Opportunity Area.

Issues such as access will have been discussed and approved as part of the Development Management Process. The full committee report and decision on this site can be found at:

<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=181&MId=2779&Ver=4>

### *Action*

No action required.

Figure 1 & 2: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area designated within the emerging Local Plan and location plan

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31511</b> Friends of Mitcham's Corner (Mrs Anne Cooper ) [5919]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Include Whichcote House on Milton Road within the Opportunity Area because it has now been sold to a private developer.

*Response*

Concerns noted. Whichcote House was not included within the Opportunity Area as the site has an approved planning application on it (15/1302/FUL) for the demolition and replacement of the existing graduate accommodation on the site. We are aware that a further application has been submitted for the retention and extension of Whichcote House. However due to the timing of this application and the fact that the Local Plan 2014 has not been adopted, the decision on the application will be made using the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Site R3: Cambridge City Football Stadium (now known as Mitcham's Park) was excluded from the Opportunity Area for the same reasons. This site is currently under construction and some units are now occupied.

As the planning applications for these sites have been approved, there is no possibility of the levy of monies for the future improvements to the Opportunity Area.

Issues such as access will have been discussed and approved as part of the Development Management Process. The full committee report and decision on this site can be found at:

<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=181&MId=2779&Ver=4>

*Action*

No action required.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31516</b> Dr Jocelynne Scutt [5920]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I generally support the submissions made by the Friends of Mitcham's Corner:

Include Whichcote House on Milton Road within the Opportunity Area because it has now been sold to a private developer.

*Response*

Concerns noted. Whichcote House was not included within the Opportunity Area as the site has an approved planning application on it (15/1302/FUL) for the demolition and replacement of the existing graduate accommodation on the site. We are aware that a further application has been submitted for the retention and extension of Whichcote House. However due to the timing of this application and the fact that the Local Plan 2014 has not been adopted, the decision on the application will be made using the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Site R3: Cambridge City Football Stadium (now known as Mitcham's Park) was excluded from the Opportunity Area for the same reasons. This site is currently under construction and some units are now occupied.

As the planning applications for these sites have been approved, there is no possibility of the levy of monies for the future improvements to the Opportunity Area.

Issues such as access will have been discussed and approved as part of the Development Management Process. The full committee report and decision on this site can be found at:

<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=181&MId=2779&Ver=4>

*Action*

No action required.



Paragraph 1.4.1

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31291	Sue Durham [5873]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*  
I don't agree that the traffic arrangements don't work. They work very well for both pedestrians, cyclists and motorists; this is one of the few junctions in Cambridge of which that can be said. There are rarely hold ups for people or cars/cycles.

*Response*  
Comments noted. The Development Framework summarises key issues and challenges in the SWOT analysis contained in section 2.4 Opportunities and constraints and section 3.2 Current problems and have been informed by a thorough context analysis of the site and consultation with local stakeholders, the community and the local residents association.

*Action*  
No action required.

=====

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31424	ms alexandra crowhurst [5901]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*  
yes it is cumbersome and confusing with too many crossings esp for pedestrians and cyclists. wheel chair users and pushchairs, small children on bikes have to navigate too many obstacles and too much danger..

*Response*  
Comments noted.

*Action*  
No action required.

=====

Paragraph 1.4.2

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31292	Sue Durham [5873]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*  
The area is growing and developing without the help of the Council, and is likely to continue to do so even without the changes being suggested because of the growth in housing provision. Shops are not empty for long, and new, vibrant, places are emerging. make some small necessary improvements, then leave things alone, and positive change will happen on its own.

*Response*  
Comments noted. The Council takes a different view, paragraph 1.4.2 notes that the district centre is not realising its full potential. Growth opportunities and investment potential are being lost as a result of the poor streetscape. The Development Framework summarises key issues and challenges in the SWOT analysis contained in section 2.4 Opportunities and constraints and section 3.2 Current problems which have been informed by a thorough context analysis of the site and consultation with local stakeholders, the community and the local residents' association.

*Action*  
No action required.

=====

### Representation(s)

31423 ms alexandra crowhurst [5901]

### Nature

Object

### Appearance

Not Specified

### Soundness Tests

None

#### Summary:

mistake in your use of an apostrophe - its and not it's would be correct usage here!

### Response

Comments noted, paragraph 1.4.2 to be updated and 'it's' changed to 'its'.

### Action

Paragraph 1.4.2 to be changed from 'it's' to 'its'.

## Paragraph Figure 5: Vision and strategic objectives

### Representation(s)

31235 Dr Roger Sewell [5506]

### Nature

Object

### Appearance

Not Specified

### Soundness Tests

None

#### Summary:

It's far from clear what is meant by 'severance of the highway layout', so cannot support this. I see absolutely no need to reduce the existing speed of traffic through this area. My fear is that 'rediscovering the high street' will be a retrograde step leading to traffic jams and increased pollution, particularly if additional non-electric buses are permitted. The third column of objectives is fine. However, the objectives absolutely need to include maintenance of the efficiency of traffic throughput, which was excellent before all the traffic lights were introduced, and is now moderate - anything even worse would be disaster.

### Response

Comments noted. Severing refers to the removal of the current gyratory system. This is explained in more detail in Section 3.3 of the Development Framework which provides an option for remodelling the current highway system around Mitcham's Corner. However, for clarity, the word 'removal' will be added to the second objective under theme 1. Maintaining the vibrancy of the District Centre and reinforcing the local character and identity of the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area is a key aspiration of Policy 21 in the emerging Local Plan.

Section 3.4 of the Development Framework sets out six specific objectives for any future detailed scheme, with bullet point 1 specifically referring to 'maintain sufficient capacity and flows through and around the area'. The option put forward in the Development Framework for remodelling the gyratory system will need to be developed and tested further, subject to continued consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council as Highways Authority and other relevant stakeholders.

### Action

Amend Figure 5, Theme 1, second objective to read 'Address the major barriers to pedestrian and cycle movement by promoting the radical transformation of the highway layout through severing and removal of the gyratory system'.

Figure 5: Vision and strategic objectives

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31351</b> P Verbinnen [5650]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Bearing in mind that cars already park in the bus lane, how do you propose to prevent that happening on both sides of the road? Don't say enforcement, because we all know that doesn't happen now and that won't change. Once again you are about to design in mistakes that the public will have to live with for decades.

I believe you have been given ideas that are far superior to what you are proposing, and without taking advice from highly qualified professionals in the vicinity you plough on to produce a 1970s solution.

*Response*

Comments noted, it is beyond the scope of the Development Framework to enforce bus lanes.

The currently gyratory system is an out-dated traffic dominated system, with few trees and narrow, poorly-connected routes for pedestrians and cyclists. Chapter 3 presents a vision for change to the existing gyratory system and seeks to better balance the needs of all road users and create the right conditions for promote a positive sense of place. In recent years the publication of Manual For Streets 1 & 2 provides alternative approaches to managing vehicles in the urban environment and evidence for the benefits of better streets. The strategic objectives set out in Figure 5 and the aspirations and key development principles set out within Chapter 3 are consistent with those set out in Manual for Streets 1 & 2.

*Action*

No action required.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31352</b> P Verbinnen [5650]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

It is hoped these measures will stabilise or reduce car traffic and reduce congestion. Is that the best you can do - hope? It is a measure of the clueless and incompetent approach that has been adopted throughout Cambridge that indicates the traffic congestion and pollution will continue.

*Response*

Comments noted.

*Action*

No action required.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31361</b> Mr Andrew Watson [5888]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The "Vision and Strategic Objectives" laid out in Figure 5 (page 11) do not say anything about maintaining or improving the junction's throughput for motor traffic. This is a grave oversight. The list of Strategic Objectives in Figure 5 should include (at least) maintaining, or (preferably) increasing the junction's motor traffic throughput.

*Response*

Comments noted. Section 3.4 of the Development Framework sets out six specific objectives for remodelling the gyratory, with bullet point 1 specifically referring to 'maintain sufficient capacity and flows through and around the area'.

*Action*

No action required.

Figure 5: Vision and strategic objectives

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31371</b> Mr Simon Norton [76]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Failure anywhere in the document to make a plan for how buses would serve the area, even though it is stated as one of the strategic objectives under Theme 1.

At present people like me who live to the west have to traverse the whole length of the gyratory to get a Citi 1/2. Interchange between different routes is not provided and many don't serve the area at all.

*Response*

Concerns noted. It is beyond the scope of the Development Framework to change the level of bus provision within the area. However, the Council does recognise that existing bus stops are poorly integrated and confusing within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area. The Development Framework therefore seeks that bus stops are well located as part of any future redesign of the gyratory system. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2 which sets out specific objectives for remodelling the gyratory system.

*Action*

No action required.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31381</b> Mr David Kuznets [3087]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Theme 1: We generally support the aims but feel that getting rid of the gyratory system is absolutely essential to the success of the whole plan and severance of the gyratory system must not be stated as a potential outcome but the necessary outcome. We think the plan put forward in figure 27 is fine, but an alternative is possible by continuing Milton Road on it's current path to Chesterton Road, albeit with 2 way traffic, thereby stopping Milton Road from encroaching so much on the (yellow) open space shown.

*Response*

Comments noted. Agree that the removal of the current gyratory system is essential. The second objective under Theme 1 (Figure 5) will be amended to remove the word 'potential' to read '...the radical transformation of the highway layout through severing and removing the gyratory system'.

*Action*

Amend Figure 5, Theme 1, second objective to read '...the radical transformation of the highway layout through severing and removal of the gyratory system'.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31390</b> A Powell [4881]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I support the principles set out in Figure 5 with the exception of the first bullet point under Theme 1 as I do not currently see benefits to Mitcham's Corner from the City Deal; instead, I think that the current City Deal proposals are likely to make the situation in the Mitcham's Corner area worse.

*Response*

Comments noted.

*Action*

No action required.

Figure 5: Vision and strategic objectives

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31409</b>	<b>Telereal Trillium [5900]</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
<i>Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]</i>				
<i>Summary:</i>				
The quote within the Emerging Local Plan refers to 'local centre' rather than District Centre. The SPD needs to ensure it quotes the Local Plan accurately.				
It is not considered that the aim to 'ensure new development promotes healthy and active lifestyles' relates to the theme 'creating a connected place'.				
Suggest 'residential' is inserted to the third bullet under Theme 2.				
Also Change 'physical' to 'physically' at Theme 3.				
<i>Response</i>				
Comments noted. Disagree the final objective under Theme 1 should be removed. Disagree the third objective under Theme 2 should specifically reference residential. Different uses have different catchments of users who are likely to bring their custom. In addition mixed use developments could also create new employment opportunities, which in turn could increase the number of potential customers for local facilities and businesses. The reference to 'Local Centre' within Policy 21 of the emerging Local Plan (2014) will be amended to read 'District Centre'.				
<i>Action</i>				
No action required.				
<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31428</b>	<b>Mr Simon Crowhurst [2162]</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
<i>Summary:</i>				
The clearest robust objective - as opposed to more general ideals - in this set of proposals is the possibility of breaking the gyratory roundabout system. This is an excellent objective provided it can be achieved without causing increased traffic tailbacks on the streets approaching the area. There needs to be a high threshold of confidence with respect to this before the gyratory system is broken.				
<i>Response</i>				
Comments noted. Any detailed scheme for remodelling the gyratory system will be subject to continued consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council as Highways Authority.				
<i>Action</i>				
No action required.				
<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31461</b>	<b>Miss Alison Taylor [5879]</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
<i>Summary:</i>				
I agree with the need to radically alter the gyratory system. The current situation is terrifying for cyclists forced to change lanes within fast-moving traffic, and pedestrians, e.g. crossing Croftholme Lane without zebra crossing or visibility. Traffic also divides shops and other services, losing all sense of a neighbourhood. What cycle lanes there are simply stop in the middle of roads, or are used for car parking.				
<i>Response</i>				
Comments noted.				
<i>Action</i>				
No action required.				

Figure 5: Vision and strategic objectives

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
31471	Mr Matthew Danish [5916]	Object	Not Specified	None
<p><i>Summary:</i></p> <p>I do hope that the gyratory is removed, that Mitcham's Corner is made more friendly to people walking and cycling, and that a proper town square can be provided there using the open space freed up by the removal of the excessive tarmac. We should be planning for a future of reduced automobile traffic within cities, and we get there by building a pleasant environment that is attractive to people, and conducive to increased use of walking, cycling and public transport.</p>				
<i>Response</i>				
Comments noted.				
<i>Action</i>				
No action required.				
=====				
<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
31487	Hester Wells [1859]	Object	Not Specified	None
<p><i>Summary:</i></p> <p>While changes to the public realm are welcome, the whole consultation is based on the idea that a busy through-road can be a 'place': the two uses are contrary. The solution should focus on creating 'places' which have low traffic volumes, and separately roads for through-traffic which separate walking, cycling and motor traffic, with safe junctions for walking and cycling.</p>				
<i>Response</i>				
<p>Comments noted. The Development Framework seeks to better balance the needs of all road users and create the right condition to promote a positive sense of place.</p> <p>As a designated Opportunity Area within the emerging Local Plan (2014), which also contains a District Centre, the streets also have an equally important 'place' function, as a destination where people visit and are encouraged to spend time. The Council considers that by making the area more enjoyable, safer, easier to get to and move around, that these improvements would enhance social, economic and community functions and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel. The Development Framework therefore seeks to better balance the traffic function and the place-making potential of the area, to create a place for people rather than for vehicles. Creating a low speed environment is critical to this as well as creating the right conditions in which a mixed use high street can thrive. This is reflected in section 3.5 Key Design Principles that stresses the that a low speed design should service as the starting point for any future detailed option for the remodelling of the gyratory. Design speeds of between 15-21 mph are the most effective in achieving the most efficient and safe use of streets in complex urban areas.</p> <p>The degree of segregation between cars, cycles and pedestrians will be carefully considered as part of any subsequent design stage, with the objective of improving safety for pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2 which sets out specific objectives for remodelling the gyratory system. Any potential option will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>If the City Council endorses the highway layout changes envisaged in its Development Framework Document, it is planned that Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority would continue to work with City Council colleagues in partnership to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* explore in more detail the implications of the conceptual layout to sever the existing gyratory</li> <li>* consider how best to balance the 'movement' and 'place' functions</li> <li>* factor in other potential City Deal measures that would influence Mitcham's Corner.</li> </ul>				
<i>Action</i>				
No action required.				
=====				

Figure 5: Vision and strategic objectives

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31501</b> Friends of Mitcham's Corner (Mrs Anne Cooper ) [5919]	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
<p><i>Summary:</i></p> <p>Theme 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* 'Removing the Gyratory system' should be top of the list. The word "potentially" should be deleted.</li> <li>* Creating a connected place: this point should have less prominence. It might be better phrased as "Increase the use of sustainable modes of travel, supporting the aims of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and the Greater Cambridge City Deal"</li> <li>* Need more convincing about an "integrated space" with no segregation of cars, cycles and pedestrians. Hard to visualise what the concrete application to Mitcham's Corner might mean. Include more visual impressions of the proposals for the junctions and public space; videos would also be useful.</li> <li>* Mention safety explicitly. How will the elderly, visually impaired and users of mobility vehicles be able to cross the highway safely.</li> <li>* There is no Plan B. We would suggest putting forward at least one other design for consideration and modelling.</li> <li>* Improve bus facilities and connections to them.</li> <li>* Support improved access and connections through the area.</li> </ul> <p>Theme 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Support promoting connections from Mitcham's Corner to the River Cam.</li> <li>* Suggest adding some guidelines on The Tivoli and Barclays to the Development Framework.</li> <li>* Support the revised boundary, as shown in the map on page 33.</li> </ul> <p>Theme 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Support public space. The space needs to be designed carefully so it is suitable and appealing for casual relaxation as well as occasional public events such as pop-up markets.</li> </ul> <p>Additional objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Emphasise affordable residential accommodation for local people.</li> <li>* More mention of car parking facilities. This should be designed in from the start. Retailers regard parking as an extremely important issue. Suggest inclusion of "woodland parking".</li> <li>* Poor bus provision increases parking problems.</li> <li>* There is also considerable opportunity for additional cycle parking.</li> </ul>			



Figure 5: Vision and strategic objectives

## Response

### Theme 1:

\* Agree. Amend second objective to remove 'potentially' and read '...the radical transformation of the highway layout through severing and removal of the gyratory system'.

\* Agree with comments regarding reference to Greater City Deal. Amend first objective under Theme 1 to read 'Increase sustainable modes of travel supporting the aims of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Greater Cambridge City Deal'.

\* Comments and concerns regarding 'integrated space' noted. The option put forward in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework for remodelling the gyratory system represents a high level concept and strategy to help explore the potential benefits for reallocation of highway space and public realm improvements at Mitcham's Corner. This concept does not discount additional options that could come forward. The degree of segregation between cars, cycles and pedestrians will be carefully considered as part of any subsequent design stage, with the objective of improving safety for pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2 which sets out specific objectives for remodelling the gyratory system. Any potential option will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders. The Council would expect any future visual impressions to be produced as part of any detailed scheme.

Theme 2: Comments noted. Figure 5 is not considered the appropriate location to refer to the development potential of the Tivoli and Barclays Bank. These sites will be governed by the general planning and design guidance in paragraphs 4.1.1 to 4.2.25. Given the limited size and the constrained nature of the Tivoli site it is not considered appropriate to visually articulate redevelopment opportunities in the same way as the site specific guidance for Staples and Henry Giles House. However the council recognises the potential development opportunities along the southern boundary of the Opportunity Area adjacent to the River Cam. These opportunities have been articulated on Figure 44: Composite plan, which does provide some level of guidance for both the Barclays and Tivoli site.

Policy 76: Protection of public houses (of the Local Plan 2014) would be a material consideration in the determination of any planning applications for the Tivoli site should an application come forward prior to the adoption of the Local Plan 2014.

Any redevelopment of the Barclay's site would also be governed by the general planning and design guidance in paragraphs 4.1.1 to 4.2.25 and Figure 44 within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework.

The Barclay's site is currently in use as a bank and offices and therefore any redevelopment on the site would also be informed by Policy 40: Development and expansion of business space and Policy 41: Protection of business space in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014.

Notwithstanding, both sites are within the Mitcham's Corner District Centre. Any development within the District Centre will also have to use Policy 72: Development and change of use in district, local and neighbourhood centres as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

The Council believes that the effective redevelopment of these sites is adequately covered by the combination of Local Plan policies and the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework.

The strategic objective of the Development Framework to create new connections to the river will be explained further in Chapter 4. A new paragraph heading will be added to Section 4.2 entitled 'Promoting connections with the River Cam'. Further explanation will be provided with regards to 'Remnants of the historic high street' development principle contained on Figure 44. Collectively, the Council considers these above amendments alongside emerging local plan (2014) policies listed above and policies 55, 56 and 57 will provide appropriate guidance for future development for The Tivoli, Barclays site and any other site which may come forward within the Opportunity Area.

Theme 3: Comments noted. Council agree that the design of any new public space at Mitcham's Corner will need careful consideration. Amend 5th objective under Theme 3 to include reference to occasional public events.

Additional objectives: Comments and concerns noted.

\*Policy 45: Affordable housing and dwelling mix in the emerging Local Plan (2014) addresses the provision of affordable housing.

\* Agree that car parking is an important issue to retailers. Consultation has also revealed a desire to



Figure 5: Vision and strategic objectives

improve car parking facilities. An additional design element will be added under section 3.5 Key design principles to read 'Explore opportunities for well integrated on street parking for vehicles and cycles, using landscape to enclose and mark groups of spaces'. The idea of 'woodland parking' will be referenced within the supporting text.

\* The Council fully recognised the importance of cycle parking and these are addressed in Emerging Local Plan (2014) Policies and Appendix L. An additional design element will be added under section 3.5 Key design principles to read 'Explore opportunities for well integrated on street parking for vehicles and cycles, using landscape to enclose and mark groups of spaces'.

### Action

#### Theme 1:

\* Agree. Amend second objective to remove 'potentially' and read '...the radical transformation of the highway layout through severing and removal of the gyratory system'.

\* Amend first objective under Theme 1 to read 'Increase sustainable modes of travel supporting the aims of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and Greater Cambridge City Deal'.

\* Agree with comments regarding reference to Greater City Deal. Amend first objective under Theme 1 to read 'Increase sustainable modes of travel supporting the aims of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and Greater Cambridge City Deal'.

\* Theme 2: A new paragraph heading will be added to Section 4.2 entitled 'Promoting connections with the River Cam'. Further explanation will be provided with regards to 'Remnants of the historic high street' development principle contained on Figure 44. Collectively, the Council considers these above amendments alongside emerging local plan (2014) policies listed above and policies 55, 56 and 57 will provide appropriate guidance for future development for The Tivoli, Barclays site and any other site which may come forward within the Opportunity Area.

\* Theme 3: Amend 5th objective to read 'Promote the creation of new and exciting public spaces that can accommodate casual relaxation and occasional public events such as pop up markets, by changing the use of existing highway space and realising the potential of underused areas'.

Amend 5th objective under Theme 3 to include reference to occasional public events.

Comments regarding additional objectives noted. An additional design element will be added under section 3.5 Key design principles to read 'Explore opportunities for well integrated on street parking for vehicles and cycles, using landscape to enclose and mark groups of spaces'. The idea of 'woodland parking' will be referenced within the supporting text. "where on street parking is appropriate, parking, servicing and cycle parking will be designed as an integral component of the streetscape."

=====

Figure 5: Vision and strategic objectives

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
		Object	Not Specified	None
<b>31526</b>	<b>Dr Jocelynne Scutt [5920]</b>			
<i>Summary:</i>				
I generally support the submissions made by the Friends of Mitcham's Corner:				
Theme 1				
* 'Removing the Gyratory system' should be top of the list. The word "potentially" should be deleted.				
* Creating a connected place: this point should have less prominence. It might be better phrased as "Increase the use of sustainable modes of travel, supporting the aims of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and the Greater Cambridge City Deal"				
* Need more convincing about an "integrated space" with no segregation of cars, cycles and pedestrians. Hard to visualise what the concrete application to Mitcham's Corner might mean. Include more visual impressions of the proposals for the junctions and public space; videos would also be useful.				
* Mention safety explicitly. How will the elderly, visually impaired and users of mobility vehicles be able to cross the highway safely.				
* There is no Plan B. We would suggest putting forward at least one other design for consideration and modelling.				
* Improve bus facilities and connections to them.				
* Support improved access and connections through the area.				
Theme 2				
* Support promoting connections from Mitcham's Corner to the River Cam.				
* Suggest adding some guidelines on The Tivoli and Barclays to the Development Framework.				
* Support the revised boundary, as shown in the map on page 33.				
Theme 3				
* Support public space. The space needs to be designed carefully so it is suitable and appealing for casual relaxation as well as occasional public events such as pop-up markets.				
Additional objectives				
* Emphasise affordable residential accommodation for local people.				
* More mention of car parking facilities. This should be designed in from the start. Retailers regard parking as an extremely important issue. Suggest inclusion of "woodland parking".				
* Poor bus provision increases parking problems.				
* There is also considerable opportunity for additional cycle parking.				

Figure 5: Vision and strategic objectives

## Response

### Theme 1:

\* Agree. Amend second objective to remove 'potentially' and read '...the radical transformation of the highway layout through severing and removal of the gyratory system'.

\* Agree with comments regarding reference to Greater City Deal. Amend first objective under Theme 1 to read 'Increase sustainable modes of travel supporting the aims of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Greater Cambridge City Deal'.

\* Comments and concerns regarding 'integrated space' noted. The option put forward in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework for remodelling the gyratory system represents a high level concept and strategy to help explore the potential benefits for reallocation of highway space and public realm improvements at Mitcham's Corner. This concept does not discount additional options that could come forward. The degree of segregation between cars, cycles and pedestrians will be carefully considered as part of any subsequent design stage, with the objective of improving safety for pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2 which sets out specific objectives for remodelling the gyratory system. Any potential option will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders. The Council would expect any future visual impressions to be produced as part of any detailed scheme.

Theme 2: Comments noted. Figure 5 is not considered the appropriate location to refer to the development potential of the Tivoli and Barclays Bank. These sites will be governed by the general planning and design guidance in paragraphs 4.1.1 to 4.2.25. Given the limited size and the constrained nature of the Tivoli site it is not considered appropriate to visually articulate redevelopment opportunities in the same way as the site specific guidance for Staples and Henry Giles House. However the council recognises the potential development opportunities along the southern boundary of the Opportunity Area adjacent to the River Cam. These opportunities have been articulated on Figure 44: Composite plan, which does provide some level of guidance for both the Barclays and Tivoli site.

Policy 76: Protection of public houses (of the Local Plan 2014) would be a material consideration in the determination of any planning applications for the Tivoli site should an application come forward prior to the adoption of the Local Plan 2014.

Any redevelopment of the Barclay's site would also be governed by the general planning and design guidance in paragraphs 4.1.1 to 4.2.25 and Figure 44 within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework.

The Barclay's site is currently in use as a bank and offices and therefore any redevelopment on the site would also be informed by Policy 40: Development and expansion of business space and Policy 41: Protection of business space in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014.

Notwithstanding, both sites are within the Mitcham's Corner District Centre. Any development within the District Centre will also have to use Policy 72: Development and change of use in district, local and neighbourhood centres as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

The Council believes that the effective redevelopment of these sites is adequately covered by the combination of Local Plan policies and the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework.

The strategic objective of the Development Framework to create new connections to the river will be explained further in Chapter 4. A new paragraph heading will be added to Section 4.2 entitled 'Promoting connections with the River Cam'. Further explanation will be provided with regards to 'Remnants of the historic high street' development principle contained on Figure 44. Collectively, the Council considers these above amendments alongside emerging local plan (2014) policies listed above and policies 55, 56 and 57 will provide appropriate guidance for future development for The Tivoli, Barclays site and any other site which may come forward within the Opportunity Area.

Theme 3: Comments noted. Council agree that the design of any new public space at Mitcham's Corner will need careful consideration. Amend 5th objective under Theme 3 to include reference to occasional public events.

Additional objectives: Comments and concerns noted.

\*Policy 45: Affordable housing and dwelling mix in the emerging Local Plan (2014) addresses the provision of affordable housing.

\* Agree that car parking is an important issue to retailers. Consultation has also revealed a desire to

Figure 5: Vision and strategic objectives

improve car parking facilities. An additional design element will be added under section 3.5 Key design principles to read 'Explore opportunities for well integrated on street parking for vehicles and cycles, using landscape to enclose and mark groups of spaces'. The idea of 'woodland parking' will be referenced within the supporting text.

\* The Council fully recognised the importance of cycle parking and these are addressed in Emerging Local Plan (2014) Policies and Appendix L. An additional design element will be added under section 3.5 Key design principles to read 'Explore opportunities for well integrated on street parking for vehicles and cycles, using landscape to enclose and mark groups of spaces'.

### Action

#### Theme 1:

\* Agree. Amend second objective to remove 'potentially' and read '...the radical transformation of the highway layout through severing and removal of the gyratory system'.

\* Amend first objective under Theme 1 to read 'Increase sustainable modes of travel supporting the aims of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and Greater Cambridge City Deal'.

\* Agree with comments regarding reference to Greater City Deal. Amend first objective under Theme 1 to read 'Increase sustainable modes of travel supporting the aims of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and Greater Cambridge City Deal'.

\* Theme 2: A new paragraph heading will be added to Section 4.2 entitled 'Promoting connections with the River Cam'. Further explanation will be provided with regards to 'Remnants of the historic high street' development principle contained on Figure 44. Collectively, the Council considers these above amendments alongside emerging local plan (2014) policies listed above and policies 55, 56 and 57 will provide appropriate guidance for future development for The Tivoli, Barclays site and any other site which may come forward within the Opportunity Area.

\* Theme 3: Amend 5th objective to read 'Promote the creation of new and exciting public spaces that can accommodate casual relaxation and occasional public events such as pop up markets, by changing the use of existing highway space and realising the potential of underused areas'.

Amend 5th objective under Theme 3 to include reference to occasional public events.

Comments regarding additional objectives noted. An additional design element will be added under section 3.5 Key design principles to read 'Explore opportunities for well integrated on street parking for vehicles and cycles, using landscape to enclose and mark groups of spaces'. The idea of 'woodland parking' will be referenced within the supporting text. "where on street parking is appropriate, parking, servicing and cycle parking will be designed as an integral component of the streetscape."

=====

Figure 5: Vision and strategic objectives

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31490</b>	<b>Ms Bettina Starke [5895]</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
<i>Summary:</i>				
Theme 1 - Creating a connected place Not maximise the benefits of "Greater city deal" but "increase the use of sustainable modes of travel" supporting the aims of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge.				
Leave out "potentially" in "through severing the gyratory system" Should be "create a low-speed, simplified and integrated highway space", followed by "considering safety for cyclist and pedestrians around Mitcham's Corner"				
Theme 4 Sitting and meeting spaces and pop-up markets need careful design.				
Additional objectives There needs to be an emphasis on affordable residential accommodation in the Mitcham's Corner area. No more student hostels or apart-hotels, which turn the locality into a dormitory district and diminish cohesion for the community and its sustainability.				
<i>Response</i>				
<b>Comments noted. Agree with comments regarding reference to Greater City Deal. Amend first objective under Theme 1 to read 'Increase sustainable modes of travel supporting the aims of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Greater Cambridge City Deal'.</b>				
<b>Agree. Amend second objective to remove 'potentially' and read '...the radical transformation of the highway layout through severing and removal of the gyratory system'.</b>				
<b>Comment noted and a reference to cyclists will be added to third objective under Theme 1. Amended text to read 'Create a low-speed, simplified and integrated highway space and help restore the balance between people, cyclists and motor vehicles. Improved safety and comfort for pedestrians and cyclists is reflected in the specific objectives for the remodelling of the gyratory under section 3.4 paragraph 3.4.2.</b>				
<b>Comment noted. Agree sitting and meeting spaces require careful design.</b>				
<b>Additional objectives:</b> <b>The Mitcham's Corner Development Frameworks is intended to provide additional guidance for the determination of planning applications within the Opportunity Area in accordance with Policy 21: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Once adopted the Development Framework will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.</b>				
<b>Any development that comes forward must not only comply with the Development Framework, but the overarching policies of the Local Plan 2014, including the affordable housing policy. Policy 46 in the emerging Local Plan (2014) addresses student accommodation. The Council has recently completed an assessment of student housing demand and supply in Cambridge. As a result of this assessment, a number of modifications are proposed to the emerging Local Plan to address a range of issues with student accommodation. A hearing session on the proposed student accommodation policy is likely to take place during 2017. Policy 77: Development and expansion of hotels addresses aparthotels. This policy has not yet been subject to discussion as part of the examinations.</b>				
<i>Action</i>				
<b>Amend first objective under Theme 1 to read 'Increase sustainable modes of travel supporting the aims of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and Greater Cambridge City Deal'.</b>				
<b>Agree. Amend second objective under Theme 1 to read '...the radical transformation of the highway layout through severing and removal of the gyratory system'.</b>				
<b>Amend third objective under Theme 1 to read 'Create a low-speed, simplified and integrated highway space and help restore the balance between people, cyclists and motor vehicles.</b>				
<b>No action required.</b>				

Figure 5: Vision and strategic objectives

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31229	Naomi Yandell [5856]	Support	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i> Improve the situation for people cycling and walking.				
<hr/>				
Response				
Agree. The Development Framework seeks to better balance the needs of all road users and create the right conditions to promote a positive sense of place.				
<i>Action</i>				
No action required.				
<hr/>				
Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31359	Mr Nigel Thornton [5852]	Support	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i> In response to the consultation I would like to express my support for the proposed changes to Mitcham's corner especially the improvement of pedestrian and cycling access. I resident of the area for approx 20 years living in Springfield Rd, Humberstone Rd and Chesterton Hall Crescent and long believed the potential of the area to grow into vibrant community has been held back by the gyratory system, which this proposal goes a long way to address. While traffic needs to flow it should not be at the expense of the community				
<hr/>				
31472	CAMCYCLE (Cambridge Cycling Campaign) (Mr Joseph Adam) [2531]	Support	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i> We welcome the SPD, and feel the document correctly identifies the key issues of the Mitcham's Corner Area. We look forward to the possibility of positive changes being brought about to improve the attractiveness, liveability and safety of the area.  As the SPD identifies, the key problem facing the area is that currently the area is designed with a sole focus on maximizing the throughput of vehicle traffic.				
<hr/>				
31356	Dr W Block [5887]	Support	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i> I welcome plans to make this junction more friendly to pedestrians and cyclists and in so doing to slow down the traffic speed.  Overall I think the proposed development will lead to much improvement in the Mitcham's Corner area.				
<hr/>				
31370	Mrs E McDonald [5890]	Support	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i> Good luck - it's a great idea to try and improve an area that's a nightmare for pedestrians and cyclists.				
<hr/>				
Response				
Comments noted.				
<i>Action</i>				
No action required.				
<hr/>				

Paragraph 1.5.3

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31250	Paul Robison [5858]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I very much support everything in this first chapter. The vision and strategic objectives are spot on. I've lived here since 1992 and before that also as a student. It's been a long time coming and I welcome this progress. Very well done to all concerned. I hope that it all happens. And soon.

*Response*

Comments noted.

*Action*

No action required.

=====

## 2. Context Analysis

### Paragraph 2.1.6

#### Representation(s)

#### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31414 Telereal Trillium [5900]

Object

Not Specified

None

Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]

#### Summary:

Final sentence does not make sense. Suggest updated to 'At the time, this was reported as Cambridge's Chaos Corner'.

31429 Mr Simon Crowhurst [2162]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

I object to the grammatical chaos in the second sentence! Seriously, I knew a local businessman who's wife refused to drive around Mitcham's corner - she had become phobic of it!

#### Response

Comments noted. Paragraph 2.1.6 to be updated to read 'Mitcham's Corner was again transformed in 1967 when a new one way traffic system was implemented to relieve congestion around what was once termed Cambridge's "chaos corner" (Cambridgeshire Daily News 11th November 1966)'

#### Action

Paragraph 2.1.6 to be updated to read 'Mitcham's Corner was again transformed in 1967 when a new one way traffic system was implemented to relieve congestions around what was once termed Cambridge's "chaos corner" (Cambridgeshire Daily News 11th November 1966)'

### Paragraph 2.2.1

#### Representation(s)

#### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31400 Telereal Trillium [5900]

Object

Not Specified

None

Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]

#### Summary:

The first bullet point claims that 'Historic fine grain development predominates'. It is not considered that this is a fair reflection of the Opportunity Area which includes a wide variety of built forms.

#### Response

Comment noted. Figure 15 shows the area predominantly comprises of fine grain development comprising of terrace and semi-detached houses. The majority of the existing housing stock dates from the early 19th Century as can be seen in Figures 7 and 8 historic OS maps.

#### Action

No action required.



Figure 15: Existing building heights

## Paragraph Figure 15: Existing building heights

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31422 Telereal Trillium [5900]

Object

Not Specified

None

*Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]*

#### Summary:

It is not considered that the colour distinction between 4 storeys and 5+ storeys is sufficiently clear.  
An amendment to the Opportunity Area Boundary should be addressed through the Local Plan rather than SPD.

### Response

Comments noted. The colours used to denote the 4 storey and 5+ storey buildings on Figure 15 will be adjusted to improve clarity.

### Action

Adjust colours used to denote the 4 storey and 5+ storey buildings on Figure 15 to improve clarity.

## Paragraph Figure 17: Existing Land use

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31223 Michael Cahn [2667]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Figure #17 actually shows Corona Rd open to Westbrook Centre. This is an error on the map, but also a very desirable outcome. Such permeability, especially for non-motorized modes, is essential to make Mitcham's Corner a success and it should be expressly included in the final version of the plan.

### Response

Comments noted. Figure 17 shows broad land use categories for building plots, areas without buildings such as the north end of Corona Road are shown white. It is not the purpose of this plan to show movement routes and permeability of sites.

### Action

No action required.

## Paragraph Strengths

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31382 Mr David Kuznets [3087]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

We think that point number 2 Public Transport links are not a strength, but a weakness. Buses are not integrated, do not necessarily serve destinations people need and bus stops are wildly divergent. We also disagree with the last point. The gyratory system does not handle high traffic levels well. It handles car throughput at the expense of all other "traffic" i.e. cyclists and pedestrians. We agree with all the other points.

### Response

Comments noted. Bullet point 3 'public transport links' will be removed from the strengths sections and 'Limited public transport links' will be added to the weaknesses section. The 10th bullet point 'Gyratory handles high traffic levels well' will also be removed.

### Action

Bullet point 3 - 'public transport links' will be removed from the strengths sections and 'Limited public transport links' will be added to the weaknesses section. The 10th bullet point 'Gyratory handles high traffic levels well' will be removed.

**Representation(s)****Nature****Appearance****Soundness Tests****31392 A Powell [4881]****Object****Not Specified****None****Summary:**

The second bullet point suggests that a current strength is the public transport links. This fails to take into account the following weaknesses in the current public transport links:

- a) the fact that many of the buses passing through Mitcham's Corner do not stop there (despite promises of trials of additional stops)
- b) the cuts by Stagecoach to the Citi 8 service.

**Response**

Comments noted. Bullet point 3 'public transport links' will be removed from the strengths sections and 'Limited public transport links' will be added to the weaknesses section.

**Action**

Bullet point 3 'public transport links' will be removed from the strengths sections and 'Limited public transport links' will be added to the weaknesses section.

**Representation(s)****Nature****Appearance****Soundness Tests****31396 Telereal Trillium [5900]****Object****Not Specified****None****Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]****Summary:**

The strength 'Domestic scale and character predominates' is not accurate. Whilst it is agreed that the areas of domestic scale and character can be considered a strength, they do not predominate within the Opportunity Area. This description fails to appreciate the diversity of scales, styles and uses within the locality. The strength should instead reference 'Areas with domestic scale and character' without stating that it predominates. This would then also better reflect the subsequent bullet point which acknowledges 'Areas of architectural richness and a fine urban grain'.

**Response**

Comments noted. Disagree. Figure 15: Existing building heights and Figure 17: Existing land use show that the area predominantly comprises of 2-2.5 storeys semi detached and terrace housing. The strength 'Domestic scale and character predominates' is a reflection of this.

**Action**

No action required.

## Paragraph Weaknesses

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31236 Dr Roger Sewell [5506]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Most of these points are true. However, introduction of all the traffic lights made matters far worse, not better - now all the traffic has to stop and start whether or not there is anything to give way to, thus increasing pollution. If you want less traffic, you MUST reduce the number of jobs in the city and replace areas of employment by areas of residence - all the current attempts of have your cake and eat it (i.e. increase job count and reduce traffic) are doomed to failure.

### Response

Concern noted, however the Council has a responsibility to meet its objectively assessed need for the growth in number of jobs over the plan period. This is laid out within the Government's National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance. The Council's intention to produce a Development Framework SPD for the Mitcham's Corner area (identified in Policy 21: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area of the Local Plan 2014) is to ensure that any development or redevelopment within the area is undertaken in a way that enhances the area, provides high quality development, delivers a sense of place and improves connectivity between people and places.

### Action

No action required.

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31251 Paul Robison [5858]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Yes, all those things are true. But what about the air pollution caused by all the motor traffic (especially dangerous particulates emitted by diesel engines) and the negative impact on the health of those living and working in the area? This is missing from this list.

### Response

Agree. Mitcham's Corner forms part of the inner ring road and is located within the City Council's Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The AQMA includes areas which have high levels of nitrogen dioxide resulting from (but not solely) traffic pollution. As such the 'potential for high pollution levels as a result of vehicular traffic' will be included in the list of weaknesses for the area.

### Action

Add 'potential for high pollution levels as a result of vehicle traffic' to the list of 'weaknesses' in section 2.4 Opportunities and constraints.

**Representation(s)****31397** Telereal Trillium [5900]**Nature**

Object

**Appearance**

Not Specified

**Soundness Tests**

None

**Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]****Summary:**

It is suggested that the weakness 'Hostile, busy junctions and an uncomfortable and confusing pedestrian/cycle environment' and 'Poor legibility and connectivity through the area for pedestrians and cyclists' duplicate the same point. It is suggested that one of these weaknesses is removed to avoid duplication and ensure a concise document.

**Response**

Disagree. These two bullet points identify different weaknesses. The first highlights that the current road system effects the quality of place. The second highlights the limited connectivity and permeability of the area.

**Action**

No action required.

**Representation(s)****31456** Mrs Veronica Bennett [5913]**Nature**

Object

**Appearance**

Not Specified

**Soundness Tests**

None

**Summary:**

How many pedestrian and cyclist casualties have there been on the gyratory since it was created fifty years ago? This is surely the test that should be used in deciding whether it is dangerous and should be replaced. Perceptions of safety or danger are not good indicators as these are personal to the individual and will vary from person to person.

**Response**

Comments Noted. The County Council hold traffic accident data for Cambridgeshire for the last 5 years (2011-2015) which is publically available on an interactive map (<http://my.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/myCambridgeshire.aspx?MapSource=CCC/AllMaps&tab=maps&Layers=accident>). This information has been used to inform guidance contained within the Development Framework.

**Action**

No action required.

**Paragraph Opportunities****Representation(s)****31343** Historic England (Ms Alice Eggeling) [5886]**Nature**

Object

**Appearance**

Not Specified

**Soundness Tests**

None

**Summary:**

Mostly supportive but request changes.

The fourth bullet point should be amended to better bring through the vision statement's aspiration to use the historic environment to bring about positive benefits.

**Response**

Comments noted. The fourth bullet point appropriately addresses the historic environment given that it references the conservation area.

**Action**

No action required.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31398</b> Telereal Trillium [5900] <i>Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]</i> <i>Summary:</i> It is suggested that the 'Allocated development site' identified under 'Opportunities' is identified as allocated for new homes to provide clarification for those reading this SPD in isolation.	Object	Not Specified	None

**Response**

Comments noted. The 5th bullet point will be amended to 'Allocated development site (R4)' The policy designation description in paragraph 4.3.3 sets out the site capacity and use of this site in detail. .

**Action**

The 5th bullet point under 'opportunities' in section 2.4 Opportunities and constraints to be amended to 'Allocated development site (R4)'

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31436</b> Mr Richard Taylor [1396] <i>Summary:</i> Introducing closure points on roads opens the possibility for raising money for public purposes by selling of currently highway land and for the provision of housing on such land.  I think the potential to constrain future options at this junction means any sale of highway land would have to be very carefully considered it is an option and this document should reflect it as an option.	Object	Not Specified	None

**Response**

Comments noted. Highway land within Mitcham's Corner is not owned by the City Council and any sale of this land is outside of the remit of the Development Framework. The sale of highways land would be subject to further discussions with Cambridgeshire County Council as highways authority and any detailed scheme for remodelling the gyratory system will be subject to continued consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council as Highways Authority.

**Action**

No action required.

**Paragraph Figure 18: Opportunities and constraints**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31300</b> Mr David Taylor [846] <i>Summary:</i> The southern frontage 133-155 Chesterton road is an important visual stop and enclosing element to the approach to the area over Victoria Bridge. It plays an important part by it's physical and historic architectural presence in the character of Mitcham's Corner.	Object	Not Specified	None

**Response**

Comments noted, we agree that the frontage to No. 133-155 Chesterton Road terminates views looking north from Victoria Avenue Bridge.

**Action**

No action required.

Figure 18: Opportunities and constraints

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31344</b>	<b>Historic England (Ms Alice Eggeling) [5886]</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
<i>Summary:</i>				
Support but request changes (no third option available in representation).				
Clarification on Central Conservation Area Boundaries needed. Figure 18 might be more accurately labelled Castle and Victoria Conservation Sub-Area.				
We are encouraged to note that Figure 18 includes not only designated and non-designated heritage assets but buildings and high street frontages that are important to the character of the area. This helps users of the document to easily identify the contribution made by these elements of the historic environment and is particularly welcome.				
<i>Response</i>				
<b>Comments noted. Figure 18: Opportunities and constraints diagram will be amended so that the three areas of the Central Conservation Area (Castle and Victoria, Historic Core and Riverside and Stourbridge Common) as well as the De Freville Conservation Area will be labelled accurately to avoid confusion.</b>				
<i>Action</i>				
<b>Amend Figure 18: Opportunities and Constraints to show the three areas of the Central Conservation Area. Key to be updated to show the boundaries of the Central Conservation Area (Castle and Victoria Conservation Area); Central Conservation Area (Historic Core); Central Conservation Area (Riverside and Stourbridge Common) and the De Freville Conservation Area.</b>				

=====

3. The Gyratory: a vision for change

Paragraph 3.1.2

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31237 Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

This movement plan would create a colossal traffic bottleneck. There is no hint I could find of how the junction between Milton Road and Chesterton Road will be controlled - ? traffic lights ?. Likewise the junction between Croft Holme Lane (which would effectively be Victoria Road) and Chesterton Road.

Response

Comments noted. The vision set out in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework presents a vision and strategy for change to the existing movement framework within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area, to help explore the potential benefits of the reallocation of road space by taking a place-making approach to the redesign of the existing gyratory. It has been appraised through sound urban design guidance, informal consultation with local stakeholders in the Community and with input from Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority.

Figure 27 presents a high level concept to sever the gyratory system (figure 27). Initial traffic modelling has been undertaken by the County Council to assess the impact of this conceptual layout. The report is available as a background document.

The outcomes of the initial modelling suggest that severing the gyratory layout would lead to increased queues on the Milton Road approach at AM peak time with all other approaches performing reasonably well. However, traffic modelling should not be considered as the sole decision making tool and other factors would need to be taken into account when determining any future changes in highway layout, such as the need to achieve a better balance between 'movement' functions and 'place' functions. Furthermore, the modelling is based on current conditions and has yet to consider changes growth and other highway network measures that may be delivered through the City Deal programme.

As a designated Opportunity Area within the emerging Local Plan (2014), which also contains a District Centre, the streets also have an equally important 'place' function, as a destination where people visit and are encouraged to spend time. The Council considers that by making the area more enjoyable, safer, easier to get to and move around, that these improvements would enhance social, economic and community functions and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel. The Development Framework therefore seeks to better balance the traffic function and the place-making potential of the area, to create a place for people rather than for vehicles.

Ultimately, any changes in highway layout would need the support of the City Deal. If the City Council endorses the highway layout changes envisaged in its Development Framework, it is planned that City Deal officers would continue to work with City Council colleagues in partnership to:

- \* explore in more detail the implications of the conceptual layout to sever the existing gyratory
- \* consider how best to balance the 'movement' and 'place' functions
- \* factor in other potential City Deal measures that would influence Mitcham's Corner

The outcomes from this work would inform the scope of future City Deal work within the tranche 2 programme and inform any future potential City Deal financial contributions based on City Deal objectives in support of other contributions from developers and the City Council.

Action

No action required.

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31248	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

This movement plan would create a colossal traffic bottleneck. There is no hint I could find of how the junction between Milton Road and Chesterton Road will be controlled - ? traffic lights ?. Likewise the junction between Croft Holme Lane (which would effectively be Victoria Road) and Chesterton Road.

*Response*

Comments noted. The option put forward in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework for remodelling the gyrotory system represents a high level concept and strategy to help explore the potential benefits for reallocation of highway space and public realm improvements at Mitcham's Corner. The movement plan (fig 27) is not a demonstration of a final detailed proposal for Mitcham's Corner. For clarity, Figure 27 text will be amended to read 'Figure 27: Preferred movement option for Mitcham's Corner'.

The vision set out in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework presents a vision and strategy for change to the existing movement framework within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area, to help explore the potential benefits of the reallocation of road space by taking a place-making approach to the redesign of the existing gyrotory. It has been appraised through sound urban design guidance, informal consultation with local stakeholders in the Community and with input from Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority.

Figure 27 presents a high level concept to sever the gyrotory system (figure 27). Initial traffic modelling has been undertaken by the County Council to assess the impact of this conceptual layout. The report is available as a background document.

The outcomes of the initial modelling suggest that severing the gyrotory layout would lead to increased queues on the Milton Road approach at AM peak time with all other approaches performing reasonably well. However, traffic modelling should not be considered as the sole decision making tool and other factors would need to be taken into account when determining any future changes in highway layout, such as the need to achieve a better balance between 'movement' functions and 'place' functions. Furthermore, the modelling is based on current conditions and has yet to consider changes growth and other highway network measures that may be delivered through the City Deal programme.

As a designated Opportunity Area within the emerging Local Plan (2014), which also contains a District Centre, the streets also have an equally important 'place' function, as a destination where people visit and are encouraged to spend time. The Council considers that by making the area more enjoyable, safer, easier to get to and move around, that these improvements would enhance social, economic and community functions and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel. The Development Framework therefore seeks to better balance the traffic function and the place-making potential of the area, to create a place for people rather than for vehicles.

Ultimately, any changes in highway layout would need the support of the City Deal. If the City Council endorses the highway layout changes envisaged in its Development Framework, it is planned that City Deal officers would continue to work with City Council colleagues in partnership to:

- \* explore in more detail the implications of the conceptual layout to sever the existing gyrotory
- \* consider how best to balance the 'movement' and 'place' functions
- \* factor in other potential City Deal measures that would influence Mitcham's Corner

The outcomes from this work would inform the scope of future City Deal work within the tranche 2 programme and inform any future potential City Deal financial contributions based on City Deal objectives in support of other contributions from developers and the City Council.

*Action*

Figure 27 text will be amended to read 'Figure 27: Preferred movement option for Mitcham's Corner'.

=====



### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31399 Telereal Trillium [5900]

Object

Not Specified

None

Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]

#### Summary:

Paragraph 3.1.2 refers to 'an option for achieving the vision and objectives for the Development Framework'. However, it is not made clear whether this equates to the masterplan required by draft policy 21 or if not, who will coordinate this and how. It is suggested that the SPD needs to make the purpose and function of this 'option' clearer for the benefit and certainty of all parties.

### Response

A modification to Policy 21: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area is set out in the Local Plan review for Matter CC2: City Centre and Areas of Major Change. The text in Policy 21 of the emerging Local Plan (2014) will be amended to read 'Development Proposals will deliver a series of coordinated streetscape and public realm improvements to streets and junctions within the Mitcham's Corner area. These will be set out in an Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document for the area, which must be approved before any major planning application is submitted and will:'. The modification is proposed to clarify the status of the Masterplan and the position in relation to planning applications. The Mitcham's Corner Development Frameworks is intended to provide additional guidance for the determination of planning applications within the Opportunity Area in accordance with Policy 21: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Once adopted the Development Framework will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

### Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 3.1.3

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31306 Susan Grossey [5876]

Support

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

I agree that residents and pedestrians/cyclists must be prioritised. A strikingly similar junction in Utrecht in the Netherlands - almost identical to Mitcham's Corner in initial layout - has been transformed: <https://bicycledutch.wordpress.com/2016/09/27/designing-for-people-by-erasing-a-car-friendly-past/>

### Response

Comments noted.

### Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 3.1.4

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31252 Paul Robison [5858]

Support

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Gyratory traffic systems are being removed in London right now, with great effect.

### Response

Comment noted.

### Action

No action required.

Paragraph 3.2.1

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31268 Mr Ranjit Chooun [5869]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

With reference to the intention to "REDUCE TRAFFIC DOMINATION" at Mitcham's Corner: There is total silence as to where this large volume of traffic will be diverted, in the local region. I am fully aware that there no local roads that can cope with a greater volume of traffic.

Response

Comments noted. The vision set out in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework presents a vision and strategy for change to the existing movement framework within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area, to help explore the potential benefits of the reallocation of road space by taking a place-making approach to the redesign of the existing gyratory. It has been appraised through sound urban design guidance, informal consultation with local stakeholders in the Community and with input from Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority.

Figure 27 presents a high level concept to sever the gyratory system (figure 27). Initial traffic modelling has been undertaken by the County Council to assess the impact of this conceptual layout. The report can be found at:

The outcomes of the initial modelling suggest that severing the gyratory layout would lead to increased queues on the Milton Road approach at AM peak time with all other approaches performing reasonably well. However, traffic modelling should not be considered as the sole decision making tool and other factors would need to be taken into account when determining any future changes in highway layout, such as the need to achieve a better balance between 'traffic' functions and 'place' functions Furthermore, the modelling is based on current conditions and has yet to consider changes in travel and consumer demand, future growth and other highway network measures that may be delivered through the City Deal programme.

As a designated Opportunity Area within the emerging Local Plan (2014), which also contains a District Centre, the streets also have an equally important 'place' function, as a destination where people visit and are encouraged to spend time. The Council considers that by making the area more enjoyable, safer, easier to get to and move around, that these improvements would enhance social, economic and community functions and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel. The Development Framework therefore seeks to better balance the traffic function and the place-making potential of the area. The Council considers that by making the area more enjoyable, safer, easier to get to and move around, that these improvements would enhance social, economic and community functions and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel.

Any future option for remodelling the gyratory will require further detailed design work to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council, in consultation with relevant stakeholders.

Action

No action required.

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31383 Mr David Kuznets [3087]

Support

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Pedestrians have difficulty in going where they want to go and cyclists constantly look frightened by the speed of the traffic on the gyratory system.

### Response

Comments noted.

### Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 3.2.2

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31238 Dr Roger Sewell [5506]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

There is/was no need for the signal controlled junctions - if you don't like them, remove them (leaving, if you want, just the puffin crossing components). Don't use the present signal controlled junctions as an excuse for wanting to modify the entire design.

### Response

Comments noted. The need to promoted and shape overall change within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area has been established under Policy 21 of the emerging Local Plan. The Development Framework has been informed by consultation with local stakeholders in the community as well as a 'Planning for Real' workshop in June 2014. A summary of this event is available at <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/mitchams-corner-spd>. Consultation to date has revealed a strong desire to transform and remove the existing gyratory system within the area.

### Action

No action required.

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31415 Telereal Trillium [5900]

Object

Not Specified

None

Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]

#### Summary:

Suggest final sentence is updated to 'Stop-vehicle movement patterns and one way flows create perceptions of high traffic speeds'.

### Response

Agreed. Amend final sentence to read 'Stop-vehicle movement patterns and one way flows create perceptions of high traffic speeds'.

### Action

Amend final sentence of paragraph 3.2.2 to read 'Stop-vehicle movement patterns and one way flows create perceptions of high traffic speeds'.

Paragraph 3.2.3

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31448	Mr Richard Taylor [1396]	Object	Not Specified	None
<b>Summary:</b> It's not just confusion of routes which currently creates a problem for pedestrians and cyclists.  The blind corner currently opposite the Radmore Farm shop brings cyclists travelling in opposite directions into conflict.  It is not currently clear how a cyclist is supposed to leave Milton Road travelling towards the city and join the on-pavement cycleway towards the light controlled crossing in the middle of the area.  The unclear routes make travelling through the area feel unsafe, and on occasion actually lead to injuries.				

**Response**

Comments noted. Figure 26 will be updated showing additional challenges faced by pedestrians and cyclists. An additional bullet point will be added 'limited visibility at the corner of 133 Chesterton Road and green space creates conflicts between cyclists/pedestrians travelling north/south'.

**Action**

Figure 26 will be updated showing additional challenges faced by pedestrians and cyclists. An additional bullet point will be added 'limited visibility at the corner of 133 Chesterton Road and green space creates conflicts between cyclists/pedestrians travelling north/south'.

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31312	Dr Rabia Dada-Oughton [5878]	Support	Not Specified	None
<b>Summary:</b> Pedestrian paths are currently complicated and unsafe. At several junctures pedestrian paths intersect with cycle paths - very unsafe. Important that pedestrian and cycle paths are made wider and safer.				
31384	Mr David Kuznets [3087]	Support	Not Specified	None
<b>Summary:</b> This is self evident. Cyclists often resort to riding on the narrow pavements which is dangerous for pedestrians. The influx of large students numbers in new student housing is making it worse.				

**Response**

Comments noted.

**Action**

No action required.

Paragraph 3.2.5

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31239	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Re: "A lack of places to...watch the world go by": Sadly, many working people no longer have time to "watch the world go by", and the more jobs you crowd into Cambridge the fewer people will have time to make any use of such places. If you want a quieter place - and many of us do, including myself - then you MUST reduce the number of jobs in Cambridge.

*Response*

Comments noted. Amend last bullet point under paragraph 3.2.5, by deleting reference to 'watch the world go by'. The Council has a responsibility to meet its objectively assessed need for the growth in number of jobs over the plan period. This is laid out within the Government's National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance. The Council's intention to produce a Development Framework SPD for the Mitcham's Corner area (identified in Policy 21: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area of the Local Plan 2014) is to ensure that any development or redevelopment within the area is undertaken in a way that enhances the area, provides high quality development, delivers a sense of place and improves connectivity between people and places.

*Action*

Amend last bullet point under paragraph 3.2.5, by deleting reference to 'watch the world go by'.

=====

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31295 Sue Durham [5873]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

I agree that the area could do with decluttering, and some decent signage, and some re-thinking of the cycleways, particularly east-west, but I'm not convinced that a large T junction (controlled how?) is either necessary or desirable, and I am concerned that it will simply create a large bottleneck, which will not enhance a 'destination'

Response

Comments noted. The vision set out in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework presents a vision and strategy for change to the existing movement framework within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area, to help explore the potential benefits of the reallocation of road space by taking a place-making approach to the redesign of the existing gyratory. It has been appraised through sound urban design guidance, informal consultation with local stakeholders in the Community and with input from Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority.

Figure 27 presents a high level concept to sever the gyratory system (figure 27). Initial traffic modelling has been undertaken by the County Council to assess the impact of this conceptual layout. The report is available as a background document.

The outcomes of the initial modelling suggest that severing the gyratory layout would lead to increased queues on the Milton Road approach at AM peak time with all other approaches performing reasonably well. However, traffic modelling should not be considered as the sole decision making tool and other factors would need to be taken into account when determining any future changes in highway layout, such as the need to achieve a better balance between 'movement' functions and 'place' functions. Furthermore, the modelling is based on current conditions and has yet to consider changes growth and other highway network measures that may be delivered through the City Deal programme.

As a designated Opportunity Area within the emerging Local Plan (2014), which also contains a District Centre, the streets also have an equally important 'place' function, as a destination where people visit and are encouraged to spend time. The Council considers that by making the area more enjoyable, safer, easier to get to and move around, that these improvements would enhance social, economic and community functions and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel. The Development Framework therefore seeks to better balance the traffic function and the place-making potential of the area, to create a place for people rather than for vehicles.

Ultimately, any changes in highway layout would need the support of the City Deal. If the City Council endorses the highway layout changes envisaged in its Development Framework, it is planned that City Deal officers would continue to work with City Council colleagues in partnership to:

- \* explore in more detail the implications of the conceptual layout to sever the existing gyratory
- \* consider how best to balance the 'movement' and 'place' functions
- \* factor in other potential City Deal measures that would influence Mitcham's Corner

The outcomes from this work would inform the scope of future City Deal work within the tranche 2 programme and inform any future potential City Deal financial contributions based on City Deal objectives in support of other contributions from developers and the City Council.

Action

No action required.



Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31311	Dr Rabia Dada-Oughton [5878]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Agree that the shops and various shops are isolated from one another due to the heavy traffic in our neighborhood. However, it is more important to make the roads/neighborhood safer for pedestrians and cyclists (particularly local families). Currently walking to Jesus Green/City Centre with children and/or pets is a very stressful experience. Not sure if a place to 'watch the world go by' should be a priority at this stage given the far bigger problems at hand.

*Response*

Comments noted. Amend last bullet point under paragraph 3.2.5, by deleting reference to 'watch the world go by'. The Council fully acknowledge the need to improve safety and comfort for pedestrians and cyclists. This is reflected in the specific objectives for the remodelling of the gyratory under section 3.4 paragraph 3.4.2.

*Action*

Amend last bullet point under paragraph 3.2.5, by deleting reference to 'watch the world go by'.

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31437	Mr Richard Taylor [1396]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The popular walking and cycling route from Jesus Green, over the Jesus Lock Bridge, across Chesterton Road to Carlyle Road is on the boundary of this area.

The current hazards and problems with the highway arrangement here, which lead to many people cycling on the wrong side of the road and across the pavement to cycle over the zebra crossing should be included as of the problems identified.

*Response*

Comments noted.

*Action*

No action required.

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31427	ms alexandra crowhurst [5901]	Support	Not Specified	None
<div>Summary:</div> <div>car drivers often drive too fast along Chesterton Road which is wider and straighter than surrounding streets. Design needs to deter fast driving along the length of the road.</div>				
31271	Mrs Elizabeth Simpson [5870]	Support	Not Specified	None
<div>Summary:</div> <div>The document is a very concise description of the ills that bedevil Mitcham's Corner. Any measures that address these failings get the whole hearted support of our family. We have lived in this area for 40 years. This area deserves to be more than a gyratory system.</div> <div>Entirely accurate. At present it is a place to hurry through, noisy and polluted but with enormous potential to be a super cohesive community.</div>				
31385	Mr David Kuznets [3087]	Support	Not Specified	None
<div>Summary:</div> <div>Our experience shows that all these points are true, and we are particularly unhappy with the way that pedestrians are hampered by the road layout.</div>				
<div>Response</div> <div>Comments noted.</div>				
<div>Action</div> <div>No action required.</div>				



Figure 26: Challenges for pedestrians and cyclists

## Paragraph Figure 26: Challenges for pedestrians and cyclists

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31209** Thomas Flannaghan [5847]

**Object**

**Not Specified**

**None**

#### Summary:

I agree with the challenges shown here. I would add that the junction with victoria avenue is especially dangerous when approaching mitcham's corner from victoria avenue when one wants to get onto the central island from the carriageway, or when one wants to turn into the right hand lane (e.g. to get to victoria road). In both cases, you need to cross from the on-road cycle path at the left of the lane to the right hand side of the lane, which is difficult and dangerous if there is a queue of traffic waiting and the lights change.

**31253** Paul Robison [5858]

**Object**

**Not Specified**

**None**

#### Summary:

Diagram illustrates only about half of the difficulties and dangers faced by cyclists and pedestrians. Those it does present are also accurate.

**31310** Dr Rabia Dada-Oughton [5878]

**Object**

**Not Specified**

**None**

#### Summary:

I do not feel these papers fully reflect the extent of risk faced by pedestrians. One must make use of 3-4 crossings to get from the Westbrook Centre to Jesus Green, but you must also address that pedestrians are forced to cross on to cycle paths several times - this can be very dangerous when cyclists are coming at speed (entirely within their rights on a cycle path!) particularly if one is with pets and or small children. First and foremost it is vital that these streets are made safer and more welcoming for pedestrians and families.

Figure 26: Challenges for pedestrians and cyclists

Response

Comments noted. Figure 26 will be updated showing additional challenges faced by pedestrians and cyclists. The following additional bullet points will be added:

'Carriageway widths within the study area are typically between 3.3-4m which encourage drivers to overtake cyclists where there is not enough room'.

'Drivers overtake cyclists on Croft Holme Lane to avoid being 'stuck' behind cyclists on Victoria Road. The width of Croft Holme Lane encourages higher traffic speeds'.

'Cycling from the Victoria Avenue bridge is perceived as unsafe as cyclists are forced to cross a lane of traffic to reach the 'island'. Travelling from Victoria Avenue to Victoria Road requires crossing a lane of traffic on Chesterton Road. Both of these movements are difficult and dangerous when traffic is queuing and the lights change'.

'The limited visibility caused by the bend in the footpath adjacent to No. 133 Chesterton Road and the green creates conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists traveling north-south'

'Where pedestrians are forced to cross cycle lanes this can be perceived as unsafe when cyclists are approaching at speed'.

Action

Figure 26 will be updated showing additional challenges faced by pedestrians and cyclists. The following additional bullet points will be added:

'Carriageway widths within the study area are typically between 3.3-4m which encourage drivers to overtake cyclists where there is not enough room'.

'Drivers overtake cyclists on Croft Holm Lane to avoid being 'stuck' behind cyclists on Victoria Road. The width of Croft Holme Lane encourages higher traffic speeds'.

'Cycling from the Victoria Avenue bridge is perceived as unsafe as cyclists are forced to cross a lane of traffic to reach the 'island'. Travelling from Victoria Avenue to Victoria Road requires crossing a lane of traffic on Chesterton Road. Both of these movements are difficult and dangerous when traffic is queuing and the lights change'.

'The Limited visibility caused by the bend in the footpath adjacent to No. 133 Chesterton Road and the green creates conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists traveling north-south'

'Where pedestrians are forced to cross cycle lanes this can be perceived as unsafe when cyclists are approaching at speed'.

Note these bullet points may change once the map is updated.

Representation(s)

Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31438	Mr Richard Taylor [1396]	Object	Not Specified	None
-------	--------------------------	--------	---------------	------

Summary:

This map should extend to Carlyle Road and show the challenges for pedestrians and cyclists at the Chesterton Road / Jesus Lock Bridge / Carlyle Road junction.

Response

Comments noted. We recognise the movement challenges faced by pedestrians and cyclists at the Chesterton Road/Jesus Lock Bridge/Carlyle Road junction. However the junction falls outside of the study area and does not form part of the movement challenges resulting from the junction.

Action

No action required.

Paragraph 3.3.1

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31289	Mrs Susan Berridge [5872]	Support	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i> The existing gyratory is cumbersome, visually muddling and complex, with potential for accidents. The radical transformation addresses these issues.				
<i>Response</i> Comments noted.				
<i>Action</i> No action required.				

Paragraph 3.3.2

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31272 Mrs Elizabeth Simpson [5870]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Support - The quicker this is implemented the better as over the years the sense of community has become disjointed due to the priority given to vehicle movement in order to relieve the congestion in the city centre and beyond.

However, in the greater city deal we were informed that there would be a 50% increase in traffic along Chesterton Road at certain times. How would this be controlled in the new Mitcham's Corner layout?

Response

Comments noted. The vision set out in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework presents a vision and strategy for change to the existing movement framework within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area, to help explore the potential benefits of the reallocation of road space by taking a place-making approach to the redesign of the existing gyratory. It has been appraised through sound urban design guidance, informal consultation with local stakeholders in the Community and with input from Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority.

Figure 27 presents a high level concept to sever the gyratory system (figure 27). Initial traffic modelling has been undertaken by the County Council to assess the impact of this conceptual layout. The report is available as a background document.

The outcomes of the initial modelling suggest that severing the gyratory layout would lead to increased queues on the Milton Road approach at AM peak time with all other approaches performing reasonably well. However, traffic modelling should not be considered as the sole decision making tool and other factors would need to be taken into account when determining any future changes in highway layout, such as the need to achieve a better balance between 'movement' functions and 'place' functions. Furthermore, the modelling is based on current conditions and has yet to consider changes growth and other highway network measures that may be delivered through the City Deal programme.

As a designated Opportunity Area within the emerging Local Plan (2014), which also contains a District Centre, the streets also have an equally important 'place' function, as a destination where people visit and are encouraged to spend time. The Council considers that by making the area more enjoyable, safer, easier to get to and move around, that these improvements would enhance social, economic and community functions and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel. The Development Framework therefore seeks to better balance the traffic function and the place-making potential of the area, to create a place for people rather than for vehicles.

Ultimately, any changes in highway layout would need the support of the City Deal. If the City Council endorses the highway layout changes envisaged in its Development Framework, it is planned that City Deal officers would continue to work with City Council colleagues in partnership to:

- \* explore in more detail the implications of the conceptual layout to sever the existing gyratory
- \* consider how best to balance the 'movement' and 'place' functions
- \* factor in other potential City Deal measures that would influence Mitcham's Corner

The outcomes from this work would inform the scope of future City Deal work within the tranche 2 programme and inform any future potential City Deal financial contributions based on City Deal objectives in support of other contributions from developers and the City Council.

Action

No action required.



### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31477 Dr Caroline Stephens [5917]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Moving to an integrated scheme seems ambitious and it may be difficult to persuade everyone of the benefits and there is a genuine concern about how it can be used by people with sight problems or poor mobility. Maybe a mixed scheme would be possible with one or two crossings. I couldn't see from the system whether the junctions would be mini roundabouts or T junctions.

### Response

Comments and concerns regarding an integrated scheme noted. The option put forward in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework for remodelling the gyratory system represents a high level concept and strategy to help explore the potential benefits for reallocation of highway space and public realm improvements at Mitcham's Corner. This concept does not discount additional options that could come forward. The degree of segregation between cars, cycles and pedestrians will be carefully considered as part of any subsequent design stage, with the objective of improving safety for pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2 which sets out specific objectives for remodelling the gyratory system. Any potential option will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders.

### Action

No action required.

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31327 Dr Alastair J Reid [5881]

Support

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Agree this is a top priority for the health of the area and its residents and other users.

31225 Naomi Yandell [5856]

Support

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

PLEASE rid the area of the gyratory system which gives cars domination (racetrack mentality), scares cyclists and makes pedestrians feel marginalised.

31218 Michael Cahn [2667]

Support

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Support the removal of the gyratory

### Response

Comments noted.

### Action

No action required.

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31395	Ms Cathy Parker [2549]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I support removing the gyratory If it is replaced with something safer, and more pleasant, for cyclists and pedestrians. Most essential is the provision of segregated cycles lanes for safety, both for the benefit of existing road users (motorists and pedestrians as well as cyclists), and to encourage more people to cycle rather than drive. Cyclists should not have to mix with motor vehicles. Motor vehicles should not be allowed to park in cycle lanes. Pedestrians should not have to share with cyclists. I also support more greenery where possible, more cycle parking, and the removal of on-street vehicle parking.

*Response*

Comments and concerns noted. The option put forward in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework for remodelling the gyratory system represents a high level concept and strategy to help explore the potential benefits for reallocation of highway space and public realm improvements at Mitcham's Corner. This concept does not discount additional options that could come forward. The degree of segregation between cars, cycles and pedestrians will be carefully considered as part of any subsequent design stage, with the objective of improving safety for pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2 which sets out specific objectives for remodelling the gyratory system.

Any potential option will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders.

*Action*

No action required.

=====

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31444	Mr Simon Crowhurst [2162]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Unless the gyratory system is severed the area cannot be significantly changed, but it must be done in such a way that it doesn't cause backlogs in the surrounding area.

*Response*

Comments noted.

*Action*

No action required.

=====

Paragraph 3.3.3

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31240 Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	Object	Not Specified	None

Summary:  
This consultation should be revisited after the traffic modelling work is complete.

Response

Comments noted. The vision set out in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework presents a vision and strategy for change to the existing movement framework within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area, to help explore the potential benefits of the reallocation of road space by taking a place-making approach to the redesign of the existing gyratory. It has been appraised through sound urban design guidance, informal consultation with local stakeholders in the Community and with input from Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority.

Figure 27 presents a high level concept to sever the gyratory system (figure 27). Initial traffic modelling has been undertaken by the County Council to assess the impact of this conceptual layout. The report is available as a background document.

The outcomes of the initial modelling suggest that severing the gyratory layout would lead to increased queues on the Milton Road approach at AM peak time with all other approaches performing reasonably well. However, traffic modelling should not be considered as the sole decision making tool and other factors would need to be taken into account when determining any future changes in highway layout, such as the need to achieve a better balance between 'movement' functions and 'place' functions. Furthermore, the modelling is based on current conditions and has yet to consider changes growth and other highway network measures that may be delivered through the City Deal programme.

As a designated Opportunity Area within the emerging Local Plan (2014), which also contains a District Centre, the streets also have an equally important 'place' function, as a destination where people visit and are encouraged to spend time. The Council considers that by making the area more enjoyable, safer, easier to get to and move around, that these improvements would enhance social, economic and community functions and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel. The Development Framework therefore seeks to better balance the traffic function and the place-making potential of the area, to create a place for people rather than for vehicles.

Ultimately, any changes in highway layout would need the support of the City Deal. If the City Council endorses the highway layout changes envisaged in its Supplementary Planning Document, it is planned that City Deal officers would continue to work with City Council colleagues in partnership to:

- \* explore in more detail the implications of the conceptual layout to sever the existing gyratory
- \* consider how best to balance the 'movement' and 'place' functions
- \* factor in other potential City Deal measures that would influence Mitcham's Corner

The outcomes from this work would inform the scope of future City Deal work within the tranche 2 programme and inform any future potential City Deal financial contributions based on City Deal objectives in support of other contributions from developers and the City Council.

Any future change to the highway layout will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders.

Action

No action required.



Paragraph 3.3.4

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31365	Mrs E McDonald [5890]	Object	Not Specified	None

Summary:  
Low speed highway design a good idea but only if enforced,

Response

Comments noted. The creation of a low speed environment is central to creating a better balance between people and vehicles. This could be enforced by a formal speed limit, but must be linked to a detailed design that changes the character of the 'road', width and geometry of the streetscape. A number of key design elements have been identified within section 3.5 of the Development Framework to achieve this.

Action

No action required.

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31394	Ms Cathy Parker [2549]	Object	Not Specified	None

Summary:  
As a driver, cyclist and pedestrian, in my opinion it is crucial that these three modes of travel are separated. It is dangerous cycling here at the moment, and that is worrying when I am driving as well as when I am cycling. I am not persuaded that shared use will make it safer. Cyclists must not be made to share the carriageway with motor vehicles, and pedestrians must not be made to share the path with cyclists (or motor vehicles).

Response

Comments and concerns noted. The option put forward in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework for remodelling the gyratory system represents a high level concept and strategy to help explore the potential benefits for reallocation of highway space and public realm improvements at Mitcham's Corner. The degree of segregation between cars, cycles and pedestrians will be carefully considered as part of any subsequent design stage, with the objective of improving safety for pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2 which sets out specific objectives for remodelling the gyratory system. Any potential option will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders.

Action

No action required.

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31273	Mrs Elizabeth Simpson [5870]	Support	Not Specified	None

Summary:  
Absolutely key to making the area more pedestrian and cyclist friendly. Anything which disrupts vehicle priority over pedestrians and cyclists has to be positive for the area. Initiate as soon as possible.

Response

Comment noted.

Action

No action required.



## Paragraph 3.3.6

### Representation(s)

31439 Mr Richard Taylor [1396]

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Object Not Specified None

#### Summary:

I am very concerned by the inclusion of double roundabouts, even in this context, in the document.

Mini roundabouts, and double roundabouts, are dangerous. The Fen Causeway / Lensfield Road double roundabout is the most dangerous in terms of casualties and serious injuries. <http://www.cambridge-news.co.uk/cambridge-s-most-dangerous-roundabouts-for-crashes-and-casualties-named/story-29715801-detail/story.html>

The document sets safety of all users as a key objective; that objective needs to be met.

### Response

Comments and concerns noted. The Council considers it appropriate to examine existing schemes implemented elsewhere to help explore options and generate ideas for improving the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area. Any emerging scheme for the remodelling of the gyratory would need to go through the County Council as Highway Authority for safety audit. The intention of figure 31 which illustrates roundels, is to demonstrate one way in which a previously traffic junction has been remodelled to achieve a better balance between pedestrians cyclists and motor vehicles. As such it is not a demonstration of a final proposals for Mitcham's Corner

The need to improve safety for pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities is a key objective for remodelling the gyratory. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2 for the document.

Any potential option will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders. This work will include reviewing any project monitoring results available for other example schemes such as the Frideswide Square (Oxford) to inform future work on changes to Mitcham's Corner.

### Action

No action required.

### Representation(s)

31213 Ms Olivia Maes [5851]

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Support Not Specified None

#### Summary:

This sounds like a sensible proposal.

### Response

Comment noted. Thank you for taking the time to respond.

### Action

No action required.

Paragraph 3.3.9

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31241 Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

a) There is insufficient detail here on how traffic movements at the three key junctions would be controlled - traffic lights ? roundabouts ? other ? Until that is clear, I object to this on the grounds that insufficient information has been provided.

b) This consultation needs to be revisited in the light of the traffic modelling report when that is available.

Response

Comments noted. The vision set out in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework presents a vision and strategy for change to the existing movement framework within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area, to help explore the potential benefits of the reallocation of road space by taking a place-making approach to the redesign of the existing gyratory. It has been appraised through sound urban design guidance, informal consultation with local stakeholders in the Community and with input from Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority.

Figure 27 presents a high level concept to sever the gyratory system (figure 27). Initial traffic modelling has been undertaken by the County Council to assess the impact of this conceptual layout. The report is available as a background document.

The outcomes of the initial modelling suggest that severing the gyratory layout would lead to increased queues on the Milton Road approach at AM peak time with all other approaches performing reasonably well. However, traffic modelling should not be considered as the sole decision making tool and other factors would need to be taken into account when determining any future changes in highway layout, such as the need to achieve a better balance between 'movement' functions and 'place' functions. Furthermore, the modelling is based on current conditions and has yet to consider changes growth and other highway network measures that may be delivered through the City Deal programme.

As a designated Opportunity Area within the emerging Local Plan (2014), which also contains a District Centre, the streets also have an equally important 'place' function, as a destination where people visit and are encouraged to spend time. The Council considers that by making the area more enjoyable, safer, easier to get to and move around, that these improvements would enhance social, economic and community functions and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel. The Development Framework therefore seeks to better balance the traffic function and the place-making potential of the area, to create a place for people rather than for vehicles.

Ultimately, any changes in highway layout would need the support of the City Deal. If the City Council endorses the highway layout changes envisaged in its Development Framework, it is planned that City Deal officers would continue to work with City Council colleagues in partnership to:

- \* explore in more detail the implications of the conceptual layout to sever the existing gyratory
- \* consider how best to balance the 'movement' and 'place' functions
- \* factor in other potential City Deal measures that would influence Mitcham's Corner

The outcomes from this work would inform the scope of future City Deal work within the tranche 2 programme and inform any future potential City Deal financial contributions based on City Deal objectives in support of other contributions from developers and the City Council.

Action

No action required.



## Representation(s)

## Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31254 Paul Robison [5858]

Object

Not Specified

None

### Summary:

Detailed design of junctions will be key.

Strongly support the overall design, but with following suggestions/caveats:

1. suggest moving Victoria Road 'gateway' further out: in its proposed position there will be too much going on.

Why not place at Albert Street/Greens Road or further still at Victoria Park?

2. detailed design of Croftholme Lane / Victoria Road will need careful consideration. For example, design speeds should be kept very low here to mitigate drivers overtaking cyclists problem noted elsewhere. And pedestrian crossings (preferably zebras, which are much more pedestrian friendly) MUST be retained. Also egress from the lane between 3 Croftholme Lane and Victoria Road must be considered. This lane serves about 20 residential properties.

3. reinstate zebra crossings by Mitchams. The very low priority given to pedestrians and cyclists, particularly on the leg right by Mitchams (currently the bed shop) causes very long wait times. I suppose this is because those who programme them prioritise motor traffic (whereas on the other two crossings at this junction, two streams of competing motor traffic dictate the priorities).

## Response

1. Comments noted. The new gateways shown on Figure 27 are indicative locations only. For clarity, the key will be updated to read 'Create new gateways into Mitcham's Corner (indicative locations)'. However, the Council agree there is merit in repositioning the Victoria Road gateway further out to Albert Street/Greens Road. Figure 27 will be updated accordingly.

2 and 3. Concerns noted. Figure 27 presents a high level concept sever and remove the gyratory system. The degree of segregation between pedestrians, cycles, vehicles in addition to the requirement of crossings, will be will be carefully considered as part of any subsequent design stage. Any future change to the highway layout will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders.

## Action

Amend figure 27: reposition Victoria Road gateway to junction of Albert Street/Greens Road. Amend supporting key text to read 'Create new gateways into Mitcham's Corner (indicative locations)'.  
=====

## Paragraph Figure 27: Movement proposals for Mitcham's Corner

## Representation(s)

## Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31216 Mr John Lees [5855]

Object

Not Specified

None

### Summary:

I would need greater understanding of interconnection between various roads - traffic lights to facilitate free traffic movement.

## Response

Comments noted.

## Action

No action required.  
=====

Figure 27: Movement proposals for Mitcham's Corner

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
31221	Michael Cahn [2667]	Object	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i>				
I note that the drawing figure #27 is very preliminary in nature and leaves many questions open regarding the exact nature of the traffic flows. Especially the nature of the connection between Victoria Road and Mitcham's Corner deserves a closer look. With reference to the long-term closure of Victoria Rd in 2014 during major road works and sewer repairs we now have proof that the connection between Victoria Road and Mitcham's Corner is indeed not essential. Victoria Rd itself has some interesting commercial infrastructure of historical nature which deserves consideration and could flourish under pedestrian oriented redesign, which corrects the narrow and dangerous pavements which are under-specified throughout.				
<i>Response</i>				
Comments noted. The feasibility of a long-term closure of Victoria Road will need to be carried out by the County Council as Highway Authority and consider future changes in travel and consumer demand, future growth of the city, and other highway network measures that may be delivered through the City Deal programme.				
<i>Action</i>				
No action required.				
=====				
<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
31234	Dr Daniel Thomas [5857]	Object	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i>				
This plan is insufficiently bold. Some of 137-155 Chesterton Road should be demolished to allow Victoria Road to connect to Milton Road with only one junction. Local access roads should be of minimal length.				
<i>Response</i>				
The demolition of some of the properties at 137-155 Chesterton to realise an alternative 'cross road' solution for remodelling the gyratory system could require Cambridgeshire County Council to use compulsory purchase powers to acquire these properties. This option has been discounted. Compulsory purchase is intended as a last resort to secure the assembly of land needed for implementing projects, and in the case of Mitcham's Corner the Councils consider that an appropriate scheme could be delivered within the current highway space available and that the objectives of the Development Framework document could still be met.				
<i>Action</i>				
No action required.				
=====				
<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
31290	Mrs Susan Berridge [5872]	Object	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i>				
The proposal is sensible but the interaction between the road system and the yellow area could be a problem especially turning right at the junction of Milton and Chesterton roads. The traffic routes need to be clearly defined.				
<i>Response</i>				
Concerns noted. Figure 27 presents a high level concept sever and remove the gyratory system. It is not considered appropriate to show the detailed design of the traffic routes within the Development Framework. The interaction between the road and any new areas of public realm will be carefully considered as part of any subsequent detailed design stage. Any future change to the highway layout will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders.				
<i>Action</i>				
No action required.				
=====				

Figure 27: Movement proposals for Mitcham's Corner

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31293	Sue Durham [5873]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I would support a good look at the cycle lane provision through Victoria road to Chesterton Road, but this could be undertaken without severing the gyratory system.

I agree that the area could do with decluttering, and some decent signage, and some re-thinking of the cycleways, particularly east-west, but I'm not convinced that a large T junction (controlled how?) is either necessary or desirable, and I am concerned that it will simply create a large bottleneck, which will not enhance a 'destination'.

Response

Comments noted. The vision set out in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework presents a vision and strategy for change to the existing movement framework within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area, to help explore the potential benefits of the reallocation of road space by taking a place-making approach to the redesign of the existing gyratory. It has been appraised through sound urban design guidance, informal consultation with local stakeholders in the Community and with input from Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority.

Figure 27 presents a high level concept to sever the gyratory system (figure 27). Initial traffic modelling has been undertaken by the County Council to assess the impact of this conceptual layout. The report is available as a background document.

The outcomes of the initial modelling suggest that severing the gyratory layout would lead to increased queues on the Milton Road approach at AM peak time with all other approaches performing reasonably well. However, traffic modelling should not be considered as the sole decision making tool and other factors would need to be taken into account when determining any future changes in highway layout, such as the need to achieve a better balance between 'movement' functions and 'place' functions. Furthermore, the modelling is based on current conditions and has yet to consider changes growth and other highway network measures that may be delivered through the City Deal programme.

As a designated Opportunity Area within the emerging Local Plan (2014), which also contains a District Centre, the streets also have an equally important 'place' function, as a destination where people visit and are encouraged to spend time. The Council considers that by making the area more enjoyable, safer, easier to get to and move around, that these improvements would enhance social, economic and community functions and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel. The Development Framework therefore seeks to better balance the traffic function and the place-making potential of the area, to create a place for people rather than for vehicles.

Ultimately, any changes in highway layout would need the support of the City Deal. If the City Council endorses the highway layout changes envisaged in its Development Framework document, it is planned that City Deal officers would continue to work with City Council colleagues in partnership to:

- \* explore in more detail the implications of the conceptual layout to sever the existing gyratory
- \* consider how best to balance the 'movement' and 'place' functions
- \* factor in other potential City Deal measures that would influence Mitcham's Corner

The outcomes from this work would inform the scope of future City Deal work within the tranche 2 programme and inform any future potential City Deal financial contributions based on City Deal objectives in support of other contributions from developers and the City Council.

Action

No action required.



Figure 27: Movement proposals for Mitcham's Corner

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31298	Mr Richard Mifsud [5874]	Object	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i> Saying how the detriment to traffic flow far outweighs all other benefits.				
<i>Response</i> Comments noted.				
<i>Action</i> No action required.				
=====				
Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31319	mr william Beavitt [5875]	Object	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i> Support - This complicated intersection has many one-way elements that would be greatly improved by converting most to two way traffic. The lanes are very wide thus lots of concrete, (up-to three lanes). Please reduce the width and number of lanes. Significantly increase tree cover to really beautify junction.  Although Mitcham's Corner gets a bad rep, with the houses and shops on the Island it is considerably better than other large open junctions like Elizabeth Way roundabouts.  I also think that reversing the narrow lane opposite the Portland arms by LLoyds bank would be better for most cars rather than sending them round Staples.				
<i>Response</i> Comments noted. It is a key objective of the Development Framework to promote measures to physically green the area (see figure 5). We agree that reduced lane widths are important. This is reflected under section 3.5 which sets out key design elements that should be incorporated within any future detailed design for remodelling the gyratory.				
<i>Action</i> No action required.				
=====				

Figure 27: Movement proposals for Mitcham's Corner

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31320	CAMCYCLE (Cambridge Cycling Campaign) (Mr Joseph Adam) [2531]	Object	Not Specified	None
<p><i>Summary:</i></p> <p>I think the plan is insufficiently bold.</p> <p>As such its has most of the draw back associated with change (cost, disruption, etc) without actually achieving a great benefit for the area.</p> <p>I think the most appropriate solution would be the demolition of some of the houses on Chesterton Road between Milton Road and Victoria Avenue. This would allow a simple, efficient (especially in space) cross-roads to be created, and free up a massive amount of new space.</p>				
<p><i>Response</i></p> <p>The demolition of some of the properties at 137-155 Chesterton to realise an alternative 'cross road' solution for remodelling the gyratory system could require Cambridgeshire County Council to use compulsory purchase powers to acquire these properties. This option has been discounted. Compulsory purchase is intended as a last resort to secure the assembly of land needed for implementing projects, and in the case of Mitcham's Corner the Councils consider that an appropriate scheme could be delivered within the current highway space available and that the objectives of the Development Framework document could still be met.</p>				
<p><i>Action</i></p> <p>No action required.</p>				

Figure 27: Movement proposals for Mitcham's Corner

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31353	Dr may block [2364]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Traffic moving north and south will find insufficient queueing space between the two sets of lights while waiting for the green phase.

No consideration is given to the junction Westbrook Avenue/Milton Rd. This junction is increasingly heavily used as the new build 'inside the Westbrook Centre' nears completion. Visibility for exiting onto Milton Rd is poor. The result is that cars creep forward and encroach onto the cycle way in order to gain a line of visibility to the right. The juxtaposition of the bus stop here aggravates this difficult junction. Move the bus stop? Reduce pavement parking towards Mitcham's Corner.

Response

Comments noted. The vision set out in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework presents a vision and strategy for change to the existing movement framework within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area, to help explore the potential benefits of the reallocation of road space by taking a place-making approach to the redesign of the existing gyratory. It has been appraised through sound urban design guidance, informal consultation with local stakeholders in the Community and with input from Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority.

Figure 27 presents a high level concept to sever the gyratory system (figure 27). Initial traffic modelling has been undertaken by the County Council to assess the impact of this conceptual layout. The report is available as a background document.

The outcomes of the initial modelling suggest that severing the gyratory layout would lead to increased queues on the Milton Road approach at AM peak time with all other approaches performing reasonably well. However, traffic modelling should not be considered as the sole decision making tool and other factors would need to be taken into account when determining any future changes in highway layout, such as the need to achieve a better balance between 'movement' functions and 'place' functions. Furthermore, the modelling is based on current conditions and has yet to consider changes growth and other highway network measures that may be delivered through the City Deal programme.

As a designated Opportunity Area within the emerging Local Plan (2014), which also contains a District Centre, the streets also have an equally important 'place' function, as a destination where people visit and are encouraged to spend time. The Council considers that by making the area more enjoyable, safer, easier to get to and move around, that these improvements would enhance social, economic and community functions and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel. The Development Framework therefore seeks to better balance the traffic function and the place-making potential of the area, to create a place for people rather than for vehicles.

Ultimately, any changes in highway layout would need the support of the City Deal. If the City Council endorses the highway layout changes envisaged in its Development Framework document, it is planned that City Deal officers would continue to work with City Council colleagues in partnership to:

- \* explore in more detail the implications of the conceptual layout to sever the existing gyratory
- \* consider how best to balance the 'movement' and 'place' functions
- \* factor in other potential City Deal measures that would influence Mitcham's Corner

The outcomes from this work would inform the scope of future City Deal work within the tranche 2 programme and inform any future potential City Deal financial contributions based on City Deal objectives in support of other contributions from developers and the City Council. Junction visibility, bus stop locations and the issue of pavement parking are all important matters that the Council would expect to be fully considered at part of any future detailed design work.

Action

No action required.





Figure 27: Movement proposals for Mitcham's Corner

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31358	Dr W Block [5887]	Object	Not Specified	None
<b>Summary:</b>				
Support - The creation of local access only roads is a major step in the improvement to benefit folk who live and work (shops, etc.) on the current gyratory system.				
However, if traffic lights are required at the junctions with Milton Road and Victoria Avenue these may contribute to continued congestion - why not consider a small round about?				
<b>Response</b>				
Comments and suggestions noted.				
<b>Action</b>				
No action required.				

Figure 27: Movement proposals for Mitcham's Corner

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31363	Mr Andrew Watson [5888]	Object	Not Specified	None
<b>Summary:</b>				
The draft SPD contains no hard data on what volume of traffic currently uses the junction, nor any simulation data to show how the proposed abolition of the gyratory outlined in Figure 27 (p33) would affect the junction's throughput. Both are severe oversights, and must be corrected. Without this information, it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions about the desirability (or otherwise) of the SPD.				
<b>Response</b>				
<p>Comments noted. The vision set out in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework presents a vision and strategy for change to the existing movement framework within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area, to help explore the potential benefits of the reallocation of road space by taking a place-making approach to the redesign of the existing gyratory. It has been appraised through sound urban design guidance, informal consultation with local stakeholders in the Community and with input from Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority.</p> <p>Figure 27 presents a high level concept to sever the gyratory system (figure 27). Initial traffic modelling has been undertaken by the County Council to assess the impact of this conceptual layout. The report is available as a background document.</p> <p>The outcomes of the initial modelling suggest that severing the gyratory layout would lead to increased queues on the Milton Road approach at AM peak time with all other approaches performing reasonably well. However, traffic modelling should not be considered as the sole decision making tool and other factors would need to be taken into account when determining any future changes in highway layout, such as the need to achieve a better balance between 'movement' functions and 'place' functions. Furthermore, the modelling is based on current conditions and has yet to consider changes growth and other highway network measures that may be delivered through the City Deal programme.</p> <p>As a designated Opportunity Area within the emerging Local Plan (2014), which also contains a District Centre, the streets also have an equally important 'place' function, as a destination where people visit and are encouraged to spend time. The Council considers that by making the area more enjoyable, safer, easier to get to and move around, that these improvements would enhance social, economic and community functions and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel. The Development Framework therefore seeks to better balance the traffic function and the place-making potential of the area, to create a place for people rather than for vehicles.</p> <p>Ultimately, any changes in highway layout would need the support of the City Deal. If the City Council endorses the highway layout changes envisaged in its Development Framework document, it is planned that City Deal officers would continue to work with City Council colleagues in partnership to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>* explore in more detail the implications of the conceptual layout to sever the existing gyratory</li><li>* consider how best to balance the 'movement' and 'place' functions</li><li>* factor in other potential City Deal measures that would influence Mitcham's Corner</li></ul> <p>The outcomes from this work would inform the scope of future City Deal work within the tranche 2 programme and inform any future potential City Deal financial contributions based on City Deal objectives in support of other contributions from developers and the City Council.</p>				
<b>Action</b>				
No action required.				

Figure 27: Movement proposals for Mitcham's Corner

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31364</b>	<b>Mr David Smith [5889]</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
<i>Summary:</i>				
Support -				
I would prefer to see traffic kept off the eastern end of the space I front of the Portland Arms. It would loop behind the terrace, as now, but two-way.				
Is there scope for encouraging traffic to go east along Chesterton Road from Victoria Avenue, instead of up Milton Road? It would then turn left/north up Elizabeth Way to Milton Road (and vice-versa).				
I await new cycle routes across the junction with interest!				
<hr/>				
<i>Response</i>				
Comments and suggestions noted. The feasibility of re-directing traffic from Victoria Avenue, to go east along Chesterton Road then to turn left/north up Elizabeth Way to Milton Road, will need to be carried out by the County Council as Highway Authority and consider future changes in travel and consumer demand, future growth of the city, and other highway network measures that may be delivered through the City Deal programme.				
<i>Action</i>				
No action required.				
<hr/>				
<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31367</b>	<b>Mrs E McDonald [5890]</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
<i>Summary:</i>				
Please improve cycle crossing as currently I avoid Mitcham's Corner altogether when cycling. Also no allowance made currently for journeys south down Milton Road and right along Chesterton Road. Rerouting traffic coming down Milton Road to turn left at roundabout down Elizabeth Way and then right along Chesterton Lane would mean you could dispense with the traffic crossing the "Urban Space" altogether.				
If the "Urban Space" does have traffic crossing it, could there be some kind of "pedestrian friendly crossing" (traditional crossings at traffic junctions are not pleasant places to stand and wait).				
<hr/>				
<i>Response</i>				
Comments and concerns noted. A key objective for remodelling the gyratory system is to improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2. of the Development Framework. Pedestrian/ cycle desire lines and crossings are important matters that the Council would expect to be fully considered at part of any future detailed design work. as such the 4th bullet point under paragraph 3.4.2 will be amended to read 'improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities, taking into account desire lines'.				
Any future option for remodelling the gyratory will require further detailed design work to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council, in consultation with relevant stakeholders. .				
<i>Action</i>				
4th bullet point under paragraph 3.4.2 will be amended to read 'improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities, taking into account desire lines'.				

Figure 27: Movement proposals for Mitcham's Corner

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
31372	Mr Simon Norton [76]	Object	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i>				
I do not object to the proposals as such, but would like to see clarification of the proposals for buses (as I have referred to elsewhere) and pedestrian movements before supporting the scheme. For pedestrians my own preferences are to have zebra rather than signalled crossings; where crossings are signalled for pedestrians the lights should be green for them whenever traffic is stopped; pedestrians should have right of way over traffic turning into the relevant road; and no guard rails.				
<i>Response</i>				
Comments and concerns noted. A key objective for remodelling the gyratory system is to improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2. of the Development Framework.				
Any future option for remodelling the gyratory will require further detailed design work to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council, in consultation with relevant stakeholders. Bus facilities, pedestrian/ cycle desire lines and crossings are important matters that the Council would expect to be fully considered at part of any future detailed design work.				
<i>Action</i>				
No action required.				
=====				
<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
31380	Dr Robert Izzard [5891]	Object	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i>				
Or you could use the City Deal money to send through traffic *under* the junction. Yes, this is expensive, but that's the point of the City Deal money! It would also provide far more space on the surface for public transport, bikes and pedestrians. If the planners here had real vision, they would do something like this, factoring in to the cost that it's a long term solution, not the proposed short-term fix (which is much like previous short-term fixes).				
<i>Response</i>				
Comments noted.				
<i>Action</i>				
No action required.				
=====				
<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
31386	Mr David Kuznets [3087]	Object	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i>				
We generally support this. Another option could be similar but with Milton Road continuing on to Chesterton Road as it does now but with 2 way traffic. This would eliminate Milton Road crossing the yellow open space and might be more open space and pedestrian friendly.				
<i>Response</i>				
Comments and suggestions noted. Any future option for remodelling the gyratory will require further detailed design work to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority, in consultation with relevant stakeholders. The size and character of any new public open space created as a result of remodelling the gyratory is an important matter that the Council would expect to be fully considered as part of any future detailed design work.				
<i>Action</i>				
No action required.				
=====				

Figure 27: Movement proposals for Mitcham's Corner

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31425	ms alexandra crowhurst [5901]	Object	Not Specified	None
<b>Summary:</b> Suuport - although there are many crossing points, many people cross Chesterton Road on foot or bike opposite the Coop as this is the quickest route from Herbert St to Ferry Path. any design needs to take this into consideration....				
<b>Response</b>  Comments and suggestions noted. Pedestrian/ cycle desire lines are important matters that the Council would expect to be fully considered at part of any future detailed design work. Therefore the 4th bullet point under paragraph 3.4.2 will be amended to read 'improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities, taking into account desire lines'.  Any future option for remodelling the gyratory will require further detailed design work to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority, in consultation with relevant stakeholders.				
<b>Action</b>  No action required.				
=====				
Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31435	Mr Richard Taylor [1396]	Object	Not Specified	None
<b>Summary:</b> I would like to see "movement proposals" for pedestrians, cyclists, and buses as well as just "traffic".  The proposal involves making some streets quiet streets without any through motor traffic; I would have thought it would be best if the streets with shops on them had such traffic reduction (while keeping easy access to park near the shops).  I note the document being consulted on omits any junction detail; (T-junction with traffic lights, a free for all, roundabout(s)) a key point appears to be being avoided.				
<b>Response</b>  Comments and suggestions noted. Chapter 3 of the Development Framework presents a vision and strategy for change to the existing movement framework within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area, to help explore the potential benefits of the reallocation of road space by taking a place-making approach to the redesign of the existing gyratory. It has been appraised through sound urban design guidance, informal consultation with local stakeholders in the Community and with input from Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority.  Figure 27 presents a high level concept to sever the gyratory system (figure 27). The Council fully acknowledge the need to improve the safety and comfort for pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2 which sets out key objectives for remodelling the gyratory system.  The extent of streets with no through access for cars will be determined as part of any subsequent design stage, with the objective of creating the right conditions in which a mixed use high street can thrive throughout the day and evening. Any future option for remodelling the gyratory will require further detailed design work to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority, in consultation with relevant stakeholders.				
<b>Action</b>  No action required.				
=====				

Figure 27: Movement proposals for Mitcham's Corner

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31454	Mrs Veronica Bennett [5913]	Object	Not Specified	None
<b>Summary:</b> The removal of the gyratory and the changes in road layout could impact negatively on the Citi8 bus route which at the moment uses the gyratory between Victoria Avenue and Victoria Road. If the new road layout causes greater delays to the Citi8 it is likely to be rerouted along Gilbert Road and one third of Histon Road and the whole of Victoria Road will lose their only bus service.				
<b>Response</b>  Comments and concerns noted. Any future option for remodelling the gyratory will require further detailed design work to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council, in consultation with relevant stakeholders. The impact on bus services is an important matters that the Council would expect to be considered at part of any future detailed design work.				
<b>Action</b>  No action required.				
=====				
Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31459	Mr Paul Dupree [5912]	Object	Not Specified	None
<b>Summary:</b> There is an opportunity for a new cycle bridge from behind Barclays to Jesus Green, thus avoiding Victoria Road.				
<b>Response</b>  Comment noted.				
<b>Action</b>  No action required.				
=====				

Figure 27: Movement proposals for Mitcham's Corner

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31460	Mr Richard Black [5911]	Object	Not Specified	None
<p><i>Summary:</i></p> <p>The document is extremely lengthy, but does not address the need to provide a functional intersection of five major roads critical to effective functioning of the city, the local community, Cambridge residents, and the inner ring. Until and unless an intersection with sufficient capacity is designed and modelled accurately, the rest of the document is premature, manipulative and presumptuous.</p> <p>The council should not have taken this document to consultation until a working intersection of sufficient capacity was part of the plans. Only once an intersection of sufficient capacity is part of the plans should they be brought for public consultation. Otherwise the danger is that the consultation may falsely give approval to a design which is guaranteed to fail.</p> <p>In the current climate of poor quality and inadequate proposals from council and city deal, the current premature proposals give the impression that the council are attempting to deliberately manipulate the consultative process to provide skeleton approval to a plan with inadequate space reserved for the necessary intersection, and hence cause further damage to the local economy.</p>				
<p><i>Response</i></p> <p>Comments noted. The vision set out in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework presents a vision and strategy for change to the existing movement framework within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area, to help explore the potential benefits of the reallocation of road space by taking a place-making approach to the redesign of the existing gyratory. It has been appraised through sound urban design guidance, informal consultation with local stakeholders in the Community and with input from Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority.</p> <p>Figure 27 presents a high level concept to sever the gyratory system (figure 27). Initial traffic modelling has been undertaken by the County Council to assess the impact of this conceptual layout. The report is available as a background document.</p> <p>The outcomes of the initial modelling suggest that severing the gyratory layout would lead to increased queues on the Milton Road approach at AM peak time with all other approaches performing reasonably well. However, traffic modelling should not be considered as the sole decision making tool and other factors would need to be taken into account when determining any future changes in highway layout, such as the need to achieve a better balance between 'movement' functions and 'place' functions. Furthermore, the modelling is based on current conditions and has yet to consider changes growth and other highway network measures that may be delivered through the City Deal programme.</p> <p>As a designated Opportunity Area within the emerging Local Plan (2014), which also contains a District Centre, the streets also have an equally important 'place' function, as a destination where people visit and are encouraged to spend time. The Council considers that by making the area more enjoyable, safer, easier to get to and move around, that these improvements would enhance social, economic and community functions and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel. The Development Framework therefore seeks to better balance the traffic function and the place-making potential of the area, to create a place for people rather than for vehicles.</p> <p>Ultimately, any changes in highway layout would need the support of the City Deal. If the City Council endorses the highway layout changes envisaged in its Development Framework document, it is planned that City Deal officers would continue to work with City Council colleagues in partnership to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>* explore in more detail the implications of the conceptual layout to sever the existing gyratory</li><li>* consider how best to balance the 'movement' and 'place' functions</li><li>* factor in other potential City Deal measures that would influence Mitcham's Corner</li></ul> <p>The outcomes from this work would inform the scope of future City Deal work within the tranche 2 programme and inform any future potential City Deal financial contributions based on City Deal objectives in support of other contributions from developers and the City Council.</p>				
<p><i>Action</i></p> <p>No action required.</p>				

Figure 27: Movement proposals for Mitcham's Corner

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31467 Cambridge Architectural Research Ltd (CAR) (Luca Leone) [5910]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

I am disappointed that the Council has only entertained one masterplan for the remodelling of the gyratory system (the "shared space" approach). I am not convinced that this is the ideal solution for this exceptionally busy junction. I am concerned about the impact, from a traffic flow perspective, of the S-bend connection between Milton Road and Victoria Avenue. Long tailbacks at this junction would not benefit users of buses and other vehicles, and they would not benefit pedestrians and cyclists either.

In my view an alternative scheme, the "IDBE" design, should be drawn up alongside the current proposal, and both schemes subjected to a feasibility exercise, including traffic flow modelling. The choice of scheme to be implemented would then be made on the basis of cost, feasibility and public preference.

Response

Comments and concerns regarding an integrated scheme noted. The option put forward in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework for remodelling the gyratory system represents a high level concept and strategy to help explore the potential benefits for reallocation of highway space and public realm improvements at Mitcham's Corner. This concept does not discount additional options that could come forward.

Figure 27 presents a high level concept to sever the gyratory system (figure 27). Initial traffic modelling has been undertaken by the County Council to assess the impact of the conceptual layout set out in Figure 27 of the Development Framework. The report can be found at:

The outcomes of the initial modelling suggest that severing the gyratory layout would lead to increased queues on the Milton Road approach at AM peak time with all other approaches performing reasonably well. However, traffic modelling should not be considered as the sole decision making tool and other factors would need to be taken into account when determining any future changes in highway layout, such as the need to achieve a better balance between 'movement' functions and 'place' functions. Furthermore, the modelling is based on current conditions and has yet to consider changes in travel and consumer demand, future growth and other highway network measures that may be delivered through the City Deal programme.

As a designated Opportunity Area within the emerging Local Plan (2014), which also contains a District Centre, the streets also have an equally important 'place' function, as a destination where people visit and are encouraged to spend time. The Council considers that by making the area more enjoyable, safer, easier to get to and move around, that these improvements would enhance social, economic and community functions and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel. The Development Framework therefore seeks to better balance the importance of the 'movement' function and the 'place' function of the area.

Any future option for remodelling the gyratory will require further detailed design work to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council, in consultation with relevant stakeholders.

Action

No action required.





Figure 27: Movement proposals for Mitcham's Corner

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31468	Mr Matthew Danish [5916]	Object	Not Specified	None
<p><i>Summary:</i></p> <p>While I support the general concept of improving Mitcham's Corner by making it more accessible to people walking and cycling, I have deep reservations about several of the concepts found in the document.</p> <p>The proposal for a double roundel or double roundabout in Mitcham's Corner is not a good idea. The existing double roundel on Trumpington Road has been a constant source of injuries to people walking and cycling. We do not need to repeat that mistake, we need to remove it.</p>				
<p><i>Response</i></p> <p>Comments and concerns noted. The option put forward in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework for remodelling the gyratory system represents a high level concept and strategy to help explore the potential benefits for reallocation of highway space and public realm improvements at Mitcham's Corner.</p> <p>The Council considers it appropriate to examine existing schemes implemented elsewhere to help explore options and generate ideas for improving the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area. The need to improve safety for pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities is a key objective for remodelling the gyratory. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2 for the document. Any potential option will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders.</p>				
<p><i>Action</i></p> <p>No action required.</p>				

Figure 27: Movement proposals for Mitcham's Corner

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31473 CAMCYCLE (Cambridge Cycling Campaign) (Mr Joseph Adam) [2531]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

We welcome the proposal for removing the gyratory, and returning many of the roads to two-way operation. However we have strong concerns about the solution identified.

The new layout being proposed is a double roundel. This would be similar to the double roundel at Lensfield Road and Trumpington Road. That junction is currently the most dangerous in the city for cyclists. We do not believe that creating another similar junction is the best way forward for the area. Ironically, the County Council is coming forward with proposals to remove the existing double roundel at Trumpington Road.

We believe that the best long-term solution for the area would be to purchase and demolish at least some of 133-155 Chesterton Road. This would allow the creation of a straightforward crossroads or roundabout joining Milton Road, Chesterton Road and Victoria Avenue, and a large new public space over part of the existing gyratory. We note that both student groups studying the junction a few years ago independently came to the same conclusion. Shared Space

Response

Comments and concerns noted. The option put forward in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework for remodelling the gyratory system represents a high level concept and strategy to help explore the potential benefits for reallocation of highway space and public realm improvements at Mitcham's Corner.

The Council considers it appropriate to examine existing schemes implemented elsewhere to help explore options and generate ideas for improving the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area. The intention of figure 31 which illustrates roundels, is to demonstrate one way in which a previously traffic junction has been remodelled to achieve a better balance between pedestrians cyclists and motor vehicles. As such it is not a demonstration of a final proposals for Mitcham's Corner

The need to improve safety for pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities is a key objective for remodelling the gyratory. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2 of the document.

Any potential option will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders. This work will include reviewing any project monitoring results available for other example schemes such as the Frideswide Square (Oxford) to inform future work on changes to Mitcham's Corner.

The demolition of some of the properties at 137-155 Chesterton to realise an alternative 'cross road' solution for remodelling the gyratory system could require Cambridgeshire County Council to use compulsory purchase powers to acquire these properties. This option has been discounted. Compulsory purchase is intended as a last resort to secure the assembly of land needed for implementing projects, and in the case of Mitcham's Corner the Councils consider that an appropriate scheme could be delivered within the current highway space available and that the objectives of the Supplementary Planning Document could still be met.

Action

No action required.

Figure 27: Movement proposals for Mitcham's Corner

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31486	Hester Wells [1859]	Object	Not Specified	None
<p><i>Summary:</i></p> <p>A double-roundel was previously mentioned for the junction with Victoria Avenue. The current version of the SPD fudges the issue of this junction, but proposes no alternative. The double-roundabout copies a junction in Cambridge (Trumpington Rd / Lensfield Rd) which is the most dangerous junction in Cambridge for cycling. The County Council are currently planning to replace it due to its awful safety record, and we should not be re-creating this mistake. I object to any design of junction which has a variation on a double roundabout. Even a single roundabout is a poor junction for cycling, unless it has an annular ring for cycling, separate from pedestrians and motor vehicles.</p> <p>It is not clear if the 'local-access only' roads will actually be blocked to through-motor traffic, to create a low-traffic environment which would be quieter, more attractive and safer, and would encourage people to want to shop and spend time in the area. If there is no physical restriction to driving, I have no confidence in people sticking to restrictions, or that they will ever be enforced. Physical constraint on through-motor traffic is required.</p>				
<p><i>Response</i></p> <p>Comments and concerns noted. The option put forward in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework for remodelling the gyratory system represents a high level concept and strategy to help explore the potential benefits for reallocation of highway space and public realm improvements at Mitcham's Corner.</p> <p>The Council considers it appropriate to examine existing schemes implemented elsewhere to help explore options and generate ideas for improving the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area. The intention of figure 31 which illustrates roundels, is to demonstrate one way in which a previously traffic junction has been remodelled to achieve a better balance between pedestrians cyclists and motor vehicles. As such it is not a demonstration of a final proposals for Mitcham's Corner</p> <p>The need to improve safety for pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities is a key objective for remodelling the gyratory. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2 of the document.</p> <p>Any potential option will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders. This work will include reviewing any project monitoring results available for other example schemes such as the Frideswide Square (Oxford) to inform future work on changes to Mitcham's Corner.</p> <p>For clarity, the key accompanying Figure 27 which states 'Local Access Only' will be amended to read 'Local access only - no through route for cars'. The way in which this is achieved is an important matter that the Council would expect to be fully considered as part of any future detailed design work.</p>				
<p><i>Action</i></p> <p>Amend Figure 27 key text to read 'Local access only - no through route for cars'.</p>				

Figure 27: Movement proposals for Mitcham's Corner

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
31517	Dr Jocelynne Scutt [5920]	Object	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i>				
I generally support the submissions made by the Friends of Mitcham's Corner:				
Move the gateway on Victoria Road up to Greens Road, to slow traffic down before it gets to Mitcham's Corner.				
31510	Friends of Mitcham's Corner (Mrs Anne Cooper ) [5919]	Object	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i>				
Move the gateway on Victoria Road up to Greens Road, to slow traffic down before it gets to Mitcham's Corner.				
<i>Response</i>				
Comments noted. The new gateways shown on Figure 27 are indicative locations only. For clarity the key will be updated to read 'Create new gateways into Mitcham's Corner (indicative locations)'. However, the Council agree there is merit in repositioning the Victoria Road gateway further out to Albert Street/Greens Road. Figure 27 will be updated accordingly.				
<i>Action</i>				
Amend figure 27: reposition Victoria Road gateway to junction of Albert Street/Greens Road. Amend supporting key text to read 'Create new gateways into Mitcham's Corner (indicative locations)'. =====				
<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
31276	Mrs Elizabeth Simpson [5870]	Support	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i>				
We like it. Should help to create a much more cohesive community.				
<i>Response</i>				
Comments noted.				
<i>Action</i>				
No action required. =====				
<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
31446	Mr Simon Crowhurst [2162]	Support	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i>				
There is a lot of pedestrian traffic across Chesterton Road to and from the Co-op, which needs to be taken into account in the provision for pedestrians.				
<i>Response</i>				
Comments noted. Pedestrian/ cycle desire lines and crossings are important matters that the Council would expect to be fully considered at part of any future detailed design work. Therefore the 4th bullet point under paragraph 3.4.2 will be amended to read 'improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities, taking into account desire lines'.				
Any future option for remodelling the gyratory will require further detailed design work to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority, in consultation with relevant stakeholders. Pedestrian desire lines is an important matter that the Council would expect to be to be fully considered at part of any future detailed design work.				
<i>Action</i>				
4th bullet point under paragraph 3.4.2 will be amended to read 'improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities, taking into account desire lines'. =====				

Figure 27: Movement proposals for Mitcham's Corner

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31476</b>	<b>Dr Caroline Stephens [5917]</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
<i>Summary:</i>				
I think the plan is very exciting and has many really good points particularly the aim to make the area more pedestrian and cycle friendly by removing the gyratory system, the new pedestrian link routes and an aim to green up have an amenity space. It is important that the remaining pavements are suitably wide.				
<i>Response</i>				
<b>Comments noted. Any future option for remodelling the gyratory will require further detailed design work to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority, in consultation with relevant stakeholders. Pedestrian desire lines and width of footway is an important matter that the Council would expect to be to be fully considered at part of any future detailed design work. Therefore the 4th bullet point under paragraph 3.4.2 will be amended to read 'improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities, taking into account desire lines'.</b>				
<i>Action</i>				
<b>4th bullet point under paragraph 3.4.2 will be amended to read 'improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities, taking into account desire lines'.</b>				
=====				
<b>Paragraph 3.3.12</b>				
<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31277</b>	<b>Mrs Elizabeth Simpson [5870]</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
<i>Summary:</i>				
Support some aspects of the City deal scheme except for the decimation of Milton Road which is a residential area not a corridor. Also it is difficult to see how the City deal scheme can be initiated before the changes to the gyratory system are in place, as the two are completely intertwined. Also we have been told that at certain times of the day there will be a 50% increase in traffic along Chesterton Road which hardly helps to improve Mitcham's Corner.				
<b>31387</b>	<b>Mr David Kuznets [3087]</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
<i>Summary:</i>				
The gyratory system should be severed before or in connection with any changes to Milton Road. It is all part of the same system. To keep disruption to a minimum, you do all the construction at the same time. If you can't do that, you work from the city centre outwards. It would be dysfunctional at best to spend a couple of years reconstructing Milton Road to funnel into the gyratory system, and then close the gyratory system to do more construction work. It must be included in Tranche 1.				
<i>Response</i>				
<b>Comments noted. The City Deal scheme for Milton Road is part of Tranche 1 of the City Deal and seeks to integrate transport improvements along the corridor. Whilst the existing gyratory system is not part of this scheme, there is potential for it to be included in future tranches of the City Deal programme.</b>				
<i>Action</i>				
<b>No action required.</b>				
=====				

Paragraph 3.3.13

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31393	A Powell [4881]	Object	Not Specified	None
<p>Summary:</p> <p>I agree that the proposed changes to Mitcham's Corner are compliant with the agreed objectives for the City Deal but I do not consider that the current City Deal proposals are compliant with the objectives for Mitcham's Corner. It is unclear that the current City Deal proposals will deliver any benefits for Mitcham's Corner (or indeed for Cambridge). Instead it appears that the City Deal proposals (e.g. for Milton Road, PCCPs etc) are likely to worsen the congestion, air quality and streetscape at Mitcham's Corner and in the surrounding roads (e.g. Victoria Road, Milton Road).</p>				
<p>Response</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>				
<p>Action</p> <p>No action required.</p>				

Paragraph 3.3.14

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31313	Dr Rabia Dada-Oughton [5878]	Object	Not Specified	None
<p>Summary:</p> <p>The phased delivery may cause confusion and increase risks for pedestrians and cyclists if rules are changed but users are not aware of them. A long drawn out development plan will also cause unnecessary and disruption and inconvenience for local residents and businesses - let's just get on with it.</p>				
<p>Response</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>				
<p>Action</p> <p>No action required.</p>				

Paragraph 3.3.15

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31278	Mrs Elizabeth Simpson [5870]	Object	Not Specified	None
<div>Summary:</div> <div>Perfect. Let's get on with it.</div>				
31255	Paul Robison [5858]	Object	Not Specified	None
<div>Summary:</div> <div>There is no need to be so cautious. Remember that Victoria Road was closed completely for months for service repairs and traffic just found other routes. I suggest you use this real-world experience to critically test traffic models.</div>				
31214	Ms Olivia Maes [5851]	Object	Not Specified	None
<div>Summary:</div> <div>Good proposal.</div>				
<div>Response</div> <div>Comments noted.</div>				
<div>Action</div> <div>No action required.</div>				
=====				

Paragraph 3.4.2

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31242	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	Object	Not Specified	None
<div>Summary:</div> <div>I fully support these aims if they mean what I would mean by the words - but fear that what you and I consider "sufficient capacity" may differ. I also think that it will be very difficult to simultaneously achieve them all.</div>				
<div>Response</div> <div>Comments noted.</div>				
<div>Action</div> <div>No action required.</div>				
=====				

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31369	Mrs E McDonald [5890]	Object	Not Specified	None
<div>Summary:</div> <div>Please keep hard standing to a minimum. It is not pleasant to walk on, particularly in winter when icy. It increases flooding. The new development behind the Portland Arms is already causing flooding on the road in front of the Portland Arms. Grass is cooler in summer and not icy in winter and helps absorb surface water.</div>				
31228	Naomi Yandell [5856]	Object	Not Specified	None
<div>Summary:</div> <div>Improve the situation for people cycling and walking. Make more room for bus stops so that pedestrians passing by don't have to step onto the roads to get past.</div>				
31314	Dr Rabia Dada-Oughton [5878]	Object	Not Specified	None
<div>Summary:</div> <div>The priority must be to support local communities and businesses by making the area safer for pedestrians and cyclists. Well located bus stops would be welcome, along with wider footpaths and more trees.</div>				
31279	Mrs Elizabeth Simpson [5870]	Object	Not Specified	None
<div>Summary:</div> <div>The sooner it is done , the better.</div>				
31267	Mr Peter Fletcher [5868]	Object	Not Specified	None
<div>Summary:</div> <div>I generally support the proposals set out in the planning document, especially those intended to improve the quality of Mitcham's Corner. However, I am sceptical that traffic can be kept flowing freely.</div>				
<div>Response</div> <div>Comments noted.</div>				
<div>Action</div> <div>No action required.</div>				
=====				



## Representation(s)

31362 Mr Andrew Watson [5888]

## Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Object Not Specified None

### Summary:

Despite relentless criticism of the present gyratory system throughout the draft SPD, and a clearly-stated objective to abolish it, the authors do concede that the "Gyratory handles high traffic levels well" (section 2.4.1, p22). The document says that a "Key Objective" for remodelling the gyratory is to "Maintain sufficient capacity and flows through and around the area" (section 3.4.2, p34). However, this objective is neither prominent enough, nor strongly-enough stated. The adjective "sufficient" is subjective, and provides wiggle room for planners to reduce the junction's throughput while asserting that this is still somehow "sufficient". The objective in section 3.4.2 should therefore be changed to "Maintain or increase motor traffic capacity through and around the area".

## Response

Comments noted. Increasing motor traffic capacity should not be the primary objective when determining any future changes in the highway layout. Traffic flow implications are not the only primary function of the street network within the area. As a designated Opportunity Area within the emerging Local Plan (2014), which also contains a District Centre, the streets also have an equally important 'place' function, as a destination where people visit and are encouraged to spend time. The Council considers that by making the area more enjoyable, safer, easier to get to and move around, that these improvements would enhance social, economic and community functions and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel. The Development Framework therefore seeks to better balance the traffic function and the place-making potential of the area.

Representations received on the draft Development Framework have revealed a strong support for the severing and remodelling of the existing gyratory system.

Any future option for remodelling the gyratory will require further detailed design work to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council, in consultation with relevant stakeholders.

## Action

No action required.

## Representation(s)

31440 Mr Richard Taylor [1396]

## Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Object Not Specified None

### Summary:

I think the "improve safety" objective ought be stressed, and made more specific.

The objective should be a reduction in deaths and injuries; as well as an improvement in people's perception of safety when travelling through the area in particular via when as more vulnerable road users - pedestrians and cyclists.

## Response

Comments noted. The Council fully acknowledge the need to improve the safety and comfort for pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is adequately reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2 which sets out key objectives for remodelling the gyratory system.

## Action

No action required.

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31462	Miss Alison Taylor [5879]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

There needs to be provision for all buses (including park and ride) to stop in a coherent line, so everyone can continue their journey.

*Response*

Concerns noted. It is beyond the scope of the Development Framework to change the level of bus provision within the area. However, the Council does recognise that existing bus stops are poorly integrated and confusing within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area. The Development Framework therefore seeks that bus stops are well located as part of any future redesign of the gyratory system. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2 which sets out specific objectives for remodelling the gyratory system.

*Action*

No action required.

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31493	Ms Bettina Starke [5895]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The P&R bus should regularly stop at Mitcham's Corner.

*Response*

Concerns noted. It is beyond the scope of the Development Framework to change the level of bus provision within the area. However, the Council does recognise that existing bus stops are poorly integrated and confusing within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area. The Development Framework therefore seeks that bus stops are well located as part of any future redesign of the gyratory system. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2 which sets out specific objectives for remodelling the gyratory system.

*Action*

No action required.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31345</b> Historic England (Ms Alice Eggeling) [5886]	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

Supportive but we request changes, again, this option is not available on the online response.

Where Paragraph 3.1.5 references Manual for Streets 2 and lists the benefits of improved streets, we would welcome recognition that better streets can also have a positive benefit for the historic environment: minimising the impact of transport on heritage (Manual for Streets 2, 2010).

We encourage you to draw on Historic England's publication Streets for All: East of England for further guidance. This can be found via the following link:

<https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/streets-for-all-east-of-england/east-eng-streets.pdf/>

Where the placemaking objectives for the remodelled gyratory system are set out in Paragraph 3.4.2, we request a further bullet point as follows;

\* Preserve and enhance the Central Conservation Area and the wider historic environment and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

We welcome the design principles as likely to help to achieve a positive contribution to local character.

*Response*

**Comments noted. Agree that better streets can enhance the historic environment. Third objective under section 3.4 will be amended to read 'Enhance the spatial quality of the public realm to enhance the Central Conservation Area and promote investment.'**

*Action*

**Third objective under section 3.4 will be amended to read 'Enhance the spatial quality of the public realm, to enhance the Central Conservation Area and promote investment'.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31373</b> Mr Simon Norton [76]	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

This objective would be a lot easier to achieve if the volume of vehicle traffic could be reduced, and therefore the ideas in the document should be combined with strong demand management measures targeted at private cars.

*Response*

**Comments noted. Any future option for remodelling the gyratory will require further detailed design work to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority, and would take into account future growth and other highway network measures that may be delivered through the City Deal programme.**

*Action*

**No action required.**

Paragraph 3.5.1

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31243	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	Object	Not Specified	None
<p>Summary:</p> <p>As far as I can tell these steps will achieve exactly the opposite of the leading aim in 3.4.2, i.e. "to maintain sufficient capacity and flow through the area".</p>				
<p>Response</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>				
<p>Action</p> <p>No action required.</p>				

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31324	CAMCYCLE (Cambridge Cycling Campaign) (Mr Joseph Adam) [2531]	Object	Not Specified	None
<p>Summary:</p> <p>I think this is missing a key design principle Provide Dedicated space for cycling (cycle tracks) separated from pedestrians and cars. This should be direct and wide, with simple routes through the space. Some of the new cycle tracks in London (along the embankment for example) have good examples of this type of design. It should be included here.</p>				
<p>Response</p> <p>Comments noted. A key objective for remodelling the gyratory system is to improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2. The degree of segregation between pedestrians, cycles and vehicles will be considered as part of any subsequent design stage. Any future change to the highway layout will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority, in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders.</p>				
<p>Action</p> <p>No action required.</p>				

## Representation(s)

31339 Mr James Baker [5882]

## Nature

Object

## Appearance

Not Specified

## Soundness Tests

None

### Summary:

It is fanciful to suppose that these measures will improve the general experience of the junction for pedestrians and cyclists. A junction as busy as this one cannot be transformed into a pedestrian/cyclist-friendly merely by reducing vehicle speeds. Pedestrians and cyclists require dedicated, segregated provision and nowhere is this more the case than at busy routes and at junctions (Mitcham's Corner qualifies as both). They are put in danger by the presence of motor vehicles and it is only through dedicated provision (crossings mandating vehicles to stop, cycle lanes, etc.) that this danger can be reliably mitigated.

## Response

Comments and concerns noted. A key objective for remodelling the gyratory system is to improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2. The degree of segregation between pedestrians, cycles and vehicles will be considered as part of any subsequent design stage. Any future change to the highway layout will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders.

## Action

No action required.

## Representation(s)

31441 Mr Richard Taylor [1396]

## Nature

Object

## Appearance

Not Specified

## Soundness Tests

None

### Summary:

The low speed environment should be created by the road environment and ought not rely on excessive signage, speed camera, or police officer enforcement.

## Response

Agree. The creation of a low speed environment is central to creating a better balance between people and vehicles. This could be enforced by a formal speed limit, but must be linked to a detailed design that changes the character of the 'road', width and geometry of the streetscape. A number of key design elements have been identified within section 3.5 of the Development Framework that would encourage lower vehicle speeds.

## Action

No action required.

## Representation(s)

31458 Mr Paul Dupree [5912]

## Nature

Object

## Appearance

Not Specified

## Soundness Tests

None

### Summary:

To encourage Cambridge cycling, cycle routes must be segregated from cars and pedestrians. The images shown are of people on bicycles riding on pavements. Cyclists in the road will have to take the road behind and in front of buses and cars.

## Response

Comments and concerns noted. A key objective for remodelling the gyratory system is to improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2. The degree of segregation between pedestrians, cycles and vehicles will be considered as part of any subsequent design stage. Any future change to the highway layout will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders.

## Action

No action required.

## Representation(s)

31463 Miss Alison Taylor [5879]

## Nature

Object

## Appearance

Not Specified

## Soundness Tests

None

### Summary:

Sufficient separation of pedestrians and traffic. The safety of children, both physical safety and air quality, is paramount

## Response

Comments and concerns noted. A key objective for remodelling the gyratory system is to improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2. The degree of segregation between pedestrians, cycles and vehicles will be considered as part of any subsequent design stage. Any future change to the highway layout will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders.

## Action

No action required.

## Representation(s)

31470 Mr Matthew Danish [5916]

## Nature

Object

## Appearance

Not Specified

## Soundness Tests

None

### Summary:

In general, new streetscape infrastructure in a busy junction should incorporate protected, separate cycling lanes, good-sized pavements, and formal crossings at frequent intervals. The junctions, whether they take the form of a single, small roundabout with an island, or a traffic signal junction, should have protected, separate cycling lanes as part of the junction, following the recommendations from the Cambridge Cycling Campaign and the latest engineering advice from the Netherlands.

## Response

Comments and concerns noted. A key objective for remodelling the gyratory system is to improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2. The degree of segregation between pedestrians, cycles and vehicles will be considered as part of any subsequent design stage. Any future change to the highway layout will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in consultation with relevant stakeholders.

## Action

No action required.

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31475 CAMCYCLE (Cambridge Cycling Campaign) (Mr Joseph Adam) [2531]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

We would like to see a Dutch-inspired solution that clearly separates the modes of transport, and minimizes conflict. The aim should be for the cycle infrastructure to be safe, reasonably direct and convenient so that it is useful and attractive for everyday cycling by people of all ages and abilities.

In the example above the traffic routes are still plain tarmac, but have clear crossing points and cycle tracks. The sense of place is created in the areas where the through traffic is absent. We feel this is a more successful approach than hoping that new paving will create pleasant areas that still have large amounts of traffic (including many buses) passing through them.

This is also likely to be a cheaper solution, both to create and in the long term. Tarmac is very good at supporting many heavy vehicles over long periods of time. Many paving solutions are only good for light use, in areas of low traffic. We feel that may well be appropriate for the newly created access roads in the space, which should see low levels of motor traffic, and therefore could become successful new public spaces.

**Response**

Comments and suggestions noted. The option put forward in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework for remodelling the gyratory system represents a high level concept and strategy to help explore the potential benefits for reallocation of highway space and public realm improvements at Mitcham's Corner. This concept does not discount additional options that could come forward.

Agree that a simple and a robust palette of materials can positively change the image and perception of the street. Materials and finishes would be fully considered as part of any future detailed design work undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highways Authority.

**Action**

No action required.

=====

## Representation(s)

**31500** The Disability Consultative Panel [5439]

**Nature**

Object

**Appearance**

Not Specified

**Soundness Tests**

None

**Agent:** Mr Mark Taylor [510]

### Summary:

As this is a general document there is little to comment on from the concerns of disabled people, because how disabled people will use this area will be defined by detail planning. However, I believe that disabled people would fight any scheme involving shared space concepts, by legal means or even civil protest. Even disability group and organisation of access professionals oppose shared space schemes are these having legal challenges at Kennington High Street, Poyton, etc. Please don't even suggest any shared space areas.

**31485** Hester Wells [1859]

Object

Not Specified

None

### Summary:

Pedestrians and people cycling through should not be made to share space - shared-use paths are a constant source of complaint and conflict in Cambridge, for both sets of users. This is particularly true for an area where pedestrians will be encouraged to enjoy the area and relax and linger, while many people cycling will be trying to move through on longer journeys.

## Response

Comments noted. A key objective for remodelling the gyratory system is to improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2. The degree of segregation between pedestrians, cycles and vehicles will be considered as part of any subsequent design stage. Any future change to the highway layout will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority, in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders

## Action

No action required.

## Representation(s)

**31389** Mr Jeremy Purseglove [5897]

**Nature**

Support

**Appearance**

Not Specified

**Soundness Tests**

None

### Summary:

Hugely support the removal of the present gyratory system together with slowed traffic and more tree planting.

**31280** Mrs Elizabeth Simpson [5870]

Support

Not Specified

None

### Summary:

Just what we need.

## Response

Comments noted.

## Action

No action required.



Paragraph 3.5.2

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31426	ms alexandra crowhurst [5901]	Support	Not Specified	None
<div>Summary:</div> <div>there is a need for motor traffic to flow - so any design shouldn't impede the flow - calming in one area may result in blockage further back?</div>				
31219	Michael Cahn [2667]	Support	Not Specified	None
<div>Summary:</div> <div>Support the reduction of vehicle speeds.</div>				
<div>Response</div> <div>Comments noted.</div>				
<div>Action</div> <div>No action required.</div>				

Paragraph 3.5.3

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31304	mr william Beavitt [5875]	Support	Not Specified	None
<div>Summary:</div> <div>This complicated intersection has many one-way elements that would be greatly improved by converting most to two way traffic. The lanes are very wide thus lots of concrete, (up-to three lanes). Please reduce the width and number of lanes. Significantly increase tree cover to really beautify junction.</div> <div>Although Mitcham's Corner gets a bad rep, with the houses and shops on the Island it is considerably better than other large open junctions like Elizabeth Way roundabouts.</div> <div>I also think that reversing the narrow lane opposite the Portland arms by LLoyds bank would be better for most cars rather than sending them round Staples.</div>				
<div>Response</div> <div>Comments noted.</div>				
<div>Action</div> <div>No action required.</div>				

## Paragraph 3.5.4

### Representation(s)

31256 Paul Robison [5858]

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Object Not Specified None

#### Summary:

I support low design speeds, but these are not low enough. Given that the distance from end-to-end of Mitchams Corner (from Trafalgar Road to Crofttholme Lane) is only about 250m, the difference in time taken to drive through the heart of this community would be less than 20 seconds more if you were to aim for a design speed of 10mph. This extra time would give 'transient visitors' time to contemplate stopping at the shops too, so should be supported by traders.  
Also, design speeds on junctions and bends would presumably be lower anyway for safety reasons?

### Response

Comments noted. The creation of a low speed environment is central to creating a better balance between people and vehicles. This could be enforced by a formal speed limit, but must be linked to a detailed design that changes the character of the 'road', width and geometry of the streetscape. A number of key design elements have been identified within section 3.5 of the Development Framework that would encourage lower vehicle speeds.

Any future option for remodelling the gyratory will require further detailed design work to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority, in consultation with relevant stakeholders. A low design speed should service as the starting point for any future detailed design work.

### Action

No action required.

### Representation(s)

31325 CAMCYCLE (Cambridge Cycling Campaign) (Mr Joseph Adam) [2531]

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Support Not Specified None

#### Summary:

Agreed.  
This should be treated as a place first, and highway later

31305 mr william Beavitt [5875]

Support Not Specified None

#### Summary:

Please reduce speed here. Many cars have come racing round the back of Mitcham's corner and lost control, crashing into the front garden walls of Cambrian Villas (the Victorian terrace between Ailsa Court Co-op and Springfield Court opposite Barkers).

### Response

Comments noted.

### Action

No action required.

Paragraph 3.5.8

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31360 Mr Andrew Watson [5888]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Mitcham's Corner is, above all, a road junction. It carries a large volume of motor traffic each day. At peak times there are moderately-long queues of traffic waiting to enter the junction via all five road entrances. Any reduction in its throughput for motor traffic would lengthen these queues, which in turn would adversely affect surrounding areas.

Response

Comments noted, however the council takes a different view. Manual for Streets 1 & 2 stress the importance of streets not only as conduits for movement but as places to visit and spend time. The aspirations and key development principles identified in section 3.5 are consistent with those set out in Manual for Streets 1 & 2.

Comments noted. The vision set out in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework presents a vision and strategy for change to the existing movement framework within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area, to help explore the potential benefits of the reallocation of road space by taking a place-making approach to the redesign of the existing gyratory. It has been appraised through sound urban design guidance, informal consultation with local stakeholders in the Community and with input from Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority.

Figure 27 presents a high level concept to sever the gyratory system (figure 27). Initial traffic modelling has been undertaken by the County Council to assess the impact of this conceptual layout. The report is available as a background document.

The outcomes of the initial modelling suggest that severing the gyratory layout would lead to increased queues on the Milton Road approach at AM peak time with all other approaches performing reasonably well. However, traffic modelling should not be considered as the sole decision making tool and other factors would need to be taken into account when determining any future changes in highway layout, such as the need to achieve a better balance between 'movement' functions and 'place' functions. Furthermore, the modelling is based on current conditions and has yet to consider changes growth and other highway network measures that may be delivered through the City Deal programme.

As a designated Opportunity Area within the emerging Local Plan (2014), which also contains a District Centre, the streets also have an equally important 'place' function, as a destination where people visit and are encouraged to spend time. The Council considers that by making the area more enjoyable, safer, easier to get to and move around, that these improvements would enhance social, economic and community functions and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel. The Development Framework therefore seeks to better balance the traffic function and the place-making potential of the area, to create a place for people rather than for vehicles.

Ultimately, any changes in highway layout would need the support of the City Deal. If the City Council endorses the highway layout changes envisaged in its Development Framework document, it is planned that City Deal officers would continue to work with City Council colleagues in partnership to:

- \* explore in more detail the implications of the conceptual layout to sever the existing gyratory
- \* consider how best to balance the 'movement' and 'place' functions
- \* factor in other potential City Deal measures that would influence Mitcham's Corner

The outcomes from this work would inform the scope of future City Deal work within the tranche 2 programme and inform any future potential City Deal financial contributions based on City Deal objectives in support of other contributions from developers and the City Council.

Action

No action required.

=====

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31379 Dr Robert Izzard [5891]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

I would recommend you try the Histon Road/Victoria road junction on a bike for an example of how drivers react to a narrowing street. They do not slow down when overtaking bicycles, they accelerate to get through before the road narrows. This means overtaking with only centimetres or, sometimes, NO space (I know of cases of cyclists being hit where the road narrows, and I suffer near misses almost daily). Given the level of bad, ignorant, aggressive driving currently in Cambridge, I am very skeptical that this is going to work without accidents.

**Response**

Comments and concerns noted. A key objective for remodelling the gyratory system is to improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2. The degree of segregation between pedestrians, cycles and vehicles will be considered as part of any subsequent design stage.

We agree that existing lane widths within the area are uncomfortable for cyclists as there is not enough room for drivers to pass safely. As such the Council would expect the choice of lane width to be carefully considered as part of any future detailed design work to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in consultation with relevant stakeholders. Guidance contained within the Government's Manual for Streets 2 should be taken into account in determining the physical lane widths.

**Action**

No action required.

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31484 Hester Wells [1859]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Narrowing the carriageway without provision of separate cycling facilities is likely to make it more unpleasant to cycle rather than less. People do not like feeling that they are blocking traffic, and more aggressive drivers will still try to overtake in limited space.

**Response**

Comments and concerns noted. A key objective for remodelling the gyratory system is to improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2. The degree of segregation between pedestrians, cycles and vehicles will be considered as part of any subsequent design stage.

Existing carriageway lane widths within the area are uncomfortable for cyclists as there is not enough room for drivers to pass safely. As such the Council would expect the choice of lane width to be carefully considered as part of any future detailed design work to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in consultation with relevant stakeholders. Guidance contained within the Government's Manual for Streets 2 should be taken into account in determining lane widths.

**Action**

No action required.

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31430	Mr Simon Crowhurst [2162]	Support	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i> Not all motorists (or cyclists) are courteous. There would probably need to be CCTV monitoring of the traffic in the area to discourage aggressive driving and cycling.				
<i>Response</i> Comments noted.				
<i>Action</i> No action required.				
=====				

Paragraph 3.5.11

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31281	Mrs Elizabeth Simpson [5870]	Support	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i> The only way to dismantle the gyratory system.				
31257	Paul Robison [5858]	Support	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i> Completely support this proposal. The current one-way gyratory brings out the wannabe Lewis Hamilton in too many drivers. The grippy road surface added a few years ago only encouraged this behaviour.				
31220	Michael Cahn [2667]	Support	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i> Support the introduction of two-way traffic.				
<i>Response</i> Comments noted.				
<i>Action</i> No action required.				
=====				

Paragraph 3.5.12

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31217 Doug Whyte [5711]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I would be interested in how you are going to improve the flow of traffic in this area as I personally think it flows very well.

The redevelopment of the Hills Road junction has made the traffic flow much worse and more dangerous for cyclists. This is due to the reduction in lanes, lines and signage.

I am sceptical that a similar approach on Mitcham's Corner will be successful.

Response

Comments noted. The vision set out in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework presents a vision and strategy for change to the existing movement framework within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area, to help explore the potential benefits of the reallocation of road space by taking a place-making approach to the redesign of the existing gyratory. It has been appraised through sound urban design guidance, informal consultation with local stakeholders in the Community and with input from Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority.

Figure 27 presents a high level concept to sever the gyratory system (figure 27). Initial traffic modelling has been undertaken by the County Council to assess the impact of this conceptual layout. The report is available as a background document.

The outcomes of the initial modelling suggest that severing the gyratory layout would lead to increased queues on the Milton Road approach at AM peak time with all other approaches performing reasonably well. However, traffic modelling should not be considered as the sole decision making tool and other factors would need to be taken into account when determining any future changes in highway layout, such as the need to achieve a better balance between 'movement' functions and 'place' functions. Furthermore, the modelling is based on current conditions and has yet to consider changes growth and other highway network measures that may be delivered through the City Deal programme.

As a designated Opportunity Area within the emerging Local Plan (2014), which also contains a District Centre, the streets also have an equally important 'place' function, as a destination where people visit and are encouraged to spend time. The Council considers that by making the area more enjoyable, safer, easier to get to and move around, that these improvements would enhance social, economic and community functions and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel. The Development Framework therefore seeks to better balance the traffic function and the place-making potential of the area, to create a place for people rather than for vehicles.

Ultimately, any changes in highway layout would need the support of the City Deal. If the City Council endorses the highway layout changes envisaged in its Supplementary Planning Document, it is planned that City Deal officers would continue to work with City Council colleagues in partnership to:

- \* explore in more detail the implications of the conceptual layout to sever the existing gyratory
- \* consider how best to balance the 'movement' and 'place' functions
- \* factor in other potential City Deal measures that would influence Mitcham's Corner

The outcomes from this work would inform the scope of future City Deal work within the tranche 2 programme and inform any future potential City Deal financial contributions based on City Deal objectives in support of other contributions from developers and the City Council.

Action

No action required.

=====

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31261	Paul Robison [5858]	Object	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i> Support but also: We need more frequent but smaller, cleaner buses.				
<i>Response</i> Comments noted.				
<i>Action</i> No action required.				
=====				

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31296 Sue Durham [5873]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I think the traffic flows well here. making it flow less well could easily lead to jams and bottlenecking, which don't benefit anyone.

*Response*

Comments noted. The vision set out in Chapter 3 of the Development Framework presents a vision and strategy for change to the existing movement framework within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area, to help explore the potential benefits of the reallocation of road space by taking a place-making approach to the redesign of the existing gyratory. It has been appraised through sound urban design guidance, informal consultation with local stakeholders in the Community and with input from Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority.

Figure 27 presents a high level concept to sever the gyratory system (figure 27). Initial traffic modelling has been undertaken by the County Council to assess the impact of this conceptual layout. The report is available as a background document.

The outcomes of the initial modelling suggest that severing the gyratory layout would lead to increased queues on the Milton Road approach at AM peak time with all other approaches performing reasonably well. However, traffic modelling should not be considered as the sole decision making tool and other factors would need to be taken into account when determining any future changes in highway layout, such as the need to achieve a better balance between 'movement' functions and 'place' functions. Furthermore, the modelling is based on current conditions and has yet to consider changes growth and other highway network measures that may be delivered through the City Deal programme.

As a designated Opportunity Area within the emerging Local Plan (2014), which also contains a District Centre, the streets also have an equally important 'place' function, as a destination where people visit and are encouraged to spend time. The Council considers that by making the area more enjoyable, safer, easier to get to and move around, that these improvements would enhance social, economic and community functions and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel. The Development Framework therefore seeks to better balance the traffic function and the place-making potential of the area, to create a place for people rather than for vehicles.

Ultimately, any changes in highway layout would need the support of the City Deal. If the City Council endorses the highway layout changes envisaged in its Development Framework document, it is planned that City Deal officers would continue to work with City Council colleagues in partnership to:

- \* explore in more detail the implications of the conceptual layout to sever the existing gyratory
- \* consider how best to balance the 'movement' and 'place' functions
- \* factor in other potential City Deal measures that would influence Mitcham's Corner

The outcomes from this work would inform the scope of future City Deal work within the tranche 2 programme and inform any future potential City Deal financial contributions based on City Deal objectives in support of other contributions from developers and the City Council.

*Action*

No action required.



Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31315	Dr Rabia Dada-Oughton [5878]	Object	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i> Support visual narrowing, and anything that reduces the speed at which cars use these roads. However I am sceptical of unsigned and unlined roads, which may make the area more unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists by removing some of the demarcations.				
<i>Response</i>  Comments and concerns noted. The key development principles identified in section 3.5 of the Development Framework are consistent with those set out in the Government's Manual for Streets 1 & 2. Manual for Streets 1 notes that the use of centre lines is not an absolute requirement and includes reference to the reductions in traffic speed that result in omitting centreline markings on carriageways, including busy routes in urban areas.				
<i>Action</i>  No action required.				

Paragraph Figures 28 to 30: Transport measures

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31337	Mr James Baker [5882]	Object	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i> It is fanciful to suppose that these measures will improve the general experience of the junction for pedestrians and cyclists. A junction as busy as this one cannot be transformed into a pedestrian/cyclist-friendly merely by reducing vehicle speeds. Pedestrians and cyclists require dedicated, segregated provision and nowhere is this more the case than at busy routes and at junctions (Mitcham's Corner qualifies as both). They are put in danger by the presence of motor vehicles and it is only through dedicated provision (crossings mandating vehicles to stop, cycle lanes, etc.) that this danger can be reliably mitigated.				
<i>Response</i>  Comments and concerns noted. A key objective for remodelling the gyratory system is to improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2. The degree of segregation between pedestrians, cycles and vehicles will be considered as part of any subsequent design stage. Any future change to the highway layout will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders.				
<i>Action</i>  No action required.				

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31282	Mrs Elizabeth Simpson [5870]	Support	Not Specified	None
<i>Summary:</i> Vehicles are put in their place. Excellent.				
<i>Response</i>  Comments noted.				
<i>Action</i>  No action required.				

## Paragraph Figures 31 to 33: Transport examples

### Representation(s)

**31321** CAMCYCLE (Cambridge Cycling Campaign) (Mr Joseph Adam) [2531]

*Nature*

*Appearance*

*Soundness Tests*

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

The examples given have no provision for bikes, and reply on cars to behave well, rather than giving pedestrians explicit priority.

### Response

Comment noted. Figures 36-37 are intended to illustrate some of the key design principles identified in section 3.5. The images provide examples of street design elements that have been used successfully in other urban areas. They are not a demonstration of a final proposal.

### Action

No action required.

### Representation(s)

**31377** Dr Robert Izzard [5891]

*Nature*

*Appearance*

*Soundness Tests*

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Fig. 33 shows a lovely piece of concrete. I sincerely hope the planner hope to promote a greener, more pleasant junction than this monstrosity. My friends in Oxford despise Frideswide Square and avoid it because it is ugly and unpleasant.

Tightening vehicle approaches is a nightmare for cyclists. Victoria Road is an example of this. If the aim is to have cars overtake with mere centimetres between them and the cyclists, then the aim is fulfilled. I hope this is NOT the case.

Fig.32 again, shared spaces are bad. Segregate the cycles and pedestrians to prevent conflict. USE the space, do not waste it.

### Response

Comments noted and concerns understood. A key theme of the Development Framework is to promote measures to physically 'green' the area and consultation has revealed strong support of this. To ensure that this objective is translated into any future proposals for the remodelling of the gyratory system, the third bullet point under paragraph 3.4.2 will be amended to read 'enhance the spatial quality of the public realm to promote investment, with trees and landscape as an integral element'

Shared space is not a one size fits all approach and needs to be tailored to the specific circumstance including an understanding of all modal flows. Any emerging scheme for the remodelling of the gyratory whether a shared space concept or not, would need to go through the County Council as Highway Authority for safety audit. The intention of figures 31-33 is to demonstrate one way in which a previously traffic dominated set of junctions have been remodelled to achieve a better balance between pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicles. As such it is not a demonstration of a final proposals for Mitcham's Corner.

A key objective for remodelling the gyratory system is to improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2. The design principles identified in section 3.5 of the Development Framework are consistent with those set out in the Government's Manual for Streets 1 & 2. The degree of segregation between pedestrians, cycles and vehicles, in addition to the nature of crossings will be considered as part of any subsequent design stage. Any future change to the highway layout will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders.

### Action

Amend third bullet point under paragraph 3.4.2 to read 'enhance the special quality of the public realm to promote investment, with trees and landscape as an integral element'.

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31457 Mr Paul Dupree [5912]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Although redesign to provide better streetscape and reduced traffic speed is supported, the proposed concept, similar to Frideswide Square, Oxford is entirely inappropriate. There is no concept of segregation of motor vehicles, cycles and pedestrians.

It is suggested to amend so that Dutch quality cycle routes around Mitcham's corner are designed into the plan.

**Response**

Comments noted and concerns understood. Shared space is not a one size fits all approach and needs to be tailored to the specific circumstances including an understanding of all modal flows. Any emerging scheme for the remodelling of the gyratory whether a shared space concept or not, would need to go through the County Council as Highway Authority for safety audit. The intention of figures 31-33 is to demonstrate one way in which a previously traffic dominated set of junctions have been remodelled to achieve a better balance between pedestrians cyclists and motor vehicles. As such it is not a demonstration of a final proposal for Mitcham's Corner.

A key objective for remodelling the gyratory system is to improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2. The design principles identified in section 3.5 of the Development Framework are consistent with those set out in the Government's Manual for Streets 1 & 2.

The degree of segregation between pedestrians, cycles and vehicles, in addition to the nature of crossings will be considered as part of any subsequent design stage. Any future change to the highway layout will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders.

**Action**

No action required.

=====

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31474</b> CAMCYCLE (Cambridge Cycling Campaign) (Mr Joseph Adam) [2531]  <i>Summary:</i> The SPD points towards several recent schemes that have used so-called shared space principles to improve an area including Poynton in Cheshire and Frideswide Square in Oxford, but we believe that shared space is not appropriate for the through routes of Mitcham's Corner. Camcycle welcomes alterations that reduce traffic speeds, and improve the look and feel of the area. However we believe it is vital that these spaces include dedicated space for cycle tracks, pavements, and clear indications of pedestrian and cycle priority and crossing points.  We believe that true shared space only works when the number of people walking or cycling is equal to or higher than that of the cars. This will likely never be true for Mitcham's Corner, which is a through route in several directions, including for several bus routes.	Object	Not Specified	None
<b>31483</b> Hester Wells [1859]  <i>Summary:</i> I support removal of the gyratory, which destroys any sense of place at Mitcham's corner, and makes cycling in the area very scary, putting many people off using active and sustainable transport.  However, I object to so-called 'shared-space' schemes such as the example shown from Oxford, which reduce distinctions between pedestrian and motor vehicle space, and ignore cycling as a separate mode of transport entirely. Most of the unpleasantness of Mitcham's Corner is due to the volume of motor traffic, and the noise and pollution and danger that this creates. A pretty, busy road is still a busy road. Frideswide Square in Oxford was the source of multiple objections from the local cycling campaign. The same objections and problems will be true for Cambridge.  Shared space is only appropriate in a low traffic environment, otherwise it results in bullying of pedestrians and people cycling, and makes crossing difficult without proper crossings. This is particularly true for partially sighted pedestrians, who need clear crossing points, and for other groups, such as children, who do not understand how to behave without clear separation of walking and driving spaces.  I object to any version of the scheme which does not include proper segregated cycling facilities so that cycling is safe and attractive for people of all ages, and is separated from pedestrians. Cycling-specific facilities are entirely absent in the detail of the consultation.	Object	Not Specified	None
<b>31469</b> Mr Matthew Danish [5916]  <i>Summary:</i> The concept of shared space is not appropriate for a busy junction like Mitcham's Corner. Shared space is only appropriate where levels of vehicular traffic are low enough that people walking and cycling can feel confident that their rights will be respected. That is not the case for Mitcham's Corner. It may work on some of the closed-off side streets that you have proposed, but not for the main section of the junction. Shared space does not work where there are too many vehicles because drivers do not respect so-called "courtesy crossings" and that leaves people with visual impairments at a severe disadvantage when having to deal with this space. Even the addition of simple Zebra crossings would make a world of difference. I also note that shared space does not work for cycling either, because motor vehicles moving in a stop-start pattern are incompatible with the movement of people cycling. Poynton in Cheshire, a frequently-cited example of shared space, has utterly failed to promote cycling and statistics there show lower levels of cycling than average in the UK. Frideswide Square in Oxford has been a failure in cycling terms and they have resorted to shared-use pavements instead of proper cycling provision.	Object	Not Specified	None

## Response

Comments noted and concerns understood. Shared space is not a one size fits all approach and needs to be tailored to the specific circumstances including an understanding of all modal flows. Any emerging scheme for the remodelling of the gyratory whether a shared space concept or not, would need to go through the County Council as Highway Authority for safety audit. The intention of figures 31-33 is to demonstrate one way in which a previously traffic dominated set of junctions have been remodelled to achieve a better balance between pedestrians cyclists and motor vehicles. As such it is not a demonstration of a final proposal for Mitcham's Corner.

A key objective for remodelling the gyratory system is to improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2. The design principles identified in section 3.5 of the Development Framework are consistent with those set out in the Government's Manual for Streets 1 & 2.

The degree of segregation between pedestrians, cycles and vehicles, in addition to the nature of crossings will be considered as part of any subsequent design stage. Any future change to the highway layout will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders.

## Action

No action required.

## Representation(s)

31215 Ms Olivia Maes [5851]

## Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Support Not Specified None

## Summary:

Good proposal.

## Response

Comments noted.

## Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 3.6.1

## Representation(s)

31283 Mrs Elizabeth Simpson [5870]

## Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Support Not Specified None

## Summary:

Blatantly obvious and anything is better than the present layout.

## Response

Comments noted.

## Action

No action required.

Paragraph 3.6.2

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31269 Mr Ranjit Chooun [5869]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

With regards to the improvement of local shopping, what extra shops is intended to be brought into the area?? The Mitcham corner area can only be improved by the "REMOVAL OF ALL THE NEW LOCAL ACTIVITIES DEVELOPMENT THAT HAVE RESULTED IN THE PAST 10 TO 15 YEARS). Yes, if the area is turned into a new local forestry area, there will be dramatic improvements to the quality of life locally. So far, we have not seen better development, we have an eye-sore of a building "the Old People Home" is a prime example.

Response

Comments noted. Mitcham's Corner is designated a District Centre within the emerging Local Plan. As noted in paragraph 1.4.2 the District Centre is not realising its full potential, as such growth opportunities and investment potential are being lost. The Council has a responsibility to meet its objectively assessed need for residential, business and retail needs over the plan period. This is laid out within the Government's National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance. The Council's intention to produce a Development Framework SPD for the Mitcham's Corner area (identified in Policy 21: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area of the Local Plan 2014) is to ensure that any development or redevelopment within the area is undertaken in a way that enhances the area, provides high quality development, delivers a sense of place and improves connectivity between people and places.

The comments regarding the creation of a new local forestry area are noted, the Development Framework identifies the location of a new public space in Figure 27 and section 3.7 through the remodelling of the existing gyratory.

Action

No action required.

Paragraph 3.6.5

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31316	Dr Rabia Dada-Oughton [5878]	Object	Not Specified	None
<div>Summary:</div> <div>More trees, wider footpaths and a generally better aesthetic would be welcome.</div>				
31340	Mr Ben Rowlings [5884]	Object	Not Specified	None
<div>Summary:</div> <div>Agree with new 'public space' - less traffic, more community, small retail/food businesses, outdoor cafe seating area, market and multi-use event space; raised beds green planting with seating; more cycle use encouraged; better evening lighting.</div>				
31284	Mrs Elizabeth Simpson [5870]	Object	Not Specified	None
<div>Summary:</div> <div>This can be achieved once the gyratory system is tamed.</div>				
31244	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]	Object	Not Specified	None
<div>Summary:</div> <div>I support the ideas of more trees and greenery. However, this is a key location on the inner ring road, and top of the list is adequate traffic flow - and it is far from obvious that this can be achieved at the same time as "more sense of place" and more trees and greenery.</div>				
31227	Naomi Yandell [5856]	Object	Not Specified	None
<div>Summary:</div> <div>More trees and greenery. Make more room for bus stops so that pedestrians passing by don't have to step onto the roads to get past. Make the area more people-friendly and let's have a gateway to central Cambridge which we can be proud of. Cafes/independent shops.</div>				
<div>Response</div> <div>Comments noted.</div>				
<div>Action</div> <div>No action required.</div>				
=====				

## Representation(s)

31375 Dr Robert Izzard [5891]

Nature

Appearance

Soundness Tests

Object

Not Specified

None

### Summary:

"cycle more easily"... this seems unlikely. Unless cyclists are cycling \*very\* slowly, mixing them with pedestrians who are "spilling out" is likely to cause conflict. Through traffic, including cyclists, will have to slow their journeys (possibly even more than currently) to get through, which will frustrate. I see nothing here which addresses these likely conflicts between users of the same (shared) space. You could learn from the Netherlands where cyclists are not made to share space with pedestrians or cars. I guess if any of the "planning" team were cyclists, this would be immediately obvious to them.

## Response

Comments noted and concerns understood. Shared space is not a one size fits all approach and needs to be tailored to the specific circumstance including an understanding of all modal flows. Any emerging scheme for the remodelling of the gyratory whether a shared space concept or not, would need to go through the County Council as Highway Authority for safety audit. The intention of figures 31-33 is to demonstrate one way in which a previously traffic dominated set of junctions have been remodelled to achieve a better balance between pedestrians cyclists and motor vehicles. As such it is not a demonstration of a final proposals for Mitcham's Corner.

A key objective for remodelling the gyratory system is to improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2. The design principles identified in section 3.5 of the Development Framework are consistent with those set out in the Government's Manual for Streets 1 & 2.

The degree of segregation between pedestrians, cycles and vehicles, in addition to the nature of crossings will be considered as part of any subsequent design stage. Any future change to the highway layout will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders.

## Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 3.7.1

## Representation(s)

31366 Mrs E McDonald [5890]

Nature

Appearance

Soundness Tests

Object

Not Specified

None

### Summary:

"Urban Space" outside Portland Arms excellent but not likely to be used if two lanes of traffic cross it.

31357 Dr W Block [5887]

Object

Not Specified

None

### Summary:

The proposed green area in the centre of the development will become a focus for the local community, which is much needed, and engender a greater community spirit.

31258 Paul Robison [5858]

Object

Not Specified

None

### Summary:

Fantastic! Who would not want this?

## Response

Comments noted.

## Action

No action required.



## Paragraph 3.7.2

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31465 Miss Alison Taylor [5879]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Sitting-out areas are most popular near the river, rather than on roads

31328 Dr Alastair J Reid [5881]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

I look forward to it as soon as possible!

31285 Mrs Elizabeth Simpson [5870]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

An area free of traffic pollution would be a dream. The cafe "Stir" has done a sterling job with outdoor spaces but it comes with the noise and pollution of speedy traffic.

### Response

Comments noted.

### Action

No action required.

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31317 Dr Rabia Dada-Oughton [5878]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Fantastic - but any outdoor space would be ruined by heavy traffic and the pollution that comes with it. Also must be mindful of possible anti social behavior which we often see on corner across from the Portland Arms.

### Response

Comments noted. These issues are acknowledged in the SWOT analysis (section 2.4) and paragraph 3.2.5 of the Development Framework and will be looked at in greater detail as part of the detailed design stage for the gyratory. The need to improve the safety and comfort for all modes is noted as a key objective in paragraph 3.4.2 of the Development Framework.

### Action

No action required.

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31447 Mr Richard Taylor [1396]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

I think it is important the public space is genuinely public and ideally is highway and is at least owned and controlled by a local council; this should be a requirement of the policy.

The reason is to ensure uses of the space are not restricted by those who are not accountable to the public.

### Response

Comments noted. The ownership of land is outside the remit of the Development Framework. However the land is currently owned and managed by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highways Authority.

### Action

No action required.

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31434	Mr Simon Crowhurst [2162]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

There are important views from across Mitcham's corner to Jesus Green and the open-air swimming pool (and from the green and pool to the other side of the river). Development of Mitcham's corner should be integrated with the promotion and use of the swimming pool and with the rest of Jesus Green.

*Response*

Comments and suggestions noted. Figure 18 identifies sensitive views from Jesus Green. A new heading will be added to Section 4.2 entitled 'Promoting connections with the River Cam' which promotes the creation of a new public space adjacent to the river, where redevelopment of Barclays Bank occurs; opportunities improve access to Jubilee Garden, and; explore options to engage and connect with the river setting.

*Action*

A new paragraph heading will be added to Section 4.2 entitled 'Promoting connections with the River Cam'.

Paragraph 3.7.3

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31260	Paul Robison [5858]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

A prominent sculpture?

*Response*

Comments noted.

*Action*

No action required.

Paragraph 3.7.4

Representation(s)		Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31259	Paul Robison [5858]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Looks excellent, but don't overlook amenities such as benches, plantings, trees, drinking fountains, public toilets, nice lighting etc.

*Response*

Comments and suggestions noted.

*Action*

No action required.

## Paragraph Figures 34 to 43: Examples of public space

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31376 Dr Robert Izzard [5891]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Fig. 38 shows the nightmare of mixed space between cyclists and pedestrians. Yes, it's fine when the volume of people is as low as suggested on the figure, but - back in reality - this will not be the case when footfall is higher, and during rush hours. Instead, there will be conflict over who can use the shared space. You could use this as an opportunity to properly segregate different modes of traffic, but instead, you the council, maintain that pedestrians (and their, e.g., dogs) have to share space with cyclists. This is the nightmare I face in Cambridge daily.

### Response

Comments noted and concerns understood. Shared space is not a one size fits all approach and needs to be tailored to the specific circumstance including an understanding of all modal flows. Any emerging scheme for the remodelling of the gyratory whether a shared space concept or not, would need to go through the County Council as Highway Authority for safety audit. The intention of figures 31-33 is to demonstrate one way in which a previously traffic dominated set of junctions have been remodelled to achieve a better balance between pedestrians cyclists and motor vehicles. As such it is not a demonstration of a final proposals for Mitcham's Corner.

A key objective for remodelling the gyratory system is to improve safety and comfort for all modes, especially pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities. This is reflected under Section 3.4, paragraph 3.4.2. The design principles identified in section 3.5 of the Development Framework are consistent with those set out in the Government's Manual for Streets 1 & 2.

The degree of segregation between pedestrians, cycles and vehicles, in addition to the nature of crossings will be considered as part of any subsequent design stage. Any future change to the highway layout will require further detailed design work and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority in addition to consultation with relevant stakeholders.

### Action

No action required.

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31286 Mrs Elizabeth Simpson [5870]

Support

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

A dream come true. We have lived in this area for 40 years and once we get off the De Freville Estate the battle to get across roads to shops is unbelievable and unpleasant.

31322 CAMCYCLE (Cambridge Cycling Campaign) (Mr Joseph Adam) [2531]

Support

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

This would be great step forward for the area. It is not currently an area where anyone stays for longer than is necessary.

### Response

Comments noted.

### Action

No action required.

## 4. Planning and Design Guidance

### Paragraph 4.1.3

#### Representation(s)

31224 Michael Cahn [2667]

#### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Object Not Specified None

#### Summary:

The document has no specific guidance for the Westbrook area, whereas specific guidance is included for Giles House and the Staples Site. It is well known that dis-connected sites and sites that lack universal permeability create impactful transportation issues for the life of the development. Improved permeability and connectivity for all modes must be addressed in the final document.

#### Response

Concerns noted. The Westbrook Centre does not include site specific guidance. Guidance on this site will be governed by the general planning and design guidance in paragraphs 4.1.1 to 4.2.25 and Figure 44 within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework. Figure 44 identifies the potential for new pedestrian and cycle links if the site were to be redeveloped and paragraphs 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 directs potential developers to Section 7: Protecting and enhancing the character of Cambridge of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 to ensure a comprehensive redevelopment of the site. In addition, Policy 80: supporting sustainable access to development and Policy 81: Mitigating the transport impact of development (of the Local Plan 2014) would be a material consideration in the determination of any planning applications for the site.

Notwithstanding, the Westbrook Centre site is currently in use as an office and therefore any redevelopment on the site would also be informed by Policy 40: Development and expansion of business space and Policy 41: Protection of business space of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014.

The Council believes that the effective redevelopment of this site is adequately covered by the combination of Local Plan policies and the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework.

#### Action

No action required.

=====

**Representation(s)**

**Nature Appearance Soundness Tests**

**31498** Ms Bettina Starke [5895]

Object

Not Specified

None

**Summary:**

Barclay's and the Tivoli site: guidelines to be included please. Tivoli should be dual use; commercial and residential. Tivoli frontage to remain.

**Response**

These sites will be governed by the general planning and design guidance in paragraphs 4.1.1 to 4.2.25. Given the limited size and the constrained nature of the Tivoli site it is not considered appropriate to visually articulate redevelopment opportunities in the same way as the site specific guidance for Staples and Henry Giles House. However the council recognises the potential development opportunities along the southern boundary of the Opportunity Area adjacent to the River Cam. These opportunities have been articulated on Figure 44: Composite plan, which does provide some level of guidance for both the Barclays and Tivoli site.

Policy 76: Protection of public houses (of the Local Plan 2014) would be a material consideration in the determination of any planning applications for the Tivoli site should an application come forward prior to adoption of the Local Plan 2014.

Any redevelopment of the Barclay's site would also be governed by the general planning and design guidance in paragraphs 4.1.1 to 4.2.25 and Figure 44 within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework.

The Barclay's site is currently in use as a bank and offices and therefore any redevelopment on the site would also be informed by Policy 40: Development and expansion of business space and Policy 41: Protection of business space in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014.

Notwithstanding, both sites are within the Mitcham's Corner District Centre. Any development within the District Centre will also have to use Policy 72: Development and change of use in district, local and neighbourhood centres as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

The Council believes that the effective redevelopment of these sites is adequately covered by the combination of Local Plan policies and the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework.

The strategic objective of the Development Framework to create new connections to the river will be explained further in Chapter 4. A new paragraph heading will be added to Section 4.2 entitled 'Promoting connections with the River Cam'. Further explanation will be provided with regards to 'Remnants of the historic high street' development principle contained on Figure 44. Collectively, the Council considers these above amendments alongside emerging local plan (2014) policies listed above and policies 55, 56 and 57 will provide appropriate guidance for future development for The Tivoli, Barclays site and any other site which may come forward within the Opportunity Area.

**Action**

A new paragraph heading will be added to Section 4.2 entitled 'Promoting connections with the River Cam'. Further explanation will be provided with regards to 'Remnants of the historic high street' development principle contained on Figure 44. Collectively, the Council considers these above amendments alongside emerging local plan (2014) policies listed above and policies 55, 56 and 57 will provide appropriate guidance for future development for The Tivoli, Barclays site and any other site which may come forward within the Opportunity Area.

## Paragraph 4.1.4

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31299 mr keith johnson [5859]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

I have read your plan and am impressed with it's scope,general approach and intentions.

However,in the the description of the intended housing there is no mention of affordable housing. Bearing in mind that that there was much promise of this in the early plans for the development of the Milton Road School site a few years ago and nothing came of it.Indeed a so- called Luxury Hotel is being built instead with"Upscale Housing". I sincerely trust that this imbalance is not repeated when the current plans are executed and look forward to seeing the details of this aspect when published. In my view it is most important that this development benefits the less wealthy instead of the the better off and the developers.

### Response

Comments noted. The Mitcham's Corner Development Frameworks is intended to provide additional guidance for the determination of planning applications within the Opportunity Area in accordance with Policy 21: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Once adopted the Development Framework will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

Any development that comes forward must not only comply with the Development Framework, but the overarching policies of the Local Plan 2014, including the affordable housing policy. Policy 46 in the emerging Local Plan (2014) addresses student accommodation. The Council has recently completed an assessment of student housing demand and supply in Cambridge. As a result of this assessment, a number of modifications are proposed to the emerging Local Plan to address a range of issues with student accommodation. A hearing session on the proposed student accommodation policy is likely to take place during 2017. Policy 77: Development and expansion of hotels addresses aparthotels. This policy has not yet been subject to discussion as part of the examinations.

### Action

No action required.

## Paragraph Figure 44: Composite plan

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31222 Michael Cahn [2667]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

The connection between Mitcham's Corner and Westbrook Centre and the housing development on the former sports fields behind it: connectivity and permeability is very poor in this area. Figure #44 shows a double sided yellow arrow which highlights this issue without offering a clear solution.

### Response

Comments noted. The orange arrow highlights the potential for a new pedestrian and cycle link between the Westbrook Centre and Mitcham's Park development. The potential for this route could be realised if the Westbrooke Centre were to come forward for redevelopment in the future.

### Action

No action required.

Figure 44: Composite plan

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31302</b> Mr David Taylor [846]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The closure of Victoria Road to through traffic presents the opportunity to create an attractive and secluded area. This could be achieved through resurfacing, tree planting and retail frontages.

The proposed closure of Milton Road to through traffic allows for new building, which would fill a resulting gap, screen views of the rear of Chesterton Terrace and provide finance from the change of use of the land.

Land behind Chesterton Terrace could provide car parking facilities for shoppers (25 spaces). Local traders consider this a priority. Access could be from Chesterton Road and provide serious tree planting to improve the outlook from surrounding residential properties.

*Response*

**The Council agrees. Paragraph 4.2.17 notes that appropriate parking solutions should be considered on site and achieve a balance between functionality and place-making. Any planning applications submitted would also have to take into account Policy 82: Parking Management in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014, which recognises that "In accordance with national guidance, the level of car parking provided needs to take into account various local circumstances".**

**The Council considers that this combination of Local Plan Policies and guidance within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework will enable sufficient provision of parking in the area for businesses and those that need to drive, without increasing the number of cars that visit the area.**

**The option forward in figure 44 would need to be developed further and will be subject to consultation with the County Council as Local Highways Authority and other relevant stakeholders. We recognise the provision of cycle and car parking within Mitcham's Corner needs to be improved and the consultation undertaken to date has revealed a strong desire to improve this provision. An additional design element will be added under section 3.5 Key design principles to read 'Explore opportunities for well integrated on street parking for vehicles and cycles, using landscape to enclose and mark groups of spaces'. The specific location of car and cycle parking will need to be considered at the detailed design stage.**

*Action*

**An additional design element will be added under section 3.5 Key design principles to read 'Explore opportunities for well integrated on street parking for vehicles and cycles, using landscape to enclose and mark groups of spaces'.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31309</b> Dr Rabia Dada-Oughton [5878]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

There is currently limited access to the Mitcham's Park development behind the Westbrook Centre. Residents of that development are isolated from the local community as a result. This is recognized in the plans (fig 44) but no solution offered. Any final document must include a solution to the lack of access available to and from this site.

*Response*

**Comments noted. The orange arrow highlights the potential for a new pedestrian and cycle link between the Westbrook Centre and Mitcham's Park development. The potential for this route could be realised if the Westbrook Centre were to come forward for redevelopment in the future.**

*Action*

**No action required.**

Figure 44: Composite plan

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31338</b> Mr Philip Lund [1308]	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

While supporting the plan in general I object to the retention of the houses in the middle of Mitchams Corner. Under the new scheme vehicles and cycles coming south down Milton Road and wanting to cross Victoria Bridge will have to execute a left turn into Chesterton Road then a right onto the bridge approach. The loss of the buildings would enable a proper crossroads at the bottom of Milton Road with a straight-over way onto the bridge. The space from the demolished buildings not needed for the road could be incorporated into the general green space of the square.

*Response*

The demolition of some of the properties at 137-155 Chesterton to realise an alternative 'cross road' solution for remodelling the gyratory system could require Cambridgeshire County Council to use compulsory purchase powers to acquire these properties. This option has been discounted. Compulsory purchase is intended as a last resort to secure the assembly of land needed for implementing projects, and in the case of Mitcham's Corner the Councils consider that an appropriate scheme could be delivered within the current highway space available and that the objectives of the Supplementary Planning Document could still be met.

*Action*

No action required.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31355</b> Dr may block [2364]	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

Other pink shaded areas on your leaflet shows four potential development areas. That is really scary!

*Response*

Comments noted.

*Action*

No action required.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31455</b> Mrs Veronica Bennett [5913]	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

Why has the Barclays Bank site been identified as "a potential future opportunity for redevelopment"? The building may lack aesthetic appeal but it has an important asset - it is the only bank north of the river with a dedicated car park which customers such as the infirm and disabled and from as far afield as Milton can use. Take away the car park and personal banking for some will become an impossibility.

*Response*

Comments noted. Barclays bank has been identified as a potential future redevelopment as it could help deliver a new pedestrian/cycle route to the River Cam. The specific uses of the site would need to be considered and assessed if a future planning application comes forward to redevelop the site.

*Action*

No action required.



Figure 44: Composite plan

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31479</b>	<b>Dr Caroline Stephens [5917]</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
<i>Summary:</i>				
I think care needs to be taken with the outdoor amenity space 1 to avoid an unused concrete area as it is right by two roads and there aren't any obvious cafes near by. It is vital to use trees as much as possible to green it up.				
The access road behind the tall buildings in the middle of the area doesn't need to extend further than Springfield road and the space behind could also be amenity space or under tree parking as there isn't any provision for parking which local businesses would value.				
<i>Response</i>				
The Council agrees. Paragraph 4.2.17 notes that appropriate parking solutions should be considered on site and achieve a balance between functionality and place-making. Any planning applications submitted would also have to take into account Policy 82: Parking Management in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014, which recognises that "In accordance with national guidance, the level of car parking provided needs to take into account various local circumstances".				
The Council considers that this combination of Local Plan Policies and guidance within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework will enable sufficient provision of parking in the area for businesses and those that need to drive, without increasing the number of cars that visit the area.				
The option forward in figure 44 would need to be developed further and will be subject to consultation with the County Council as Local Highways Authority and other relevant stakeholders. We recognise the provision of cycle and car parking within Mitcham's Corner needs to be improved and the consultation undertaken to date has revealed a strong desire to improve this provision. An additional design element will be added under section 3.5 Key design principles to read 'Explore opportunities for well integrated on street parking for vehicles and cycles, using landscape to enclose and mark groups of spaces'. The specific location of car and cycle parking will need to be considered at the detailed design stage.				
<i>Action</i>				
An additional design element will be added under section 3.5 Key design principles to read 'Explore opportunities for well integrated on street parking for vehicles and cycles, using landscape to enclose and mark groups of spaces'.				

Figure 44: Composite plan

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31507</b> Friends of Mitcham's Corner (Mrs Anne Cooper ) [5919]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

We have already mentioned the possibility that redevelopment of the Barclays Bank or Tivoli sites could provide a connection to the River Cam, and have suggested that the Development Framework should include some guidelines on these windfall sites. We recently canvassed our members on what uses the Tivoli should be put to: there was a strong preference for a use that continues to serve the public in some way, perhaps with flats above. The historic frontage should be retained, and conceivably the rear of the site could provide access to a pedestrian/cycle bridge over the river. Similar possibilities may exist for the Barclays site should it become available.

*Response*

Comments noted. The Barclay's and Tivoli sites do not have site specific guidance. These sites will be addressed by the general planning and design guidance in paragraphs 4.1.1 to 4.2.25. Given the limited size and the constrained nature of the Tivoli site it is not considered appropriate to visually articulate redevelopment opportunities in the same way as the site specific guidance for Staples and Henry Giles House. However the council recognises the potential development opportunities along the southern boundary of the Opportunity Area adjacent to the River Cam. These opportunities have been articulated on Figure 44: Composite plan, which does provide some level of guidance for both the Barclays and Tivoli site.

Policy 76: Protection of public houses (of the Local Plan 2014) would be a material consideration in the determination of any planning applications for the Tivoli site should an application come forward prior to the adoption of the Local Plan 2014.

Any redevelopment of the Barclay's site would also be governed by the general planning and design guidance in paragraphs 4.1.1 to 4.2.25 and Figure 44 within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework.

The Barclay's site is currently in use as a bank and offices and therefore any redevelopment on the site would also be informed by Policy 40: Development and expansion of business space and Policy 41: Protection of business space in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014.

Notwithstanding, both sites are within the Mitcham's Corner District Centre. Any development within the District Centre will also have to use Policy 72: Development and change of use in district, local and neighbourhood centres as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

The Council considers that the effective redevelopment of these sites is adequately covered by the combination of Local Plan policies and the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework.

The strategic objective of the Development Framework to create new connections to the river will be explained further in Chapter 4. A new paragraph heading will be added to Section 4.2 entitled 'Promoting connections with the River Cam'. Further explanation will be provided with regards to 'Remnants of the historic high street' development principle contained on Figure 44. Collectively, the Council considers these above amendments alongside emerging local plan (2014) policies listed above and policies 55, 56 and 57 will provide appropriate guidance for future development for The Tivoli, Barclays site and any other site which may come forward within the Opportunity Area.

*Action*

A new paragraph heading will be added to Section 4.2 entitled 'Promoting connections with the River Cam'. Further explanation will be provided with regards to 'Remnants of the historic high street' development principle contained on Figure 44. Collectively, the Council considers these above amendments alongside emerging local plan (2014) policies listed above and policies 55, 56 and 57 will provide appropriate guidance for future development for The Tivoli, Barclays site and any other site which may come forward within the Opportunity Area.

=====

Figure 44: Composite plan

## Representation(s)

## Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31520 Dr Jocelynne Scutt [5920]

Object

Not Specified

None

### Summary:

I generally support the submissions made by the Friends of Mitcham's Corner:

We have already mentioned the possibility that redevelopment of the Barclays Bank or Tivoli sites could provide a connection to the River Cam, and have suggested that the Development Framework should include some guidelines on these windfall sites. We recently canvassed our members on what uses the Tivoli should be put to: there was a strong preference for a use that continues to serve the public in some way, perhaps with flats above. The historic frontage should be retained, and conceivably the rear of the site could provide access to a pedestrian/cycle bridge over the river. Similar possibilities may exist for the Barclays site should it become available.

## Response

Comments noted. The Barclay's and Tivoli sites do not have site specific guidance. These sites will be addressed by the general planning and design guidance in paragraphs 4.1.1 to 4.2.25. Given the limited size and the constrained nature of the Tivoli site it is not considered appropriate to visually articulate redevelopment opportunities in the same way as the site specific guidance for Staples and Henry Giles House. However the council recognises the potential development opportunities along the southern boundary of the Opportunity Area adjacent to the River Cam. These opportunities have been articulated on Figure 44: Composite plan, which does provide some level of guidance for both the Barclays and Tivoli site.

Policy 76: Protection of public houses (of the Local Plan 2014) would be a material consideration in the determination of any planning applications for the Tivoli site should an application come forward prior to the adoption of the Local Plan 2014.

Any redevelopment of the Barclay's site would also be governed by the general planning and design guidance in paragraphs 4.1.1 to 4.2.25 and Figure 44 within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework.

The Barclay's site is currently in use as a bank and offices and therefore any redevelopment on the site would also be informed by Policy 40: Development and expansion of business space and Policy 41: Protection of business space in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014.

Notwithstanding, both sites are within the Mitcham's Corner District Centre. Any development within the District Centre will also have to use Policy 72: Development and change of use in district, local and neighbourhood centres as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

The Council considers that the effective redevelopment of these sites is adequately covered by the combination of Local Plan policies and the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework.

The strategic objective of the Development Framework to create new connections to the river will be explained further in Chapter 4. A new paragraph heading will be added to Section 4.2 entitled 'Promoting connections with the River Cam'. Further explanation will be provided with regards to 'Remnants of the historic high street' development principle contained on Figure 44. Collectively, the Council considers these above amendments alongside emerging local plan (2014) policies listed above and policies 55, 56 and 57 will provide appropriate guidance for future development for The Tivoli, Barclays site and any other site which may come forward within the Opportunity Area.

## Action

A new paragraph heading will be added to Section 4.2 entitled 'Promoting connections with the River Cam'. Further explanation will be provided with regards to 'Remnants of the historic high street' development principle contained on Figure 44. Collectively, the Council considers these above amendments alongside emerging local plan (2014) policies listed above and policies 55, 56 and 57 will provide appropriate guidance for future development for The Tivoli, Barclays site and any other site which may come forward within the Opportunity Area.

=====

Figure 44: Composite plan

## Representation(s)

## Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31297 Emmanuel College [5867]

Support

Not Specified

None

Agent: Bidwells (Mrs Alison Barnes) [5866]

### Summary:

Emmanuel College owns 26-30 Chesterton Road (Barclays Bank) show in figure 44 as an opportunity for new urban space and redevelopment. The College is generally supportive of the SPD and would request a meeting with officers to agree how the College can assist in improving the SPD and delivering Policy 21 as appropriate whilst protecting its interests.

## Response

Comments noted. The council encourages early pre-application discussions for the redevelopment of sites within Mitcham's Corner. Further advice on the pre-application process is available online at <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/content/pre-application-advice>

## Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 4.2.1

## Representation(s)

## Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31270 Mr Ranjit Chooun [5869]

Object

Not Specified

None

### Summary:

We do not need a "ApartHotel" at the end of Gilbert Road, yet, we are stuck with yet another development. In conclusion, there should be no extra development, but instead, turn back the clock to 75 years ago and replace all the development with trees please. It development that have resulted in the current problem at the Mitcham Corner region, therefore reversed development is the solution.

## Response

Concern noted, however the Council has a responsibility to meet its objectively assessed need for residential, business and retail needs over the plan period. This is laid out within the Government's National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance. The Council's intention to produce a Development Framework SPD for the Mitcham's Corner area (identified in Policy 21: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area of the Local Plan 2014) is to ensure that any development or redevelopment within the area is undertaken in a way that enhances the area, provides high quality development, delivers a sense of place and improves connectivity between people and places.

The Mitcham's Corner Development Frameworks is intended to provide additional guidance for the determination of planning applications within the Opportunity Area in accordance with Policy 21: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Once adopted the Development Framework will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

Any development that comes forward must not only comply with the Development Framework, but the overarching policies of the Local Plan 2014, including the affordable housing policy. Policy 46 in the emerging Local Plan (2014) addresses student accommodation. The Council has recently completed an assessment of student housing demand and supply in Cambridge. As a result of this assessment, a number of modifications are proposed to the emerging Local Plan to address a range of issues with student accommodation. A hearing session on the proposed student accommodation policy is likely to take place during 2017. Policy 77: Development and expansion of hotels addresses aparthotels. This policy has not yet been subject to discussion as part of the examinations.

## Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 4.2.2

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31419 Telereal Trillium [5900]

Object

Not Specified

None

Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]

#### Summary:

Should refer to 'within the Opportunity Area' rather than 'on the site'.

### Response

Comments noted. Paragraph 4.2.2 refers to emerging Local Plan policies set out in chapter 7 which relate to sites rather than the opportunity area.

### Action

No action required.

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31497 Ms Bettina Starke [5895]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Heights recommended will be the starting point of any new development, but where are these guidelines apart from Henry Giles House and Staples? Please no 5+1 storeys for Henry Giles House!

### Response

Comments and concerns noted. The heights indicated on Figure 52: Development Principles for Henry Giles House have been informed by a comprehensive townscape analysis of the area and the Council's own 3D model and have been developed to respond to the varied edges of the site to ensure a well design scheme that fits into its context. Any proposals that seek to break this guidance will need to be tested in a robust way, and applicants will need to demonstrate through accurate 3D computer modelling that their proposals will not unduly impact upon the surrounding context in line with emerging Cambridge Local Plan (2014) Policy 55. The impact of the development on the amenities of existing properties (including overshadowing, overlooking and overbearing impacts) will be considered and assessed in the event of any planning application being submitted.

Any development over 4 storeys (13m) will automatically trigger the need to assess the criteria set out within emerging Local Plan (2014) Policy 60: Tall buildings and the skyline in Cambridge.

### Action

No action required.

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31230 Naomi Yandell [5856]

Support

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Ensure that developments are of good quality and use local stone and are sympathetic to their surroundings.

### Response

Comments noted.

### Action

No action required.

### Paragraph 4.2.3

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
31499	Ms Bettina Starke [5895]	Object	Not Specified	None
<p><i>Summary:</i></p> <p>What architects must do and how they should design should include developers and landowners, not just architects.</p> <p>Uses of recent developments in Mitcham's Corner area have been altered at Student Castle, Your Space (Trafalgar Rd), King's residence. Development Guidelines must be adhered to, also after planning approval.</p>				
<p><i>Response</i></p> <p>Concern noted, The Council's intention to produce a Development Framework SPD for the Mitcham's Corner area (identified in Policy 21: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area of the Local Plan 2014) is to ensure that any development or redevelopment within the area is undertaken in a way that enhances the area, provides high quality development, delivers a sense of place and improves connectivity between people and places.</p>				
<p><i>Action</i></p> <p>No action required.</p>				

## Representation(s)

		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31509</b>	<b>Friends of Mitcham's Corner (Mrs Anne Cooper ) [5919]</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

### Summary:

FMC are concerned that many recent developments in the area have been implemented in a way that is different from that authorised by the planning department. For example, the Student Castle is not solely for Anglia Ruskin students as stated originally; the Trafalgar Road flats are not residential in nature, but like an aparthotel; and Kings Residence is no longer for PhD students but consists of private flats. In order for the development guidelines to achieve the desired objectives, it is vital that they are enforced robustly.

<b>31518</b>	<b>Dr Jocelyne Scutt [5920]</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
--------------	---------------------------------	---------------	----------------------	-------------

### Summary:

I generally support the submissions made by the Friends of Mitcham's Corner:

FMC are concerned that many recent developments in the area have been implemented in a way that is different from that authorised by the planning department. For example, the Student Castle is not solely for Anglia Ruskin students as stated originally; the Trafalgar Road flats are not residential in nature, but like an aparthotel; and Kings Residence is no longer for PhD students but consists of private flats. In order for the development guidelines to achieve the desired objectives, it is vital that they are enforced robustly.

## Response

**Concern noted, The Council's intention to produce a Development Framework SPD for the Mitcham's Corner area (identified in Policy 21: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area of the Local Plan 2014) is to ensure that any development or redevelopment within the area is undertaken in a way that enhances the area, provides high quality development, delivers a sense of place and improves connectivity between people and places.**

The draft Development Framework will be taken to Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee in January 2017 with the intention to agree the final version of the Development Framework. However, the document cannot be adopted as an SPD until the Local Plan 2014: Proposed submission is adopted. The Development Framework will still be a material consideration to guide the decisions on planning matters prior to adoption as an SPD.

The Mitcham's Corner Development Framework supports Policy 21: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission, However the Local Plan examination is still underway and therefore a final Inspectors Report has not yet been published. Modifications have been put forward to the policy in the Local Plan and these may need to be reflected in the Development Framework, therefore the document cannot be adopted as an SPD before the adoption of the Local Plan 2014.

Any development that comes forward must not only comply with the Development Framework, but the overarching policies of the Local Plan 2014, including the affordable housing policy. Policy 46 in the emerging Local Plan (2014) addresses student accommodation. The Council has recently completed an assessment of student housing demand and supply in Cambridge. As a result of this assessment, a number of modifications are proposed to the emerging Local Plan to address a range of issues with student accommodation. A hearing session on the proposed student accommodation policy is likely to take place during 2017. Policy 77: Development and expansion of hotels addresses aparthotels. This policy has not yet been subject to discussion as part of the examinations.

## Action

No action required.

=====



## Paragraph 4.2.4

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31491 Ms Bettina Starke [5895]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

There needs to be a balance between commercial units and residential property.

### Response

Concern noted. General planning and design guidance in paragraphs 4.1.1 to 4.2.25 and Figure 44 within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework will guide any redevelopment within the Opportunity Area. In particular paragraphs 4.2.4 to 4.2.6 supports the use of a mixed use high street. Any development within the District Centre will also have to use Policy 72: Development and change of use in district, local and neighbourhood centres as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

In addition Policy 40: Development and expansion of business space and Policy 41: Protection of business space of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014, will protect existing business development within the area; Policy 3: Spatial strategy for the location of residential development is intended to protect the loss of residential provision. Policy 72: Development and change of use in district, local and neighbourhood centres is intended to protect retail uses within the district centre.

The Council considers that the combination of Local Plan Policies and guidance within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework will enable a balanced mix of residential and commercial development.

### Action

No action required.

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31452 Jonathan Jones [5905]

Support

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Hello

I think that it's imperative to the whole area that the old cinema/weatherspoons is successfully redeveloped into something that can be used for the community such as a cinema or arts centre rather than just redeveloped for flats or retail.

### Response

Concerns noted. The Tivoli site does not have site specific guidance. Guidance on these sites will be governed by the general planning and design guidance in paragraphs 4.1.1 to 4.2.25.

Figure 44 within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework. Figure 44 identifies the Tivoli as an opportunity to enhance and repair the frontage of the Tivoli and explore options to engage with the river setting.

In addition, Policy 76: Protection of public houses (of the Local Plan 2014) would be a material consideration in the determination of any planning applications for the site. The policy requires that alternative use of the site would only be permitted if it can be proven that the site is no longer needed as a public house or other form of community facility.

Notwithstanding, the site is within the Mitcham's Corner District Centre. Any development within the District Centre will also have to use Policy 72: Development and change of use in district, local and neighbourhood centres as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. The Council believes that the effective redevelopment of these sites is adequately covered by the combination of Local Plan policies and the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework.

### Action

No action required.



## Paragraph 4.2.5

### Representation(s)

**31512** Friends of Mitcham's Corner (Mrs Anne Cooper ) [5919]

### Nature

Object

### Appearance

Not Specified

### Soundness Tests

None

#### Summary:

The discussion of potential funding sources (page 48) should also mention the possibility of selling freed-up land for development ("land exchange").

### Response

Comments noted. This is not within the remit of the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework, but welcomes discussions with landowners and developers concerning development opportunities within the Mitcham's Corner area.

### Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 4.2.6

### Representation(s)

**31346** Historic England (Ms Alice Eggeling) [5886]

### Nature

Support

### Appearance

Not Specified

### Soundness Tests

None

#### Summary:

Supportive but request amendments.

We are encouraged that the proposed design guidance seeks to improve the historic street network and increase the quality of the spaces around Mitcham's Corner. We request that the second bullet point in paragraph 4.2.6 be amended as follows;

\* Well defined and transparent edges, where appropriate to historic character - for shop windows and cafes to allow activity to be visible from the street, making the public realm feel safer and more welcoming.

### Response

Agree, Paragraph 4.2.6 bullet point 2 will be amended to read 'Well defined and transparent edges, where appropriate to the historic character - for shop windows and cafes to allow activity to be visible from the street, making the public realm feel safer and more welcoming'.

Further guidance relating to the design of retail frontages is contained in the emerging Local Plan (2014) Policy 64 and Appendix H: Shop front Design Guide.

### Action

Paragraph 4.2.6 bullet point 2 to be amended to read 'Well defined and transparent edges, where appropriate to historic character - for shop windows and cafes to allow activity to be visible from the street, making the public realm feel safer and more welcoming'.

**Representation(s)**

**Nature**

**Appearance**

**Soundness Tests**

**31347** Historic England (Ms Alice Eggeling) [5886]

**Support**

**Not Specified**

**None**

**Summary:**

Supportive but request amendments.

There are fourteen headings under Section 4.2: Area Wide Guidance. We request that an additional heading of 'Historic Environment' is added to ensure that the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the historic environment is communicated fully. We suggest the following wording or similar:

Historic Environment

Conservation of the historic environment can bring wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits. Development should seek to draw out opportunities to maintain and enhance surviving buildings of good quality, where these make a positive contribution to the distinctive character of the area.

Development should have regard to its context and wider setting, ensuring the it relates well to all elements of the historic environment including the setting of Jesus College and Jesus Green; the setting and significance of individual listed and locally listed buildings within and adjacent to the opportunity area and to the conservation areas within the locality.

**Response**

**Comment noted. Agree, adding the suggested text will help achieve the vision for Mitcham's Corner set out in the emerging Local Plan (2014) Policy 21. The suggested text will be included after paragraph 4.2.2**

**We do not consider it appropriate to add the second paragraph as this is already appropriately safeguarded in the emerging Local Plan Policies 55, 61 and the Conservation Area Appraisals for the area. Furthermore figure 18: Opportunities and constraints and figure 44: Composite Plan highlights the sensitive views from Jesus Green.**

**Action**

**New paragraph to be added explaining the development principles for 'Remnants of the Historic High Street'.**

**New text will be added paragraph 4.2.2 which states 'Development should seek to draw out opportunities to maintain and enhance surviving building of good quality, where these make a positive contribution to the distinct character of the area'.**

=====

## Paragraph 4.2.7

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31505 Friends of Mitcham's Corner (Mrs Anne Cooper ) [5919]	Object	Not Specified	None

#### Summary:

On page 44 it is said that "the heights recommended in this guidance will be the starting point for consideration of any new development" - but we could actually find no explicit guidelines on building heights except when specifically discussing Henry Giles House and the Staples site. On a similar topic, the discussion of Henry Giles House mentions the 'possibility' of 5+1 storeys, which is surely just placing temptation in the way of developers!

### Response

Concerns noted. The Barclay's and Tivoli sites do not have site specific guidance. Guidance on these sites will be governed by the general planning and design guidance in paragraphs 4.1.1 to 4.2.25.

Figure 44 within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework. Figure 44 identifies the Tivoli as an opportunity to enhance and repair the frontage of the Tivoli and explore options to engage with the river setting.

In addition, Policy 76: Protection of public houses (of the Local Plan 2014) would be a material consideration in the determination of any planning applications for the site.

Any redevelopment of the Barclay's site would also be governed by the general planning and design guidance in paragraphs 4.1.1 to 4.2.25 and Figure 44 within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework. Figure 44 identifies the Barclays site as a potential area for future redevelopment.

The Barclay's site is currently in use as a bank and offices and therefore any redevelopment on the site would also be informed by Policy 40: Development and expansion of business space and Policy 41: Protection of business space of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014.

Notwithstanding, both sites are within the Mitcham's Corner District Centre. Any development within the District Centre will also have to use Policy 72: Development and change of use in district, local and neighbourhood centres as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. The Council believes that the effective redevelopment of these sites is adequately covered by the combination of Local Plan policies and the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework.

Site specific guidance has been provided for Henry Giles House as this site is an allocated site in the emerging Local Plan (site R4). Guidance for the Staples site has also been included within the Development Framework due to previous applications coming forward for the redevelopment of this site.

The heights indicated on Figure 52 and Figure 53 have been informed by a comprehensive townscape analysis of the area and the Council's own 3D model. Any proposals that seek to break this guidance will need to be tested in a robust way, and applicants will need to demonstrate through 3D computer modelling that their proposals will not unduly impact upon the surrounding context in line with emerging Cambridge Local Plan (2006) Policy 55.

Any development over 4 storeys (13m) will automatically trigger the need to assess the criteria set out within emerging Local Plan (2014) Policy 60: Tall buildings and the skyline in Cambridge.

For clarity paragraph 4.2.7 will be removed.

### Action

Remove paragraph 4.2.7

=====

**Representation(s)**

**Nature**

**Appearance**

**Soundness Tests**

**31522** Dr Jocelynne Scutt [5920]

**Object**

**Not Specified**

**None**

**Summary:**

I generally support the submissions made by the Friends of Mitcham's Corner:

On page 44 it is said that "the heights recommended in this guidance will be the starting point for consideration of any new development" - but we could actually find no explicit guidelines on building heights except when specifically discussing Henry Giles House and the Staples site. On a similar topic, the discussion of Henry Giles House mentions the 'possibility' of 5+1 storeys, which is surely just placing temptation in the way of developers!

**Response**

**Concerns noted. The Barclay's and Tivoli sites do not have site specific guidance. Guidance on these sites will be governed by the general planning and design guidance in paragraphs 4.1.1 to 4.2.25.**

**Figure 44 within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework. Figure 44 identifies the Tivoli as an opportunity to enhance and repair the frontage of the Tivoli and explore options to engage with the river setting.**

**In addition, Policy 76: Protection of public houses (of the Local Plan 2014) would be a material consideration in the determination of any planning applications for the site.**

**Any redevelopment of the Barclay's site would also be governed by the general planning and design guidance in paragraphs 4.1.1 to 4.2.25 and Figure 44 within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework. Figure 44 identifies the Barclays site as a potential area for future redevelopment.**

**The Barclay's site is currently in use as a bank and offices and therefore any redevelopment on the site would also be informed by Policy 40: Development and expansion of business space and Policy 41: Protection of business space of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014.**

**Notwithstanding, both sites are within the Mitcham's Corner District Centre. Any development within the District Centre will also have to use Policy 72: Development and change of use in district, local and neighbourhood centres as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. The Council believes that the effective redevelopment of these sites is adequately covered by the combination of Local Plan policies and the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework.**

**Site specific guidance has been provided for Henry Giles House as this site is an allocated site in the emerging Local Plan (site R4). Guidance for the Staples site has also been included within the Development Framework due to previous applications coming forward for the redevelopment of this site.**

**The heights indicated on Figure 52 and Figure 53 have been informed by a comprehensive townscape analysis of the area and the Council's own 3D model. Any proposals that seek to break this guidance will need to be tested in a robust way, and applicants will need to demonstrate through 3D computer modelling that their proposals will not unduly impact upon the surrounding context in line with emerging Cambridge Local Plan (2006) Policy 55.**

**Any development over 4 storeys (13m) will automatically trigger the need to assess the criteria set out within emerging Local Plan (2014) Policy 60: Tall buildings and the skyline in Cambridge.**

**For clarity paragraph 4.2.7 will be removed.**

**Action**

**Remove paragraph 4.2.7**

## Paragraph 4.2.8

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31401** Telereal Trillium [5900]

**Object**

**Not Specified**

**None**

*Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]*

#### Summary:

4.2.8 does not make any distinction that the requirements of Appendix F are associated with proposed policy 60 and therefore are only meant to apply to tall buildings. It is suggested that this should be phrased in a more discretionary manner.

### Response

Paragraph 4.2.8 specifically relates to the guidance for the production of 3D digital models and assessing visual impact which is contained in Appendix F of the emerging Local Plan (2014). The sentence will be amended to clarify that the guidance relates to the production of 3D digital models.

### Action

The second sentence in paragraph 4.2.8 will be amended to read 'further advice regarding the production of 3D digital models is available within Appendix F of the emerging Local Plan'.

## Paragraph 4.2.10

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31323** CAMCYCLE (Cambridge Cycling Campaign) (Mr Joseph Adam) [2531]

**Support**

**Not Specified**

**None**

#### Summary:

I fully agree. In fact I would go further and require new buildings to meet the PassiveHouse standards for energy efficiency and sustainability.

### Response

Comments noted. The council encourages developers to promote the construction of energy efficient homes. The emerging Local Plan (2014) in Policy 27 encourages new developments to integrate the principles of sustainable design and construction into the design of proposals. The Development Framework cannot go further than this.

### Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 4.2.12

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31245** Dr Roger Sewell [5506]

**Support**

**Not Specified**

**None**

#### Summary:

Prevention of overheating inside buildings is extremely important. The more overheating, the more need for aircon, and hence energy consumption.

### Response

Comments noted.

### Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 4.2.13

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31431 Mr Simon Crowhurst [2162]

Support

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Some excellent low-carbon approaches to buildings are now available and Cambridge should take a lead in this.

### Response

Comments noted.

### Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 4.2.14

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31329 Dr Alastair J Reid [5881]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Apart from the old vision of no. 48 these examples are dismal.

### Response

Comments noted.

### Action

No action required.

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31508 Friends of Mitcham's Corner (Mrs Anne Cooper ) [5919]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

In the design guidance, reference is made several times (e.g. page 45) to what architects must do and how they should design. However, developments are primarily the result of clients' requirements and briefs, and therefore it would be more appropriate to direct the comments on e.g. G.R.A.I.N and water-sensitive design at developers and landowners.

31519 Dr Jocelynne Scutt [5920]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

I generally support the submissions made by the Friends of Mitcham's Corner:

In the design guidance, reference is made several times (e.g. page 45) to what architects must do and how they should design. However, developments are primarily the result of clients' requirements and briefs, and therefore it would be more appropriate to direct the comments on e.g. G.R.A.I.N and water-sensitive design at developers and landowners.

### Response

Agree. The sentence will be amended so that the comments on G.R.A.I.N (paragraph 4.2.14) are directed at developers, landowners and architects.

### Action

Amend the last sentence in paragraph 4.2.14 to read '...;developers, landowners and architects are encouraged to think about G.R.A.I.N'

## Paragraph 4.2.16

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31402 Telereal Trillium [5900]

Object

Not Specified

None

*Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]*

#### Summary:

It is considered that paragraph 4.2.16 is too prescriptive.  
The current wording of the SPD fails to appreciate the need to address each individual site. It is suggested that it is reworded to state:  
'Access to private amenity space in the form of roof gardens, balconies and/or winter gardens should be encouraged. Where provided, it is essential that these amenity areas...'

### Response

**Comments noted. The requirement for private amenity space is set out in the emerging Local Plan (2014) Policy 50: Residential space standards which requires that 'all new residential units will be expected to have direct access to an area of private amenity space'.**

### Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 4.2.17

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31442 Mr Richard Taylor [1396]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

There should be another subsection under "car parking" dealing with parking for those using shops, banks, restaurants, take-aways etc. The provision of parking for those making such visits is important for the commercial viability of businesses in the area, and for making the facilities in area accessible to those who need to drive.

### Response

**Comments noted. Paragraph 4.2.17 notes that appropriate parking solutions should be considered on site and achieve a balance between functionality and place-making. Any planning applications submitted would also have to take into account Policy 82: Parking Management in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014, which recognises that "In accordance with national guidance, the level of car parking provided needs to take into account various local circumstances".**

**The Council considers that this combination of Local Plan Policies and guidance within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework will enable sufficient provision of parking in the area for businesses and those that need to drive, without increasing the number of cars that visit the area.**

**The option forward in figure 44 would need to be developed further and will be subject to consultation with the County Council as Local Highways Authority and other relevant stakeholders. It is recognised that the provision of cycle and car parking within Mitcham's Corner needs to be improved and the consultation undertaken to date has revealed a strong desire to improve this provision. An additional design element will be added under section 3.5 Key design principles to read 'Explore opportunities for well integrated on street parking for vehicles and cycles, using landscape to enclose and mark groups of spaces'. The specific location of car and cycle parking will need to be considered at the detailed design stage.**

### Action

**An additional design element will be added under section 3.5 Key design principles to read 'Explore opportunities for well integrated on street parking for vehicles and cycles, using landscape to enclose and mark groups of spaces'.**

**Representation(s)**

**31492** Ms Bettina Starke [5895]

**Nature**

Object

**Appearance**

Not Specified

**Soundness Tests**

None

**Summary:**

Provision of car parking is not addressed adequately. This needs immediate attention. Not to be dealt with at a later stage. The demand for short term parking is high because of inadequate bus services. The P&R bus should regularly stop at Mitcham's Corner. There needs to be more cycle parking to attract cyclists to the Mitcham's Corner area.

**Response**

Comments noted. Paragraph 4.2.17 notes that appropriate parking solutions should be considered on site and achieve a balance between functionality and place-making. Any planning applications submitted would also have to take into account Policy 82: Parking Management in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014, which recognises that "In accordance with national guidance, the level of car parking provided needs to take into account various local circumstances".

The Council considers that this combination of Local Plan Policies and guidance within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework will enable sufficient provision of parking in the area for businesses and those that need to drive.

The option forward in figure 44 would need to be developed further and will be subject to consultation with the County Council as Local Highways Authority and other relevant stakeholders. It is recognised that the provision of cycle and car parking within Mitcham's Corner needs to be improved and the consultation undertaken to date has revealed a strong desire to improve this provision. An additional design element will be added under section 3.5 Key design principles to read 'Explore opportunities for well integrated on street parking for vehicles and cycles, using landscape to enclose and mark groups of spaces'. The specific location of car and cycle parking will need to be considered at the detailed design stage.

The Council recognises the need for additional cycle parking in the area through paragraph 4.2.20. Policy 82: Parking Management in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014, also recognises the need for high-quality and easily accessible cycle parking.

The provision of bus services within the area is the remit of Cambridgeshire County Council and Stagecoach and therefore cannot be included within the Development Framework. However, discussions and projects are on-going between the County Council and City Deal with regard to public transport provision.

**Action**

An additional design element will be added under section 3.5 Key design principles to read 'Well integrated on street parking for cyclists and vehicles, using landscape to enclose and mark groups of spaces'.

=====



<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31433</b> Mr Simon Crowhurst [2162]	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

Chesterton Road residents were asked to sacrifice their parking facilities many years ago for the wider good. The consequent lack of parking facilities along the northern side of Chesterton Road in particular, needs to be taken into account.

<b>31262</b> Paul Robison [5858]	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
----------------------------------	----------------	----------------------	-------------

*Summary:*

Many of the shops on Mitchams Corner have parking at the rear: they should encourage customers to use it (as HSBC and Barclays do). But on the whole, increasing the number of parking spaces available will just increase the number of cars.

*Response*

The Council agrees. Paragraph 4.2.17 notes that appropriate parking solutions should be considered on site and achieve a balance between functionality and place-making. Any planning applications submitted would also have to take into account Policy 82: Parking Management in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014, which recognises that "In accordance with national guidance, the level of car parking provided needs to take into account various local circumstances".

The Council considers that this combination of Local Plan Policies and guidance within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework will enable sufficient provision of parking in the area for businesses and those that need to drive, without increasing the number of cars that visit the area.

The option forward in figure 44 would need to be developed further and will be subject to consultation with the County Council as Local Highways Authority and other relevant stakeholders. We recognise the provision of cycle and car parking within Mitcham's Corner needs to be improved and the consultation undertaken to date has revealed a strong desire to improve this provision. An additional design element will be added under section 3.5 Key design principles to read 'Explore opportunities for well integrated on street parking for vehicles and cycles, using landscape to enclose and mark groups of spaces'. The specific location of car and cycle parking will need to be considered at the detailed design stage.

*Action*

An additional design element will be added under section 3.5 Key design principles to read 'Well integrated on street parking for cyclists and vehicles, using landscape to enclose and mark groups of spaces'.

=====

## Paragraph 4.2.18

### Representation(s)

31246 Dr Roger Sewell [5506]

<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
Object	Not Specified	None

#### Summary:

Car-free development is in cloud cuckoo land. Everywhere that the council has tried to reduce the number of parking spaces per dwelling, the result has been parking 'wars' and discontent. Buses are NOT a solution to this, at least not until they are non-emitting and don't use diesel engines of any sort (biofuel is not mitigation of the stink they create, e.g. on St Andrew's Street).

### Response

Concerns noted. Paragraph 4.2.17 notes that appropriate parking solutions should be considered on site and achieve a balance between functionality and place-making. Any planning applications submitted would also have to take into account Policy 82: Parking Management in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014, which recognises that "In accordance with national guidance, the level of car parking provided needs to take into account various local circumstances".

The Council considers that this combination of Local Plan Policies and guidance within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework will enable sufficient provision of parking in the area for businesses and those that need to drive, without increasing the number of cars that visit the area.

### Action

No action required.

### Representation(s)

31445 Mr Richard Taylor [1396]

<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
Object	Not Specified	None

#### Summary:

There is a need to consider that at certain times of people's lives having vehicle access is needed, either for residents themselves, or their visitors / contractors / carers.

31318 Dr Rabia Dada-Oughton [5878]

Object	Not Specified	None
--------	---------------	------

#### Summary:

Expecting local residents to live in 'care free developments' is entirely unrealistic. Certainly not entire families work in the city center, for example. Instead discourage commuters from driving into Cambridge and to local shops etc - rather than penalising local residents.

### Response

Concerns noted. Paragraph 4.2.17 notes that appropriate parking solutions should be considered on site and achieve a balance between functionality and place-making. Any planning applications submitted would also have to take into account Policy 82: Parking Management in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014, which recognises that "In accordance with national guidance, the level of car parking provided needs to take into account various local circumstances".

The Council considers that this combination of Local Plan Policies and guidance within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework will enable sufficient provision of parking in the area for businesses and those that need to drive, without increasing the number of cars that visit the area.

### Action

No action required.

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31374 Mr Simon Norton [76]

Support

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

This is a policy that needs to be adopted throughout the city and even in some of the surrounding villages, as it could help to underpin a much better public transport network than we now have. There may need to be "contracts" to ensure that people who sign up to living carfree can be assured that their services will stay; in the stretch of Chesterton Road to the west, changes a few years ago reduced the frequency of buses from 15 per hour to just 3, and drastically cut the range of destinations served directly.

### Response

Comments noted.

### Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 4.2.19

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31368 Mrs E McDonald [5890]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Please keep hard standing to a minimum. It is not pleasant to walk on, particularly in winter when icy. It increases flooding. The new development behind the Portland Arms is already causing flooding on the road in front of the Portland Arms. Grass is cooler in summer and not icy in winter and helps absorb surface water.

### Response

Comments noted. The treatment of new open space area in front of the Portland Arms Pub will be agreed as part of the detailed design of the scheme.

### Action

No action required.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31480</b> Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience Patience) [5918]	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

There are a number of foul and surface water sewers in Anglian Water's ownership located within the boundary of the opportunity area as identified in the Draft SPD. Having laid these assets under statutory notice, Anglian Water would require the standard protected easement width for this asset and for any requests for alteration or removal to be conducted in accordance with the Water Industry Act 1991.

Detailed comments -Drainage and surface water flood risk (para 4.2.19):

We support the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and would like to see their use to reduce the risk of surface water and sewer flooding. It would therefore be helpful to strengthen the requirement to provide SuDs as part of the area wide guidance for the Opportunity Area.

*Response*

**Comments noted. The Council notes the presence of foul and surface water sewers and other assets in the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area and these will be referred to as part of pre-application discussions for specific sites as they come forward for redevelopment.**

**The Cambridgeshire Flood and Water Supplementary Planning Document (available from <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/cambridgeshire-flood-and-water-spd>) forms a material consideration and provides detailed guidance on the use of SUDs. The requirement to provide SUDs is covered by emerging Local Plan (2014) Policy 31 and does not need to be replicated in the Development Framework.**

*Action*

**No action required.**

=====

## Paragraph 4.2.20

### Representation(s)

		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31326</b>	<b>CAMCYCLE (Cambridge Cycling Campaign) (Mr Joseph Adam) [2531]</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

#### *Summary:*

The area needs more well thought out cycle parking as part of making it a destination rather than area to passed through.  
For example the Boathouse and Portlands arms have the combined total of 0 bike parking spaces at the moment!  
Hard to think of a business that is less suited to arriving by car.

<b>31247</b>	<b>Dr Roger Sewell [5506]</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
--------------	-------------------------------	----------------	----------------------	-------------

#### *Summary:*

Currently there is totally inadequate cycle parking in most parts of Cambridge.

<b>31330</b>	<b>Dr Alastair J Reid [5881]</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
--------------	----------------------------------	----------------	----------------------	-------------

#### *Summary:*

Secure and plenty of it.

### Response

Comments noted. Paragraph 4.2.17 notes that appropriate parking solutions should be considered on site and achieve a balance between functionality and place-making. Any planning applications submitted would also have to take into account Policy 82: Parking Management in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014, which recognises that "In accordance with national guidance, the level of car parking provided needs to take into account various local circumstances".

The Council considers that this combination of Local Plan Policies and guidance within the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework will enable sufficient provision of parking in the area for businesses and those that need to drive, without increasing the number of cars that visit the area.

The option forward in figure 44 would need to be developed further and will be subject to consultation with the County Council as Local Highways Authority and other relevant stakeholders. It is recognised that the provision of cycle and car parking within Mitcham's Corner needs to be improved and the consultation undertaken to date has revealed a strong desire to improve this provision. An additional design element will be added under section 3.5 Key design principles to read 'Explore opportunities for well integrated on street parking for vehicles and cycles, using landscape to enclose and mark groups of spaces'. The specific location of car and cycle parking will need to be considered at the detailed design stage.

### Action

An additional design element will be added under section 3.5 Key design principles to read 'Well integrated on street parking for cyclists and vehicles, using landscape to enclose and mark groups of spaces'.

=====

## Paragraph 4.2.21

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31331** Dr Alastair J Reid [5881]

**Support**

**Not Specified**

**None**

#### Summary:

Lots of trees please!

**31388** Ms Anne Rivington [5896]

**Support**

**Not Specified**

**None**

#### Summary:

I agree that everything should be underpinned by sustainability. All features of a new Mitcham's corner should be totally ecological in their design. For example planting wild flowers which is good for the environment and great visually. Large areas of wild flowers(like those on Jesus Green this summer)affect people's behaviour in a positive way,improving sociability and reducing tensions.This has been done successfully in other UK cities. Also planting trees in groups enables them to support each other and improves the air we breathe. Plant more of them in a large central grass area,rather than having isolated trees surrounded by paving.

### Response

Comments noted.

### Action

No action required.

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31432** Mr Simon Crowhurst [2162]

**Support**

**Not Specified**

**None**

#### Summary:

There is a surprisingly diverse ecology in this area, including foxes, bats, herons, kingfisher and sparrowhawks, which can be encouraged.

**31464** Miss Alison Taylor [5879]

**Support**

**Not Specified**

**None**

#### Summary:

Planters for trees and flowers are welcome

Building in nesting facilities, especially for swifts and kestrels, would be especially welcome

### Response

Comments noted. Paragraph 4.2.21 (3rd bullet point) notes that nesting opportunities for a variety of bird and bat species should be encouraged.

### Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 4.2.23

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31443 Mr Richard Taylor [1396]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

I don't think engagement of a local artist should be required.

Money which could go into art could go into high quality architectural features on the buildings themselves, architecture itself is art.

A key consideration with public art ought be it needs to last at least as long as the development it relates to. A one-off event, or even a series of events, shouldn't ever be considered to meet a planning requirement for public art.

### Response

The requirement for Public Art is set out in Policy 56 (part j) of the emerging Local Plan (2014) which states 'embed public art as an integral part of the proposals as identified through the council's Public Art supplementary planning document.

Public art proposals submitted as part of a planning application will be subject to public consultation. The Council's Statement of Community Involvement, found at: <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/statement-of-community-involvement> outlines the Council's consultation procedure for documents and planning applications. The nature and extent of consultation will vary depending on the size, scale, location and nature of the proposed development and will be decided upon once received. Neighbour notification letters are sent out to residents within the immediate vicinity of the application site. You can view planning applications by visiting the Customer Service Centre or by visiting the Public Access system: <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/monitor-anapplication>.

### Action

Add the word 'policy' to the first sentence to read 'Public art is encouraged as part of development proposals in accordance with emerging Local Plan policy 56' in paragraph 4.2.23.

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31332 Dr Alastair J Reid [5881]

Support

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Might be nice, might be awful ... can we have specific consultation on this in due course please.

### Response

Public art proposals submitted as part of a planning application will be subject to public consultation. The Council's Statement of Community Involvement, found at: <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/statement-of-community-involvement> outlines the Council's consultation procedure for documents and planning applications. The nature and extent of consultation will vary depending on the size, scale, location and nature of the proposed development and will be decided upon once received. Neighbour notification letters are sent out to residents within the immediate vicinity of the application site. You can view planning applications by visiting the Customer Service Centre or by visiting the Public Access system: <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/monitor-anapplication>.

### Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 4.2.25

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31515 Dr Jocelynne Scutt [5920]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

I generally support the submissions made by Friends of Mitcham's Corner:

The discussion of potential funding sources (page 48) should also mention the possibility of selling freed-up land for development ("land exchange").

### Response

Comments noted. The Council does not feel that this is within the remit of the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework to suggest selling highway land, it maybe that the sale of lane could come forward in the future and we would welcome discussions with the County Council and over landowners and developers concerning development opportunities within the Mitcham's Corner area.

### Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 4.3.1

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31333 Dr Alastair J Reid [5881]

Support

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

It would be great to get rid of this monstrosity which spoils the whole ambiance of the area, especially when seen from Jesus Green.

### Response

Comments noted.

### Action

No action required.



Figure 52: Development principles for Henry Giles House

## Paragraph Figure 52: Development principles for Henry Giles House

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31308 Dr Thomas Davies [3326]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

- 1 the proposed houses would be built on top of a 2 metre rise and would closely overlook. Stability would be a problem.
- 2 several trees exist next to the dividing wall

### Response

The impact of the development on the amenity of existing properties (including overshadowing, overlooking and overbearing impacts) will be considered and assessed in the event of a planning application being submitted.

A new paragraph will be added after paragraph 4.3.13 'All new buildings should respect the amenity of surrounding existing properties. Applicants will be expected to produce shadow studies at different times of the year to demonstrate that proposals do not have an adverse amenity impact on existing houses and gardens adjacent to the Henry Giles site'.

### Action

New paragraph to be added after paragraph 4.3.13 'All new buildings should respect the amenity of surrounding existing properties. Applicants will be expected to produce shadow studies at different times of the year to demonstrate that proposals do not have an adverse amenity impact on existing houses and gardens adjacent to the Henry Giles site'.

Figure 52: Development principles for Henry Giles House

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31391</b>	<b>Mr Richard Warburton [4149]</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

Position of new buildings on the site would result in overshadowing impacts to houses fronting Chesterton Road and would restrict views of Jesus Green from the rear garden.

Storey heights - 4 and 5+1 storeys are grossly unsuitable.

New development will result in overlooking to the rear gardens of existing houses fronting Chesterton Road. level different between adjacent HGH site and existing terrace.

There is a right of access over the lane to the left of No. 81 Chesterton Road.

Proposed pedestrian and cycle access from HGH site to Chesterton Road will increase noise and disturbance. A cut through via the development should lead to Carlyle Road.

*Response*

Comments noted. The heights indicated on Figure 52: Development Principles for Henry Giles House have been informed by a comprehensive townscape analysis of the area and the Council's own 3D model and have been developed to respond to the varied edges of the site to ensure a well design scheme that fits into its context. Any proposals that seek to break this guidance will need to be tested in a robust way, and applicants will need to demonstrate through accurate 3D computer modelling that their proposals will not unduly impact upon the surrounding context in line with emerging Cambridge Local Plan (2014) Policy 55. The impact of the development on the amenity of existing properties (including overshadowing, overlooking and overbearing impacts) will be considered and assessed in the event of a planning application being submitted.

Any development over 4 storeys (13m) will automatically trigger the need to assess the criteria set out within emerging Local Plan (2014) Policy 60: Tall buildings and the skyline in Cambridge.

A new paragraph will be added after paragraph 4.3.13 'All new buildings should respect the amenity of surrounding existing properties. Applicants will be expected to produce shadow studies at different times of the year to demonstrate that proposals do not have an adverse amenity impact on existing houses and gardens adjacent to the Henry Giles site'.

Figure 52 will be amended to show the right of access over the lane to the west of No. 81 Chesterton Road.

The green links/lane show to the west of No. 81 Chesterton Road is intended to improve connectivity between the allocation site and Chesterton Road. The route is to provide through access for cycles and pedestrians only and the detailed design of this route will be subject to a planning application coming forward for the Henry Giles House site.

*Action*

New paragraph to be added after paragraph 4.3.13 'All new buildings should respect the amenity of surrounding existing properties. Applicants will be expected to produce shadow studies at different times of the year to demonstrate that proposals do not have an adverse amenity impact on existing houses and gardens adjacent to the Henry Giles site'.

Figure 52 to be amended to show the right of access over the lane to the west of No.81 Chesterton Road.



Figure 52: Development principles for Henry Giles House

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31410</b>	<b>Telereal Trillium [5900]</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
<i>Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]</i>				
<i>Summary:</i>				
<p>The majority of the principles are supported. However, it is suggested that reference to 'creation of pedestrian and cycle green links/lanes' is too fixed and fails to provide the necessary flexibility at this high level stage.</p> <p>It is also suggested that the massing design principles are too cautious and don't seek to maximise the opportunities at the site.</p> <p>It is crucial that the SPD maximises the opportunities of the site rather than providing undue restriction. The full scale and massing would be subject to detailed modelling at the application stage.</p>				
<i>Response</i>				
<p>Comments noted. The green links/lane show to the west of No. 81 Chesterton Road is intended to improve connectivity between the allocation site and Chesterton Road. The route is to provide through access for cycles and pedestrians only and the detailed design of this route will be subject to a planning application coming forward for the Henry Giles House site.</p>				
<p>The heights indicated on Figure 52: Development Principles for Henry Giles House have been informed by a comprehensive townscape analysis of the area and the Council's own 3D model and have been developed to respond to the varied edges of the site to ensure a well design scheme that fits into its context. Any proposals that seek to break this guidance will need to be tested in a robust way, and applicants will need to demonstrate through accurate 3D computer modelling that their proposals will not unduly impact upon the surrounding context in line with emerging Cambridge Local Plan (2014) Policy 55.</p>				
<p>Any development over 4 storeys (13m) will automatically trigger the need to assess the criteria set out within emerging Local Plan (2014) Policy 60: Tall buildings and the skyline in Cambridge.</p>				
<i>Action</i>				
<p>No action required.</p>				

=====

Figure 52: Development principles for Henry Giles House

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31449</b>	mr stephen haylock [5903]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Suggested amendments to building heights, which are higher than the proposed heights.  
Objection to height causing overshadowing.  
4 and 5 +1 storeys are unsuitable given surrounding building heights.  
Access lane to 81-93 Chesterton Lane needs to be retained for parking, rear access and waste storage.

*Response*

Comments noted. The heights indicated on Figure 52: Development Principles for Henry Giles House have been informed by a comprehensive townscape analysis of the area and the Council's own 3D model and have been developed to respond to the varied edges of the site to ensure a well design scheme that fits into its context. Any proposals that seek to break this guidance will need to be tested in a robust way, and applicants will need to demonstrate through accurate 3D computer modelling that their proposals will not unduly impact upon the surrounding context in line with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) Policy 3/4. The impact of the development on the amenities of existing properties (including overshadowing, overlooking and overbearing impacts) will be considered and assessed in the event of a planning application being submitted.

Any development over 4 storeys (13m) will automatically trigger the need to assess the criteria set out within emerging Local Plan (2014) Policy 60: Tall buildings and the skyline in Cambridge.

A new paragraph will be added after paragraph 4.3.13 'All new buildings should respect the amenity of surrounding existing properties. Applicants will be expected to produce shadow studies at different times of the year to demonstrate that proposals do not have an adverse amenity impact on existing houses and gardens adjacent to the Henry Giles site'.

Figure 52 will be amended to show the right of access over the lane to the west of No. 81 Chesterton Road.

The green links/lane show to the west of No. 81 Chesterton Road is intended to improve connectivity between the allocation site and Chesterton Road. The route is to provide through access for cycles and pedestrians only and the detailed design of this route will be subject to a planning application coming forward for the Henry Giles House site.

*Action*

New paragraph to be added after paragraph 4.3.13 'All new buildings should respect the amenity of surrounding existing properties. Applicants will be expected to produce shadow studies at different times of the year to demonstrate that proposals do not have an adverse amenity impact on existing houses and gardens adjacent to the Henry Giles site'.

Figure 52 to be amended to show the right of access over the lane to the west of No.81 Chesterton Road.

=====

Figure 52: Development principles for Henry Giles House

**Representation(s)**

**31450 Mrs Vicky Stevenson [5904]**

**Nature Appearance Soundness Tests**

**Object Not Specified None**

**Summary:**

Firstly the residents of 81-93 Chesterton Road have a right of way over the side road (Henry Giles House) to the access road at the back of the properties to garages etc. This access road also allows for rubbish collection. This road is owned by the residents and should therefore not be incorporated in the plan. There is a large difference in height between the access road to the rear of the properties and the car park behind which means that any housing built at the back will overlook the original Victorian properties..

**Response**

Comments noted. Figure 52 will be amended to show the right of access over the lane to the west of No. 81 Chesterton Road.

**Action**

Figure 52 to be amended to show the right of access over the lane to the west of No.81 Chesterton Road.

Figure 52: Development principles for Henry Giles House

**Representation(s)**

**Nature Appearance Soundness Tests**

**31453 Mr Nick Davies [5914]**

**Object**

**Not Specified**

**None**

**Summary:**

Section 4.3 and figure 52 contain errors in relation to 81- 93 Chesterton Road and the existing access alongside no 81. They ignore existing trees; differing levels; development in the last 20 years and occupation and use of the rear access.

The rear access rights are registered at the Land Registry

Any two-storey building on the south eastern side will tower over existing properties; reduce light; and be out of proportion with the scale and intimacy of the rear of the existing properties. A one-storey limit is needed.

The proposed 4 and 5+1 storey buildings are taller than the existing building on that part of the site and will tower over all existing properties and be wholly out of proportion.

The framework does not reflect the primary element of this site: the changing level of the site itself.

Detailed submission attached

**Response**

Comments noted. The heights indicated on Figure 52: Development Principles for Henry Giles House have been informed by a comprehensive townscape analysis of the area and the Council's own 3D model and have been developed to respond to the varied edges of the site to ensure a well design scheme that fits into its context. Any proposals that seek to break this guidance will need to be tested in a robust way, and applicants will need to demonstrate through accurate 3D computer modelling that their proposals will not unduly impact upon the surrounding context in line with emerging Cambridge Local Plan (2014) Policy 55. The impact of the development on the amenity of existing properties (including overshadowing, overlooking and overbearing impacts) will be considered and assessed in the event of a planning application being submitted.

Any development over 4 storeys (13m) will automatically trigger the need to assess the criteria set out within emerging Local Plan (2014) Policy 60: Tall buildings and the skyline in Cambridge.

A new paragraph will be added after paragraph 4.3.13 'All new buildings should respect the amenity of surrounding existing properties. Applicants will be expected to produce shadow studies at different times of the year to demonstrate that proposals do not have an adverse amenity impact on existing houses and gardens adjacent to the Henry Giles site'.

Figure 52 will be amended to show the right of access over the lane to the west of No. 81 Chesterton Road.

The green links/lane show to the west of No. 81 Chesterton Road is intended to improve connectivity between the allocation site and Chesterton Road. The route is to provide through access for cycles and pedestrians only and the detailed design of this route will be subject to a planning application coming forward for the Henry Giles House site.

**Action**

No action required.

Figure 52: Development principles for Henry Giles House

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31496</b>	<b>Ms Bettina Starke [5895]</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

Heights recommended will be the starting point of any new development, but where are these guidelines apart from Henry Giles House and Staples? Please no 5+1 storeys for Henry Giles House!

*Response*

Comments noted. The Council recognises the potential development opportunities along the southern boundary of the Opportunity Area adjacent to the River Cam. These opportunities have been articulated on Figure 44: Composite plan, which does provide some level of guidance for both the Barclays and Tivoli site. Given the limited size and the constrained nature of the Tivoli and Barclays sites it is not considered appropriate to visually articulate redevelopment opportunities in the same way as the site specific guidance for Staples and Henry Giles House.

The heights indicated on Figure 52: Development Principles for Henry Giles House and Figure 53: Development Principles for Staples have been informed by a comprehensive townscape analysis of the area and the Council's own 3D model and have been developed to respond to the varied edges of the site to ensure a well design scheme that fits into its context. Any proposals that seek to break this guidance will need to be tested in a robust way, and applicants will need to demonstrate through accurate 3D computer modelling that their proposals will not unduly impact upon the surrounding context in line with emerging Cambridge Local Plan (2014) Policy 55. The impact of the development on the amenity of existing properties (including overshadowing, overlooking and overbearing impacts) will be considered and assessed in the event of a planning application being submitted.

Any development over 4 storeys (13m) will automatically trigger the need to assess the criteria set out within emerging Local Plan (2014) Policy 60: Tall buildings and the skyline in Cambridge.

*Action*

No action required.

=====

Figure 52: Development principles for Henry Giles House

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31506</b> Friends of Mitcham's Corner (Mrs Anne Cooper ) [5919]	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

On page 44 it is said that "the heights recommended in this guidance will be the starting point for consideration of any new development" - but we could actually find no explicit guidelines on building heights except when specifically discussing Henry Giles House and the Staples site. On a similar topic, the discussion of Henry Giles House mentions the 'possibility' of 5+1 storeys, which is surely just placing temptation in the way of developers!

*Response*

**Comments noted. The Council recognises the potential development opportunities along the southern boundary of the Opportunity Area adjacent to the River Cam. These opportunities have been articulated on Figure 44: Composite plan, which does provide some level of guidance for both the Barclays and Tivoli site. Given the limited size and the constrained nature of the Tivoli and Barclays sites it is not considered appropriate to visually articulate redevelopment opportunities in the same way as the site specific guidance for Staples and Henry Giles House.**

The heights indicated on Figure 52: Development Principles for Henry Giles House and Figure 53: Development Principles for Staples have been informed by a comprehensive townscape analysis of the area and the Council's own 3D model and have been developed to respond to the varied edges of the site to ensure a well design scheme that fits into its context. Any proposals that seek to break this guidance will need to be tested in a robust way, and applicants will need to demonstrate through accurate 3D computer modelling that their proposals will not unduly impact upon the surrounding context in line with emerging Cambridge Local Plan (2014) Policy 55. The impact of the development on the amenity of existing properties (including overshadowing, overlooking and overbearing impacts) will be considered and assessed in the event of a planning application being submitted.

Any development over 4 storeys (13m) will automatically trigger the need to assess the criteria set out within emerging Local Plan (2014) Policy 60: Tall buildings and the skyline in Cambridge.

*Action*

No action required.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31521</b> Dr Jocelynne Scutt [5920]	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

I generally support the submissions made by the Friends of Mitcham's Corner:

On page 44 it is said that "the heights recommended in this guidance will be the starting point for consideration of any new development" - but we could actually find no explicit guidelines on building heights except when specifically discussing Henry Giles House and the Staples site. On a similar topic, the discussion of Henry Giles House mentions the 'possibility' of 5+1 storeys, which is surely just placing temptation in the way of developers!

<b>31263</b> Paul Robison [5858]	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
----------------------------------	---------------	----------------------	-------------

*Summary:*

Changing the usage of this site should also significantly reduce the need for car parking on this stretch of Chesterton Road.

*Response*

Comments noted.

*Action*

No action required.



## Paragraph 4.3.7

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31348** Historic England (Ms Alice Eggeling) [5886]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Supportive subject to amendments.

We are pleased to note that references to the conservation area are made throughout this section, albeit that there is some uncertainty as to whether this is the Central Conservation Area or the Castle and Victoria Conservation Area. Equally, the need to respond sensitively to views from Jesus Green is noted to have been included.

We would like to draw your attention to the fact that the site is immediately opposite five Grade II listed structures, identified under three listings:

- \* The pair of telephone kiosks on Chesterton Road
- \* Jesus Green Lock
- \* Jesus Green Bridge
- \* Jesus Green Lock House

As a result of the change in ground level and proximity of the site to these listed structures, any redevelopment will likely form part of their setting. We strongly recommend that consideration of both the setting and the significance of adjacent listed structures be emphasised in the design guidance for the site, perhaps through incorporation of an additional heading after Paragraph 4.3.29.

Acknowledgement that the site is potentially within the setting of these listed structures should also be incorporated into the site designations.

### Response

Comments noted. The views from Jesus Green have been highlighted in Figure 1 as "Important Views". In addition Figure 18: Opportunities and Constraints and Figure 44: Composite Plan illustrate the sensitive views from Jesus Green which will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications within the Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area.

The second sentence in Paragraph 4.3.3 will be amended to clarify that the site falls within the Castle and Victoria Conservation Area (part of the Central Conservation Area).

The setting and the significance of the Grade II listed structures noted is appropriately covered by existing Local Plan (2016) Policy 4/10 Listed Buildings and 4/11 Conservation Areas.

### Action

Replace second sentence in paragraph 4.3.3 from 'Site falls within Castle and Victoria Conservation Area' to 'Site falls within Castle and Victoria Conservation Area (part of the Central Conservation Area)'.

### Representation(s)

**31403** Telereal Trillium [5900]

*Nature*

Object

*Appearance*

Not Specified

*Soundness Tests*

None

*Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]*

#### Summary:

It is suggested that the Western Edge/Carlyle Road frontage description refers only to what officers consider as the attributes of the street scene. There is no acknowledgement of the existing 3 storey property that exists opposite the Henry Giles House site, set forward of the existing terraced line and so a particularly prominent feature as one passes down Carlyle Road from Chesterton Road. It is suggested that the description of this site edge acknowledges this variation rather than just the line of 2.5 terraced properties.

### Response

**Comments noted. Buildings fronting the western edge of Carlyle Road are predominantly 2-2.5 storeys as shown on Figure 15 Existing building heights. No. 1a Carlyle Road forms an exception and is 3 storeys in height. The wording in Paragraph 4.3.7 is referring to the row of terraced houses immediately to the west of the, as such it is not necessary to amend the wording in Paragraph 4.3.7.**

### Action

**No action required.**

## Paragraph 4.3.8

### Representation(s)

**31494** Ms Bettina Starke [5895]

*Nature*

Object

*Appearance*

Not Specified

*Soundness Tests*

None

#### Summary:

Henry Giles House and Staples Site: "development should comprise of improve quality of public realm...and urban-design-led approach should be taken - surely this should always be the case!

**31502** Friends of Mitcham's Corner (Mrs Anne Cooper ) [5919]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

In the discussions of both Henry Giles House and the Staples site there are statements that "development should improve the quality of the public realm" and that an "urban-design-led approach" should be taken - this should be made a general principle applicable to any new developments in the area.

**31525** Dr Jocelyne Scutt [5920]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

I generally support the submissions made by the Friends of Mitcham's Corner:

In the discussions of both Henry Giles House and the Staples site there are statements that "development should improve the quality of the public realm" and that an "urban-design-led approach" should be taken - this should be made a general principle applicable to any new developments in the area.

### Response

**Comments noted. Paragraph 4.2.2 will be amended to read 'An urban design led approach should be adopted to inform proposals with development demonstrating that it responds positively to the key contextual characteristic of its surroundings'.**

### Action

**Paragraph 4.2.2 will be amended to read 'An urban design led approach should be adopted to inform proposals with development demonstrating that it responds positively to the key contextual characteristic of its surroundings'.**

## Paragraph 4.3.13

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31404** Telereal Trillium [5900]

**Object**

**Not Specified**

**None**

*Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]*

#### Summary:

4.3.13 needs to make clear that the modelling is justified on the basis of proposed policy 60 to ensure that the requirement is triggered by the appropriate height parameters. It is proposed that the paragraph should be worded to state:

'Applicants will be expected to produce accurate 3D computer models to inform an appropriate massing of the development on any key views and vistas, where the scale of the proposed development would trigger the requirements of proposed policy 60 of the emerging Local Plan'.

### Response

Comments noted. A number of taller buildings are suggested in Figure 52 and buildings which are over 4 storeys (13m) will automatically trigger the need to assess the criteria set out within emerging Local Plan (2014) Policy 60: Tall buildings and the skyline in Cambridge.

Given the scale of the site and scope for change the council would expect any proposals for the redevelopment of the site to include accurate 3D models to inform scale and massing and assess the amenity impact of the proposals. Paragraph 4.3.13 specifically relates to the guidance for the production of 3D digital models and assessing visual impact which is contained in Appendix F of the emerging Local Plan (2014). The sentence will be amended to clarify that the guidance relates to the production of 3D digital models.

### Action

The second sentence in paragraph 4.3.13 will be amended to read 'further advice regarding the production of 3D digital models is available within Appendix F of the emerging Local Plan'.

## Paragraph 4.3.14

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31334** Dr Alastair J Reid [5881]

**Support**

**Not Specified**

**None**

#### Summary:

Yes, please, a series of individual buildings rather than one big one.

### Response

Comments noted.

### Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 4.3.17

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31405** Telereal Trillium [5900]

Object

Not Specified

None

*Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]*

#### Summary:

It is suggested that it needs to be made clear that 'finer urban grain' does not necessarily mean breaks in plan form of buildings. 'Fine grain' can be achieved through height variations, voids at upper floors, rhythm, projections or set backs among others.

### Response

Comments noted. Agree that fine grain can be achieved in a number of ways and paragraph 4.2.14 G.R.A.I.N sets out the various ingredients of fine grain development. These do not need to be repeated in paragraph 4.3.17.

### Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 4.3.18

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31420** Telereal Trillium [5900]

Object

Not Specified

None

*Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]*

#### Summary:

Refer to figure 52 rather than figure 57.

### Response

Comments noted. Paragraph 4.3.18 will be amended to refer to figure 52.

### Action

Replace wording in paragraph 4.3.18 'The development principles summarised in figure 57...' with 'The development principles summarised in figure 52...'

## Paragraph 4.3.20

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31406** Telereal Trillium [5900]

Object

Not Specified

None

*Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]*

#### Summary:

It is suggested that the second sentence should encourage the specified connections rather than stating that they should be provided. This would better reflect the first sentence and the uncertainty.

### Response

Comments noted. The second sentence in paragraph 4.3.20 will be updated to reflect that the specified connections to Grasmear Gardens should be provided where possible.

### Action

Amend the second sentence in paragraph 4.3.20 to read 'Any new development should provide links from Chesterton Road iunto the site and where possible reconnect through to Grasmere Gardens'.

**Representation(s)**

**Nature**

**Appearance**

**Soundness Tests**

**31335** Dr Alastair J Reid [5881]

**Support**

**Not Specified**

**None**

**Summary:**

Yes, and a through way to Victoria Road would be really useful.

**Response**

Comments noted.

**Action**

No action required.

**Paragraph 4.3.22**

**Representation(s)**

**Nature**

**Appearance**

**Soundness Tests**

**31407** Telereal Trillium [5900]

**Object**

**Not Specified**

**None**

**Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]**

**Summary:**

Suggest that smaller, more resilient features distributed throughout the development are 'encouraged' rather than 'should be used'. Until detailed assessment is undertaken, it cannot be known the level of mitigation and design credentials associated with the scheme. Flexibility is still required at this stage, although it is agreed that certain principles can be encouraged. In any event, having one larger management feature could be beneficial in the context of 4.3.23 which notes that there is an opportunity to create dynamic focal space that deals with water.

**Response**

Comments noted. The wording used in paragraph 4.3.22 is consistent with the wording in the supporting text for Policy 31 (Local Plan 2014) which states 'Smaller more resilient features distributed throughout a development should be used, instead of one large management feature'. The council will be looking to improve water run off rates to green field rates, as such a number of smaller more resilient measures should be used to address water quality. Changing the wording to 'encourage' rather than 'should' may not achieve the run off rates required.

**Action**

No action required.

**Representation(s)**

**Nature**

**Appearance**

**Soundness Tests**

**31481** Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience Patience) [5918]

**Support**

**Not Specified**

**None**

**Summary:**

Intergrated Water Management (para 4.3.22 and 4.4.22): we are supportive of the use of SuDs as part of new developments. As such we welcome the wording in para 4.3.22 and 4.4.22 of the Draft SPD

**Response**

Comments noted.

**Action**

No action required.

## Paragraph 4.3.28

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31408** Telereal Trillium [5900]

Object

Not Specified

None

*Agent: Savills (UK) Ltd (Mrs Claire Mills) [5899]*

#### Summary:

Suggest that this refers broadly to 'landscaping' rather than specifically 'street trees' to provide some flexibility, depending on the final design intentions and relationship with highway design/safety.

### Response

Comments noted. Disagree, street trees provide a number of benefits as such the wording from paragraph 4.4.28 will be introduced after paragraph 4.3.28 to explain the benefits of street trees. The second sentence from paragraph 4.4.27 relating to the presence of underground services will be added to paragraph 4.3.28.

### Action

Add second sentence to paragraph 4.3.28 'The presence of underground services within this area requires careful consideration'.

A new paragraph (4.3.29) will be added after paragraph 4.3.28 to read 'The provision of trees improves air quality, reduces dust, muffles noise and offers shade and shelter. it also reduces the heat island effect.'

## Paragraph 4.4.5

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31349** Historic England (Ms Alice Eggeling) [5886]

Support

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

As before, we are pleased that reference is made to the fact that the site occupies a prominent location within the conservation area, is noted to be visible in longer range views and that design guidance is provided for its redevelopment.

We also appreciate the emphasis for the retention and adaptive re-use of the Lloyds Bank building and the recognition that unlisted buildings such as this can make a positive contribution to streetscape and local character.

### Response

Comments noted.

### Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 4.4.9

### Representation(s)

31524 Dr Jocelynne Scutt [5920]

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

Object Not Specified None

#### Summary:

I generally support the submissions made by the Friends of Mitcham's Corner:

In the discussions of both Henry Giles House and the Staples site there are statements that "development should improve the quality of the public realm" and that an "urban-design-led approach" should be taken - this should be made a general principle applicable to any new developments in the area.

31503 Friends of Mitcham's Corner (Mrs Anne Cooper ) [5919]

Object Not Specified None

#### Summary:

In the discussions of both Henry Giles House and the Staples site there are statements that "development should improve the quality of the public realm" and that an "urban-design-led approach" should be taken - this should be made a general principle applicable to any new developments in the area.

31495 Ms Bettina Starke [5895]

Object Not Specified None

#### Summary:

Henry Giles House and Staples Site: "development should comprise of improve quality of public realm...and urban-design-led approach should be taken - surely this should always be the case!

### Response

Comments noted. Paragraph 4.2.2 will be amended to read 'An urban design led approach should be adopted to inform proposals with development demonstrating that it responds positively to the key contextual characteristic of its surroundings'.

### Action

Paragraph 4.2.2 will be amended to read 'An urban design led approach should be adopted to inform proposals with development demonstrating that it responds positively to the key contextual characteristic of its surroundings'.

## Paragraph 4.4.15

### Representation(s)

31336 Dr Alastair J Reid [5881]

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

Support Not Specified None

#### Summary:

Yes, more diversity wherever possible.

### Response

Comments noted.

### Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 4.4.22

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31482** Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience Patience) [5918]

**Support**

**Not Specified**

**None**

#### Summary:

Intergrated Water Management (para 4.3.22 and 4.4.22): we are supportive of the use of SuDs as part of new developments. As such we welcome the wording in para 4.3.22 and 4.4.22 of the Draft SPD

### Response

Comments noted.

### Action

No action required.

## Paragraph 4.4.25

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31504** Friends of Mitcham's Corner (Mrs Anne Cooper ) [5919]

**Object**

**Not Specified**

**None**

#### Summary:

In the discussions of both Henry Giles House and the Staples site there are statements that "development should improve the quality of the public realm" and that an "urban-design-led approach" should be taken - this should be made a general principle applicable to any new developments in the area.

**31523** Dr Jocelynne Scutt [5920]

**Object**

**Not Specified**

**None**

#### Summary:

I generally support the submissions made by the Friends of Mitcham's Corner:

In the discussions of both Henry Giles House and the Staples site there are statements that "development should improve the quality of the public realm" and that an "urban-design-led approach" should be taken - this should be made a general principle applicable to any new developments in the area.

### Response

Comments noted. Paragraph 4.2.2 will be amended to read 'An urban design led approach should be adopted to inform proposals with development demonstrating that it responds positively to the key contextual characteristic of its surroundings'.

### Action

Paragraph 4.2.2 will be amended to read 'An urban design led approach should be adopted to inform proposals with development demonstrating that it responds positively to the key contextual characteristic of its surroundings'.