

Appendix A: Key Issues

Mill Road Depot Planning and Development Brief

Key Issues from June-July 2016 public consultation

Chapter 1 – Introduction and Background	
1.1.2 and Figure 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The boundary differs from Local Plan allocation Site R10 as Women's Resource Centre is not part of allocation
1.1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The character and distinctive local community is under threat through the loss of smaller independent shops and gentrification, and the plan does not address this
1.2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The document fails to support its city-wide objective of supplying truly affordable housing for the community
1.2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Depot needs to be retained in Council ownership to meet community aspirations for affordable housing, open space, live/work units, in-keeping design, and to control developer pressure to negotiate away these elements The character is under threat from larger nationally owned retail outlets and gentrification The cumulative area has a lack of local affordable housing. The accommodation needs to be for rent, ideally co-operative/mutual There are major access and traffic issues - the site should be car-free or car-capped The draft development brief, exhibition, and transport report give inadequate consideration to access and traffic issues The site's capacity depends on resolution of issues for all users (including Bharat Bhavan and Language School). The draft development brief's assessment of context is so wrong that it invalidates the whole draft The draft development brief will hinder, not enable, resolution of the listed building at risk.
Figure 3 – Cambridge City Council allocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft development brief's assessment of context is so wrong that it invalidates the whole draft Fig 3 is misleading in that it uses a superseded version of the Local Plan fig 3.10, which omits the key Designated Heritage Assets relevant to the development brief - the Conservation Area boundary and the former Library within the site. Figure 3 in the draft development brief needs updating to reflect the Council's version in its proposed changes.
1.4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Plan proposals mention space for a district heating centre. Other than 1.4.2 there is no mention in draft development brief. Is this a valid proposal and where?
1.5.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcomes no general vehicle access from Hooper Street because of damaging impact on conservation area, quality of life for residents and negative impact on property values.
1.6.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wording of 'Anticipated' - This time (14 March 2016) has now passed, so need to change in order to reflect status
1.6.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Without a statutory status, this section should clarify who

Appendix A: Key Issues

	should be considering this as a 'material consideration', and what means will be taken to enforce this recommendation.
Chapter 2 – Site and Context	
2.2.1 – Land Ownership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Old Library should become a Community Centre open to all, as part of the redevelopment of the Mill Road Depot.
2.2.2 – Historic development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft development brief states that the former library has now been converted into a community centre, which is a misnomer as it is not available to the general community
2.2.3 – Buildings on site and surroundings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome more detailed discussion about the future of the garages in Hooper Street. I am a leaseholder. Paragraph 2.2.3 Private garages are located to the north west corner not north eastern corner.
2.2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support
2.2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As well as referring to the Warehouse on the southern side of Mill Road, this should refer to the Site R9 allocation in the emerging Local Plan that is not likely to continue in current form.
2.2.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The brief could refer to the need for high quality design and good practice in relation to the public realm, including advice in Historic England's 'Streets for All East of England'.
Figure 10 – Existing site photographs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council leases on the private garages prevent leaseholders painting their garage doors. A uniform repainting programme should be carried out if judged to be having a negative townscape impact fig 20 and para 2.2.31.
Figure 11 – Vehicular access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The junction of Kingston Street and Mill Road is already extremely dangerous. Need a proper pedestrian crossing or better still traffic lights.
2.2.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kingston Street is currently a 1-way street. In this context, unclear about the reference to 2-way passing and conflict? Needs to be clarified. Possible cycle/car - but this is linked to parking arrangements and lack of effective enforcement The block between Kingston Street and Hooper Street is there for good reason and must remain. It is highly permeable to cyclists and pedestrians. There is a huge amount of pedestrian/cycle commuter traffic transiting this block every morning/evening heading to the Railway Station Paragraph gives wrong impression of traffic management measures. They are not important vehicular routes linking Mill Road with Newmarket Road. The paragraph should be amended to read "the residential streets to the west and north of the Depot are narrow and are heavily parked in the day and in the evenings". Two road closures on Gwydir Street and Hooper Street are designed to prevent through traffic from Mill Road reaching Newmarket Road/East Road."
2.2.9 - Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This paragraph misses the point. It ignores the displaced parking demand caused by loss of garages if redeveloped for housing. Surrounding streets are controlled by a resident parking scheme. Displacing the 40 cars in the garages onto

Appendix A: Key Issues

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the adjoining streets will aggravate an existing bad situation. Concern that residents of new development will use surrounding side roads i.e. Hooper/Sturton Streets etc
2.2.12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot see the Chisholm Trail link to Mill Road as shown being practicable with any reasonable degree of safety – if needed it should be through the site away from junction. Chisholm Trail could run along the Boulevard/edge of Eagle Foundry Walk, especially as the trail comes down Ainsworth Street. This would help activate the public green open space in the centre of the site. A cycle route could cut diagonally across the site through the open spaces to increase cycle connectivity.
2.2.14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support - Within the constraints of the site development as much community space as possible is required. This needs to be well thought out, taking into account the impact on residents in the new development, managing how people consuming alcohol be prevented from colonising these spaces? What about late night returnees from a night out in town - how will this access be controlled? There is currently a huge flux of people travelling back from town along Kingston / Sturton / Ainsworth Streets that will be able to cut through the Mill Road Depot development.
Figure 14 – Existing land uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land uses: fig 14 is misleading in that it shows 'community and education' as a single block. What this actually comprises is: the Bharat Bhavan (the former Library, which is now in very limited community use); Council offices (not at all in community use); and the Regent Language school (in private commercial hands not in community use). The existing land uses need to be clearly and fully distinguished; this is vital for properly assessing the SPD's scope for influence and change. The orange garages are added to the legend.
2.2.18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vehicular access is potentially dangerous. Are traffic lights envisaged? What are the implications for pedestrians and cyclists? How will anyone turn right out of the site? It is not possible for access to Mill Road Depot to be other than directly from the only existing entrance on Mill Road.
2.2.20 – Existing Building Heights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistency between text (library 1 storey building) and figure (library a 4 storey building)
2.2.21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should add that currently there are predominantly garages and service buildings along the railway lines, north of the site. The noise conditions are key in inhabiting this area. This is the place to mention the future development of the site immediately south of Mill Road
Figure 16 – Existing Building Heights and 2.2.20-21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building heights (fig 16 and 2.2.20-21): the assessment is completely wrong and completely misrepresentative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The text fails to mention almost all buildings in the area are of traditional form with pitched roofs. Key to the

Appendix A: Key Issues

	<p>character of the area is not just total building height (i.e. to the ridge), but the height to the eaves. In the street scene, attic storeys (dormers and gables) within pitched roofs are subsidiary to eaves heights (as demonstrated by photos in fig 21). The text in 2.2.20-21 overlooks this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fig 16 falsely claims that the context includes a significant number of 3 and 4 storey buildings. ● Inconsistency between text (library 1 storey building) and figure (library a 4 storey building) ● Support - No taller development please than 2-3 storeys and 3-4 storeys. ● Figure 16 Why is the library shown as four storey when, according to paragraph 2.2.20 and also the photograph at figure 6, it should be shown as single storey?
2.2.22-29 Heritage Assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Officers should seek to secure the implementation of archaeological work through an appropriately worded condition placed on any planning consent. ● The setting of Listed Buildings in the Conservation Area, and undesignated historic stock, is best covered by advice from City Council Conservation Team and Historic England. ● No mention is made of archaeology/potential archaeology. Refer to the County HER for further information in this regard and suggest that an archaeological desk based study and possible site investigation may be required.
2.2.26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Para 2.2.26 fails to mention the Mill Road Conservation Area Appraisal's identification (p55) of the former Library as a Building at Risk. This is a key issue directly relevant to the Depot site. Why is it not even mentioned nor addressed, in the draft development brief? Claims that the former Library is no longer at risk, are contrary to all evidence: see Appendices 1 and 2. ● This para is ignoring the character of the specific industrial site in favour of the generic residential and commercial uses. The industrial character, as mentioned in section 2.2.2 should be acknowledged in this paragraph, or will be lost. ● The document should recommend an interpretation of industrial character - both in townscape and architectural articulation (such as scale, materiality, rhythm etc)
2.2.27 – Listed Buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The draft development brief seeks to retain the former Library building, without consideration to the issues and challenges relating to the now Bharat Bhavan. There have been unauthorised internal alterations and progressive deterioration of key architectural details. The building was independently noted as being "at risk", in the Mill Road Conservation Area Appraisal (p.55), and continued to deteriorate since then. ● There is no evidence of efforts to repair the former Library which now requires potentially expensive specialist manufacture and repair works. ● Retention of the listed building will depend not only on

Appendix A: Key Issues

	<p>resourcing the major repairs, but also on providing a viable long-term beneficial use. This is dependent on achieving a secondary means of escape; and adequate external functional space for servicing etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft development brief does not recognise the challenges nor offer solutions. The draft access layout impinges on the limited space adjoining the listed building. The consequence is that the difficult situation will be made worse. • Library must be retained and converted so is available for all local residents/community groups to use on an equal footing
2.2.31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify if the 'negative buildings' were identified by the Council (as stated in paragraph 2.2.31) or by the consultant team (as stated in the legend for figure 20 on page 26). • While the gatehouse is an original, handsome building, the gatehouse extension is a later addition. It is of a low quality, and it is suggested to mark it as a negative building. • The removal of the gatehouse extension may improve the entrance sequence into the site, since currently it creates a long barrier along the only access route, with little merit. • The existing coach houses on the site are a unique feature which will make a positive contribution to the site and their retention should be stated. • The garages to the north west of the site are judged to be negative buildings within the draft development brief. The Council has not maintained the garage doors which tenants are not responsible for under the terms of the lease. In spite the garages were built in the 1980s they are all in use and are in relatively good condition. Several owners have invested in new garage doors. They are modern functional buildings one would expect to find in a residential area. Comments that they should be removed in terms of their impact on the conservation area are unjustified and should be deleted.
2.2.33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The document states only that trees make 'a significant contribution to the appearance and character' on the area but not to our health and well-being. The trees at the southern end of the site bordering Mill Road and the railway are noted as significant. They are strong features in the street scene, they would screen the railway bridge and its traffic from any new development, but they would also heavily overshadow what is proposed as a new public space. Has any assessment been made of their long-term prospects, or of the potential need for succession planting?
2.2.34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support - trees must be retained. They should be used to partially block the 4/5 storey flats proposed for close to the railway line.
2.2.36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The documents should include a noise outline strategy, based on a desktop survey to provide the material evidence. • Although means of noise mitigation are available so close to

Appendix A: Key Issues

	the railway and road - it is the council's obligation to provide an initial working assumption for the future development (and not pass it to future developers responsibility)
2.2.37 – Land contamination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any redevelopment of this area should give special attention to ground contamination, sustainable urban drainage and environmental conservation betterment. Provide reference and access to EPS report 2016 on the Geo-Environmental Assessment in the SPD document, as the evidence base for this section
2.3.2 - Constraints	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Devonshire/Mill Road/Kingston Street 4 way junction needs to be made safe for pedestrians/cyclists transiting to the station across the flow of vehicles/cycles along Mill Rd. The long leases on the garages are a constraint in that there is no "reasonable prospect" of their development taking place in this plan period. Given the timescales if it is to be introduced to Site R10 this should be done as part of Plan Review after 2031. The development brief must be guided by the Local Plan context not the other way around
2.3.3 Opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please add to 'Integrate existing landscape and trees' the potential of integrating existing trees into enhanced new open public space in benefit of the whole area. 3rd bullet point - the existing garages should not be included in short term given the uncertainty over the Local Plan allocation and bearing in mind there is "no reasonable prospect" of coming forward until after 2031.

Chapter 3 – Vision and Key Principles

3.1 - Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The difficulties in the wider local area can be turned into an opportunity. If the council retains ownership of the site there is the possibility for council and community to make an exemplar site for this area and Cambridge. Support an exemplar site that reflects and enhances the local distinctiveness and character of the Mill Road conservation area, and combines this with what is needed to address future climate change. Some of these are reflected in the development brief. The Council could appoint an architect to design energy efficient housing and reduce carbon usage. Retention of the site by the Council opens up the possibility of a development that is exemplary in being wholly or largely car-free. This would avoid many access and traffic issues, & offer greater scope for community aspirations for the site. Will there be any safeguarding of owner-occupier sales? A concern for many in Romsey and Petersfield is the amount of new housing that is bought up by buy-to-let. The Council should preclude this sort of sale, to encourage local people to own; perhaps via cheaper access to mortgage, and giving consideration to workers in local industry and the NHS.
3.2.1 – Access and permeability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vehicle access to be entirely from Mill Rd apart from an emergency gate onto Hooper St. Vehicles on site not wanted. No vehicle provision.

Appendix A: Key Issues

3.2.2 – Housing-led mix of uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing as primary use with a "significant proportion" affordable • Mixed uses? We need cooperative housing not private housing. Community use building demanded at consultation none proposed. • Support - "Community space must be properly used". • Efficient use of space could be through a "Community Hub" for entertainment of the multi-cultural/ethnic local people with a range of activities. • Omit the word 'ambition' to form a stern obligation - 'with an overall of 40% affordable housing as a minimum target'. The current sentence lends itself to be watered down. • Given the extremely high cost of housing in this area, that still more than 40% of the new housing will be affordable. • How will 40% affordable provision be safeguarded?
3.2.3 - Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While para 3.2.3 proposes a "contextual approach to scale and massing" neither figs 42 and 45-53, nor text in 4.6.6-8 acknowledge or tackle the disparity (clear in fig 53) between the scale of traditional pitched roof forms in the area, and the bulk/height of what is proposed for the Depot site. • Want retention/refurbishment of coach houses on west of the site. Building design to reflect the surrounding streets whilst allowing much higher buildings along the railway. • Cambridgeshire Constabulary to consult with future developers to discuss Secured by Design principles and measures to mitigate against Crime and Disorder. • Any proposals for the site should consider the setting of the listed building and seek to preserve and enhance this. • Proposals should include a response to the site's industrial past, with opportunities for larger scale along the railway edge, and material sensitivity to the historic use of iron and timber on site, to maintain a hint of its past character. • Define merit of coach house separately to the later/lesser extension. • The sentence 'the block of garages should be retained in the short-term...' should be deleted. The sentence should be amended to read "Should the Inspector at the Local Plan Inquiry determine that the garages should be part of the site any scheme should be capable of accommodating their phased future redevelopment should they become available after 2031" • Support, but this needs to be much bolder. This is a unique opportunity to set a design benchmark for Cambridge. The aim should be to create a multi-award winning reference site that elevates the standard for future private developments. Every aspect of the development must be exemplary: highly visible and usable public spaces, promoting a strong sense of community; high proportion of affordable rented accommodation; generous internal spaces, with maximal penetration of daylight; ultra-low energy and water use; well-

Appendix A: Key Issues

	<p>concealed, secure and convenient storage areas for bins and cycles (including trikes, cargo & trailer bikes); high levels of craftsmanship in building designs and landscaping.</p>
3.2.4 – Open Space environment /	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support provision of open space and landscaping especially as this area of Cambridge has the least amount. Not agree. Open Space should be over 33%. Highlight free access to the new open space. Add the words 'public' and 'green' to express 'public green open space' and ensure legally it is not possible to become a gated private space in the future. At the moment the space is only coloured green on the plan, which ensures very little.
Chapter 4 – Development Parameters	
4.1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section will benefit from simple line illustrations of the streets, open spaces, building typologies in use to identify the variety and difference envisioned for the site. As was done for the Addenbrooke's masterplan.
4.1.3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change the term 'open space' to 'open public space', or better still to 'open public green space' to highlight the quality and accessibility of these spaces.
4.2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support - The development of the depot site provides a valuable opportunity to provide the Chisholm Trail to the station. Site Framework Plan (Fig 27) shows the route which is likely to become heavily used with many bikes passing at speed. As such it should not cut through the depot site where it would endanger pedestrians, especially children.
Figure 27 – Site Framework Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support
4.2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section should provide a hierarchy of streets. While vehicular traffic may be even on both north/ south routes, it is important to distinguish between the west route along the coach houses (a mews scale street) and the route to the east, along the green space (a more prominent 'boulevard')
4.3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be no approval of draft development brief unless and until; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) a comprehensive and realistic analysis of the movement, access, and traffic management issues has been provided, (ii) the City and County Councils have together provided demonstrably credible proposals for resolving these issues. These are not matters to leave to a developer. They are the responsibility of the Councils, and require justification to the community, who rely on the Councils for safety on roads.
Figure 28 – Transport and Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the road and pathway layout and Chisholm Trail going round the edge of the site as shown on the Site Framework Plan and Transport and Access plan (Fig 28). This section should provide a hierarchy of streets. While vehicular traffic may be even on both north/ south routes, it is important to distinguish between the west route along the coach houses (a mews scale street) and the route to the east, along the green space (a more prominent 'boulevard')

Appendix A: Key Issues

4.3.2 – Pedestrian and cycle connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision for pedestrian and cycle connectivity is supported. • Support confirmation the Trail will keep to the edge of site. • Chisholm Trail could run along the Boulevard/edge of Eagle Foundry Walk, especially as the trail comes down Ainsworth Street. This would help activate the public green open space in the centre of the site. A cycle route could cut diagonally across the site through the open spaces to increase cycle connectivity. • The three cycle access points from Hooper Street to the development are dangerous for numerous reasons. The Chisholm Trail route could continue directly on from Ainsworth Street, and find its way over to the railway at a more southerly point. This would then be the sole cycle access point from Hooper Street. It could also serve as the Emergency Vehicle Access for the development that could continue to be used after the Hooper Street garages go. • Support delivery of Chisholm Trail for the improvement of cycle transportation around Cambridge. Proposals must also consider wider cycling patterns in the local area, including measures to lower the volume of cycling traffic across the narrow Mill Rd railway bridge. The Council should also seek proposals for a cycle bridge linking Hooper St with Cavendish Road as part of development?
4.3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The standard width for new two-way cycle paths is 3m so 'the suggestion that the Trail needs to be 6m wide should be removed from the development brief and replaced with the requirement that the route be at least 3m.' Many other parts of the Trail are incapable of providing a 3m wide path let alone 6m. It is therefore not appropriate to provide a 6m wide path for the depot part of the Trail and reduce the opportunities for landscaping and other elements of the depot plan.
4.3.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further strain is going to be put on any new junction from the proposed Chisholm Trail cyclists; yet this has not been acknowledged or accounted for within the traffic study. • Transport report is negligent in failing to highlight the more than 10 times increase (22 to 262 trips, even excluding Chisholm Trail traffic) in cycle trips projected in the report, or consider its implications for number and frequency of cycles (coupled with increase in pedestrians) crossing traffic flows. • While the draft development brief includes an acknowledgement (paras 4.3.4 and 4.3.5) that there are issues requiring "careful design review in the context of potential junction enhancements to ensure a safe, formalised means of access", no such analysis or design has been provided. • These issues must be resolved before the development brief is approved, because the nature of any redevelopment of the Depot site is totally dependent on the capacity of the site access.

Appendix A: Key Issues

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note the acknowledgement in the document that the existing junction will need to be improved and tested for capacity. • Cannot see the Chisholm Trail link as shown being practicable with any reasonable degree of safety. • A cycle link to Mill Road from the Chisholm Trail should be provided through the site joining away from the junction. • Whilst the difficulties of the junction on Mill Road are noted the desire line for cyclists to access the trail (and proposed bridge) at this point must be accommodated as stated. • Land needs to be safeguarded in the south eastern corner of the site for any future potential connections across the railway to new development sites to the east. Any such connection would be beneficial to the cycle and pedestrian network in the city and the brief should reflect this. • Support provision of a 6m wide strip for the Chisholm Trail. • An area of concern for me is the crossroads with Mill Road, Devonshire Rd and Kingston Street. This is a very dangerous crossing for pedestrians and cyclists and should have already been resolved. Suggest as a matter of priority that the crossroad be given controlled crossing areas to protect the most vulnerable road users - especially at peak times.
4.3.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attention needs to be given to the connection with Ainsworth St - this junction has poor visibility. The proposed Chisholm Trail route will add a lot of new cycle traffic turning right into Ainsworth Street. It would be better to align the northern entrance/exit from the depot site with Ainsworth Street so cycle traffic in both directions has good visibility. Giving north-south traffic priority here (with give-way lines on Hooper Street) could also improve safety.
4.3.7 – Vehicular access, routes and hierarchy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What has not been considered is the increased strain on the already overworked and frequently dangerous Mill Road. • The draft development brief and Policy 23 of the draft Local Plan seek to achieve public realm improvements on Mill Road. However this depends on resolving the issues relating to the access and Mill Road without harming the character of the area. • Mill Road is known to the police, planning inspectors and local users, as a very busy road with limited crossings. • There is nothing in the draft development brief to say how the public realm improvements can be achieved. Instead, it assumes it will be possible to inject more movements by car, bike and walking onto Mill Road with no consequent adverse effects. • These issues must be resolved before the development brief is approved, because the nature of any redevelopment of the Depot site is totally dependent on the capacity of the site access.
4.3.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The traffic report is notable for: • (i) inadequate scope (failure to include the access needs of

Appendix A: Key Issues

	<p>Bharat Bhavan, the Language School, and Chisholm trail),</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (ii) failure to assess the interactions between movement patterns (and consequent management issues) generated by these multiple needs, and • (iii) its inadequate assessment of its own survey data. • The draft junction layout does not show the route of the Chisholm Trail, or the needs of Bharat Bhavan and the Language School (neither of which have any rear access or servicing). To be realistic, any proposal for the junction needs to assess the consequent traffic flows and space needs. It also needs to provide sufficient access, parking and servicing space for Bharat Bhavan. • These issues must be resolved before the development brief is approved, because the nature of any redevelopment of the Depot site is totally dependent on the capacity of the site access. • Traffic surveys - no cycles in manual surveys.
4.3.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient consideration has been given to the adverse impact this will have on Ainsworth St/Hooper St/Sturton St area. No notice has been taken of the parking problems at the depot-development area end of Sturton Street: • The proposed emergency access routes into Hooper Street on the latest development plan will turn into a general access route increasing traffic. The nearest access for emergency vehicles: Police, Fire and Ambulance are via Mill Road, it makes no sense for them to negotiate the narrow, traffic-clogged back streets.
4.3.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft development brief para 4.3.10 leaves resolution of access capacity and design issues to "any future site developer". This is inexcusable. The access, and the junction with Mill Road have to serve the whole of the site and all of its users. • The capacity and form of the access and junction, and hence the capacity of the site, are dependent on identifying and meeting all these needs. We remain completely unconvinced that this is possible for this site. • The transport report claims that there will be a substantial reduction in vehicle movements by comparison with the current position. This is an assessment drawn from a false assumption that; 'an increase in cycle and public transport would lead to a subsequent decrease in trips by car'. • These issues have to be resolved now, before the development brief is approved. The nature of any redevelopment of the Depot site is totally dependent on the capacity of the site access. • Note the acknowledgement in the document that the existing junction will need to be improved and tested for capacity. • Cannot see the Chisholm Trail link as shown being practicable with any reasonable degree of safety. • A cycle link to Mill Road from the Chisholm Trail should be

Appendix A: Key Issues

	provided through the site joining away from the junction.
4.3.13 – Car Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Car-free" site? For housing on the site to be in character with the Mill Road conservation area, it will need to be of small units. If the site is not to be a car-free one, there is little to prevent householders from having two cars for their needs undermining much of the report. These issues have to be resolved now. The Depot site meets the criteria for a car-free development set out in the draft Cambridge Local Plan Policy 82 and is supported by text in para 9.29 of the draft Local Plan. On this site the joint involvement of the City and County Councils as landowners and planning and highway authorities provides an ideal basis for developing an exemplary solution. On this particular site, a car-free or car-capped development may be the only way of resolving the major site access challenges. Providing "low" car-parking, which is insufficient for the requirements of residents, leads to conflict, bad parking, and increased trouble for everybody in surrounding areas. It does not reduce car ownership or use. Other developments which have done this have caused problems both to themselves and to their neighbouring areas. Parking provision should be sufficient for the needs of those who will live in the development, rather than only meet the level of car ownership which the council aspires to people having. Insufficient consideration seems to have been given to the adverse impact this will have on the Ainsworth St/Hooper St/ Sturton St area. Notice has not been taken of the parking problems at the depot-development area end of Sturton Street including: - inadequate provision for parking - one parking space for either a two or three bedroomed property is not enough. If they are unable to park on the development then will park in nearby streets. Residents in this part of Sturton Street need a 24/7 resident's parking scheme to ensure have parking spaces. This is the place to highlight the council's promotion of a modal shift. Currently the scheme allows car park, but due to location, single entrance, narrow street pattern and mix of pedestrian and cycle movement, the car park allows prioritisation of cars. A maximum standard should be set for this site (rather than rely on policies) to avoid creeping vehicular movement to appease developers and house prices, on the account of alternative means of transport.
4.3.15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This paragraph misses the point. It ignores the displaced parking demand caused by loss of garages should they be redeveloped for housing. Surrounding streets are controlled by a resident parking scheme covering the Petersfield area north of Mill Road. Residents' parking in streets adjoining the Depot is a nightmare. There are frequently no spaces to park in the evening after 5pm. There is very little turnover of spaces in the day. Cars frequently have to park overnight on

Appendix A: Key Issues

	<p>double yellow lines, which cause additional danger to cyclists and motorists. On pavement parking affects pedestrians, the disabled and mothers with push chairs. The loss of 40 garages will further aggravate this situation for all residents living either side of the road closures.</p>
4.3.16 – Cycle parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.3.16 should include reference to the need to adhere to City Council Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments.
4.4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England supports the proposed open space framework for the site. The detailed design could make use of the checklist in Natural England's Green Infrastructure Guidance. Open space provision should be multi-functional and contribute to the objectives of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy (Cambridgeshire Horizons, 2011) and local Biodiversity Action Plan targets where possible. Opportunities to enhance connectivity with areas of off-site open space and green corridors should be considered. Redevelopment of Mill Road Depot site could deliver a high quality strategic biodiversity 'hotspot' connecting to a strong city-wide wildlife corridor (railway line). Therefore support requirement for a significant proportion of the site being allocated to open space, particularly the green corridor on the eastern boundary along the railway line (Chisholm Trail). Change 'open space' to 'publicly accessible open space' as per definition in CCC 'Open Space and Recreation Strategy' to ensure the open space can not be gated for private use. The area has the street and market in car park as an open public space, but it is not green. There are other green spaces which are not public (e.g. the university cricket club) The consultation raised the need for greener, planted, publicly accessible spaces. Accordia set a standard, but people do not use the gardens as parks. There is a need for clarity, otherwise the quality and accessibility of spaces will be undermined by developers.
Figure 33 – Open Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the expressed wish to meet some of the needs of the wider Mill Road community on open space the Mill Park should be on the southern side of the site, adjacent to the Chisholm Trail, to give the park a more open feel with immediate access for the wider community walking and cycling through the area along the Trail.
4.4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The document fails to address how open space will be a community resource, positioned as it is three-quarters of the way down the development, and considered primarily as a water run-off area. At the consultations, people expressed the desire for the open space to be directly accessible from Mill Rd, and to be well integrated throughout the built environment. The area allocated for 'Mill Park' is smaller than any of the current listed open spaces on Fig13 and

Appendix A: Key Issues

	<p>does little to increase the ratio of open space to housing density. More green spaces could be accommodated and safe play areas for children provided throughout the site if the development was car-free.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the general principle, but it's important to make public spaces VISIBLE to the public. There is a danger that the Mill Park space will be underused, being relatively invisible and not adjacent to a public thoroughfare. Also suggest making the southern green space larger, more inviting, and more suitable for community events. The proposed houses west of The Limes should be relocated to Mill Park, and The Limes park expanded to connect with Gatehouse Court. A further justification for these changes is the front rooms of houses facing Mill Road bridge would be overlooked by people crossing the bridge. Relocating the houses to a more private space part of the area will make them more valuable.
4.4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open Space should be over 33% Set 25% open public space as minimum, otherwise it will end as 20%. Also, if allow green roofs/terraces on top of the taller buildings, this should not undermine the 25% on the ground level.
4.4.4 – Street Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paras 4.4.4-7 do not go far enough in proposing and requiring a landscape strategy, in relation to not just open space but also the role of trees in assimilating developments into context, in mitigating the impacts of the adjacent busy road and railway, and in moderating summer heat.
The Limes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This space is located north of the bridge as it rises, and therefore the space will be mostly shaded. While the trees may provide amenity and noise screening, the sun-lit useable portion of the open space is narrowed to rising or setting sun only. It is advised to run a sun path study to conclude overshading. In conclusions this area is of little. A central 'Mill Park' will benefit from a larger space in its place. Provision of community space is welcome, but land overshadowed by the bridge will require very careful landscaping.
Mill Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the expressed wish to meet some of the needs of the wider Mill Road community on open space the Mill Park should be on the southern side of the site, adjacent to the Chisholm Trail, to give the park a more open feel with immediate access for the wider community walking and cycling through the area along the Trail.
Eagle Foundry Walk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As in 4.3, the character of this walk should be identified together with the road as the more prominent street, with a wide pavement and the scale of the taller buildings to the east. It is proposed to define this street pattern as a 'boulevard' to highlight its difference from the 'mews' street along the coach houses to the west.
Chisholm Trail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The redevelopment of Mill Road Depot site could deliver a

Appendix A: Key Issues

	<p>high quality strategic biodiversity 'hotspot' for the City connecting to a strong city-wide wildlife corridor (railway line). Support the provision of a 6m zone along the eastern boundary that abuts the railway line to accommodate the off-road Chisholm Trail. This area should provide biodiversity function and be designed to benefit wildlife, especially those indicative of the railway environment - e.g. reptiles, invertebrate and plants associated with open mosaic habitat on previously developed land.</p>
Gatehouse courtyard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend the later gatehouse extension is defined of low quality and promote its demolition to enable a more direct access sequence from the long and narrow entrance street into an extended version of the gatehouse court. This will support both the entrance and the public space with very little loss of low quality accommodation which can be compensated for elsewhere.
4.4.9 – Outdoor sports pitches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is a relatively constrained urban site with limited opportunity for on-site provision for sport. Therefore support (Para.4.4.9) that the best approach for providing for sport will be through financial contributions to improve the quantitative or qualitative off-site provision of facilities within the catchment area of the proposed development. Cambridge City Council has completed a Playing Pitch Strategy and Sports Facilities Strategy which will help identify investment priorities in the vicinity of the site relating to outdoor and indoor sport. Sport England would be happy to advise further on the details of off-site provision.
4.5.1 - Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The nature of Mill Road and the adjacent streets is more mixed than the proposed scheme giving it the unique, lively blend of housing and urban mixed use curiosities. Several local artists and Art trust organisations have expressed interest in using the coach houses, especially lower single storey type, as artists' workshops. Further opportunities can be found along Chisholm Trail/Eagle Foundry Walk sides of the ground floor of the higher buildings. A constant flow of cyclists and pedestrians may inform the use of the ground floor and require feasibility study to inform this, before the SPD dismisses this option. The preliminary design work undertaken as part of the development brief suggests that the site has capacity to achieve the 167 dwellings identified in the Local Plan. The later provision of 6 or so houses on the garages site is clearly not needed in order to achieve the Local Plan housing target for site R10. How has the CCC arrived at this capacity? How has the vehicular and cycle traffic loading been taken into account? What happened to the idea that the coach houses could be let as studio space/small business units which is the kind of facility that Mill Road needs - instead this site is jam packed with only houses and flats. The density again is problematic.

Appendix A: Key Issues

Figure 38 – Indicative Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The balance of proposed land uses should include greater provision for employment-related uses. This is an opportunity for workshops and spaces for local craftsmen etc to store materials close to their inner urban clients. Residential development should be at a minimum if it is needed to offset costs of servicing the site.
4.5.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tenure should be informed, or at least mention recommendation raised in the Draft Local Plan by SHMA, or future evidence based surveys.
Figure 39 – Photographs showing examples of housing typologies in Cambridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Virtually none of the images shown provide any context with the Mill Road conservation area. Whilst some may be positive the sheer number that does not achieve any relationship with the local context is inappropriate. At least two of the examples are of low quality build (marked on the attached image), and recommend not including these in the illustration, to avoid creating a negative precedent.
4.5.4 – Affordable housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area has a lack of genuinely affordable housing, with limited scope for improving the situation. Nationally, affordable housing is 80% of market value. For this area, 80% of market value would be unaffordable for the majority of the community. By far the best opportunity to achieve genuine affordable housing in this area is the Depot site, which is in the ownership by the Council. According to the Council Leader, the Council have committed to supplying 50% social housing at 40-60% market rents. This is not mentioned in the development brief and will impact on the type of housing provided. Interest was also expressed in the provision of rented Co-operative housing. This site represents an opportunity to address the shortage of affordable housing that threatens the City's economic success. Welcome commitment to 40% affordable housing. However, as the site is Council owned it could sustain a higher proportion, even up to 100% affordable. The Mill Road Depot site could become a model for innovative/creative options for affordable housing. The development brief mentions exploring co-op housing, perhaps even intermediary dwellings, social rental schemes. Encouraged by the emphasis on the significant potential the site holds. Highly recommend investigation of above options to best utilise the site. We need co-operative housing. Procurement and partnering models of the City Council should be referred to in other policy papers, and ensure quality of deliverance is not undermined by commercial value alone.
4.5.5 – Community and other non-residential uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In discussion with the local residents association in the area (PACT), when talking to people in the local community, and at the consultation meetings the view is repeatedly expressed that:

Appendix A: Key Issues

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ there needs to be a dedicated community facility to serve the depot and the surrounding streets to the north and west of the depot site, and ○ such a facility should be located at the north end of the site to serve both the new and existing housing. ○ The community to the north of Mill Rd (through to East Rd and New Street) have very few local facilities. ● Paras 4.5.5-6 Positive to see recognition of pressure on Early Years provision and identification of solution. Would want to see this point made more forcefully if possible. ● Sport England aims to ensure positive planning for sport, enabling the right facilities to be provided in the right places, based on assessments of need for and all sectors of the community. To achieve this, our planning objectives are to PROTECT sports facilities; ENHANCE existing facilities; and PROVIDE new facilities. ● Sport England, has produced 'Active Design'(2015), a guide to planning new developments to help people get more active. The guidance sets out ten principles for ensuring new developments incorporate opportunities for people to take part in physical activity. The principles promote healthy communities through good urban design. ● Propose the inclusion of artist studios and a dedicated contemporary art gallery or project space as part of the Mill Road Depot development plans. ● Paragraph 4.5.5 and 4.5.6 Community and other non-residential uses - Any planning application will need to be informed by the range of uses already put forward for the site in the Local Plan. It is not the role of the development brief to start introducing other uses at this stage and without consultation with the community. Why is it that space can be found to Women's Resource Centre when their lease has expired yet the garages can't be re-accommodated within the site?
4.5.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Councils need to assess the space needs of the existing community-related uses, most particularly the Women's Resources Centre and the present and future occupants of the former Library. Also need to assess the major gaps in community provision in the area, and reflect the outcome of this assessment in the on-site community provision. The following community aspirations were stated at a public meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ *Green space ○ *Creative community Space - multi functional and flexible. ○ *A Space for community and teaching kitchens ○ *Space to enable a maintenance hub for cyclists, along with a teaching and learning facility ○ *Affordable workshop, gallery and storage Space for

Appendix A: Key Issues

	<p>local artists</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ *Safe space for the homeless. A space to offer the homeless room to breathe and to be able to start to build lives for themselves. ○ *A strong message from the community is to emphasise the call to develop and take part in community teaching and learning. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Not agree. Mixed use zone? Community node? Unclear - we need community building not in private use. Community use building demanded at consultation none proposed. ● The provision of community space is welcome, but the land overshadowed by the bridge will require careful landscaping. ● Suggest it would be in the creative spirit of the Mill Road area to preserve some or all of the coach houses as rented creative workspace, including affordable artists' studios. The southern coach house (at the Mill Rd end) could become a café/gallery, creating an inviting entrance to the site. ● Local artists and arts trusts have expressed interest in the single storey coach houses for use as studios to let. Such activity may enrich the environment and should not clash with the residential environment (see existing Cambridge Artworks community on 5 Green's Road). An uplift in apartments to meet the 167 unit target. Additional uses should also be considered, such as small health surgeries to provide supportive services to the community, as well as local coffee shops which encourage social life around them. Ground floor units for retail/services/office may be allocated at the bottom of the taller buildings along the Chisholm trail and Eagle Foundry Walk. This may offset build cost, while providing a mix of use into the depth of the site. ● Paragraph 4.5.5 and 4.5.6 Community and other non-residential uses - Any planning application will need to be informed by the range of uses already put forward for the site in the Local Plan. It is not the role of the SPD to start introducing other uses at this stage and without consultation with the community. Why is it that space can be found to Women's Resource Centre when their lease has expired yet the garages can't be re-accommodated within the site? ● What happened to the idea that the coach houses could be let as studio space/small business units which is the kind of facility that Mill Road needs - instead this site is jam packed with only houses and flats. The density again is problematic.
4.6.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Having small gardens at front of housing seems to run contrary to previous points about fitting in with general context of Mill Road conservation area, where vast majority of homes front directly onto the street. This is something previously described as a positive feature of the area.
4.6.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Welcome proposals for the refurbishment of existing coach houses. Opportunities should be sought to re-use existing historic buildings wherever possible. They add

Appendix A: Key Issues

	<p>distinctiveness, meaning and quality to the places in which we live, providing a sense of continuity and a source of identity. Accommodating change in an appropriate manner will help to secure the future of such assets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be out of character with the Mill Rd area to have the main part of the site devoted to housing. Suggest it would be in the creative spirit of Mill Rd to preserve some or all of the coach houses as workspace - preferably for creative purposes including affordable artists studios. The southern coach house could become a café/gallery, providing a lively and inviting entrance to the site. • Further attention should be given to the location of the coach houses and their height including specific recommendations to their extension by adding another floor, and their proposed use e.g. a cafe opening to the park, Art gallery or other use with public benefit.
4.6.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gentrification is an increasing trend that will have effects on the whole of this community. It will - as can be seen in the draft development brief - bring about calls for larger and taller housing units in and around Mill Road, changing the character of the low rise area, with small dwellings bought by young families - those lucky enough to be able to afford them. • Four storeys is too high for this area of town. Do not want to become like the horrible development at CB1. • Not necessary to limit the southern apartment block (adjacent to the railway) to a maximum of five storeys. It would be consistent with the industrial heritage of the area (e.g. Foster's Mill and Dale's Brewery) to have a more prominent loft-style vertical building, of say seven or eight storeys. This would act as a landmark. The provision of additional apartments in the upper floors could relieve the pressure to convert the coach houses to housing, allowing them to be used as creative workspace. • In the final sentence, should this read 'Taller buildings' or 'A taller building'? Recommend HE Advice Note 4 on tall buildings. Whilst four storeys may not be regarded as particularly tall, it is taller than the mainly two-storey neighbourhood. Any development would need to give due consideration to the draft Local Plan (Proposed Modifications) which sets out criterion against which tall buildings are assessed. Await more detailed proposals to assess and draw firm conclusions in this respect. • According to the illustrative plan, some of the 3-4 storeys buildings will be facing 'Mill Park'. Consideration should be given to the impact this may have on the buildings height, whether these buildings should be allowed to go higher, while allowing to release other buildings to different uses, or this may help reduce other buildings' height. • The document needs to be very specific about how tall a

Appendix A: Key Issues

	<p>taller building may be, and how many tall buildings will be allowed. Without specificity, a developer can interpret this however they want, and we end up with a Marque on our corner. 4 stories should be the absolute maximum. Older taller buildings have variable roof pitches. Modern buildings are square boxes that look taller than they are. So 5 stories look more like 7.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Live on Great Eastern Street and look directly into the site across the rail lines. A four-storey building would be intrusive for us, as well as residents on the Depot site, and those in adjoining streets. The Women's Refuge Building is only two storeys and that seems tall enough? Can planning be restricted to just three storeys, preferably two storeys?
4.6.9 - Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome the requirement for a careful consideration of heritage assets in support of any planning application. Any assessment will need to give consideration to local context and key views. Note that the Council/consultants consider 4 storeys may be appropriate along the eastern boundary of the site. Any development would need to give due consideration to the draft Local Plan (Proposed Modifications) which sets out criterion against which tall buildings are assessed. Await more detailed proposals to assess and draw firm conclusions in this respect. • 'Long horizontal facades' is not necessarily a negative feature of a building, as long as it is articulated and detailed properly. This term may do more damage than help, unless design intention is clarified.
4.7.1 - Layout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no mention of cycle or bin storage on site. It is essential the development includes well-concealed, secure and convenient areas to store cycles (including trikes, cargo and trailer bikes) and bins. Consideration should be given to providing communal bins rather than individual bins.
Figure 43 – Illustrative Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft document shows in Fig 43 a pathway providing a continuation of Ainsworth St south into the depot site. This is likely to lead to cyclists on the Trail cutting through the depot site rather than following the Trail round the edge of the site. The development brief should make clear that the Trail must keep to the edge of the site and any risk of cyclists diverting through the site must be prevented • Further detailed comments provided on a plan.
4.7.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the approach that streets and blocks should respond to the surrounding context as described in the Conservation Area Appraisal. However, suggest an amendment to the wording from 'existing' to 'proposed' for the sentence to make sense. We agree that a dominant north south street pattern, reflecting the surrounding context, would appear to be appropriate in this location.
4.7.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome statement that buildings should be orientated to overlook streets and public spaces with layouts following best practice guidance such as Secure by Design. Has

Appendix A: Key Issues

	<p>consideration been given to the possibility of routing the Chisholm cycle trail through the main spine of the development as part of the Eagle Foundry Walk to ensure it is adequately overlooked and secure? Recognise this is a matter for the County Council in their transport planning role.</p>
4.7.4 – Long-term phasing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was not consensus on the retention of the garage block off Hooper St. The draft development brief assumes these would be replaced by housing at some future point but this will not be easy to achieve. This facility is valuable to residents in and around Hooper St so some replacement should be provided. The point was made in the consultations that the opportunity should be taken to relocate this parking and an underground facility was suggested. The development brief should make clear that 'the garage block should be removed and replaced with enough alternative secure car parking (possibly underground) to meet demand from the existing garage users.' • Insufficient consideration seems to have been given to the adverse impact this will on the Ainsworth St / Hooper St / Sturton St area. Notice has not been taken of the parking problems we have consistently spoken about at the depot-development area end of Sturton Street including: Hooper Street Garages - Concern that the existing garage block in Hooper Street will be demolished in favour of further housing to be accessed from Hooper Street when the leases expire adding to the already congested streets. • Welcome the phased approach and planning for the longer term provision of housing addressing Hooper Street to replace the garages once their lease has expired. • The use of the ground floors of the higher residential buildings may lend themselves with time to other uses - retail, services or public. To enable such future flexibility it is proposed to condition the construction of taller floor to ceiling height for these spaces (say 3-3.5m). • Wholeheartedly support this paragraph.
4.7.5 – Indicative street typologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome statement that buildings should be orientated to overlook streets and public spaces with layouts following best practice guidance such as Secure by Design. Has consideration been given to the possibility of routing the Chisholm cycle trail through the main spine of the development as part of the Eagle Foundry Walk to ensure it is adequately overlooked and secure? Recognise this is a matter for the County Council in their transport planning role. • Orientation (front/back) should be clearly highlighted on the illustrative plan to avoid creating enclosed courtyards giving their back to the street as might happen around 'Mill Park' (and not be mistaken with the 'colleges inspired' inward looking residential courts).
4.7.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further clarity on the variety of streets should be provided

Appendix A: Key Issues

	<p>here. This section could identify the character of the entrance street from Mill Road, and assign uses and activities it could host. For example the street could be laid out and paved to encourage a temporary use as a changing market, which may extend into the public open spaces and internal pedestrian/shared surface street.</p>
4.7.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is proposed to clarify the different street typologies, and define the character of the 'Eagle Foundry Walk' as a more prominent 'boulevard', supported by the shared surface, planting and scale of the taller buildings to the east. It is also proposed to define street along the coach houses as a more subservient 'mews', and highlight its difference from the above mentioned 'boulevard' to the east.
4.7.8 - Character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome the requirement for proposals to respond to local townscape and demonstrate a positive and appropriate response to key design features including street elevations, roofscape, materials, massing and building corners. It might be helpful to list some of the materials that would be considered appropriate and other locally distinctive materials/ features that help to contribute to the character and unique local distinctiveness of the area as a whole and Mill Road Conservation Area. Also suggest the brief could refer to the need for high quality design and good practice in relation to the public realm and specific advice in 'Streets for All East of England'. This section should highlight the importance of quality design, as per Local Plan policy 57 (Designing new buildings) - re-word 'Opportunities for HIGH QUALITY contemporary design solutions which consider traditional local styles, MATERIALS and detailing should be incorporated as appropriate.'
4.8.1 – Side-wide sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any redevelopment of this area should give special attention to sustainable urban drainage and environmental conservation betterment. Refer to the Agency's 'Planning Application Guidance' document for your assistance.
4.8.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further consideration should be mentioned and explored such as renewable energy (PVs, Ground source heat pumps) and advanced technologies such as District Heating distribution across the site and in conjunction with the adjacent site south of Mill Road.
4.8.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On a site of such scale, a new substation will most likely be required - A possible location for such services should be indicated on the illustrative plan.
4.8.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Endorse the requirement for the use of SUDs for surface water drainage where at all possible. Above ground water storage should be allocated and shown on the illustrative plan. Support - Consideration should be given to providing piped access to underground rainwater reservoirs so that owners with gardens and park attendants can draw on it. This would

Appendix A: Key Issues

	obviate the need for water butts, which run dry in summer.
4.8.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pleased to see recommendation for developer to consult with Anglian Water to identify a drainage strategy.
4.8.11 - Ecology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.8.11 to 4.8.20 The Mill Road Depot site could deliver a high quality strategic biodiversity 'hotspot' for the City connecting to a strong city-wide wildlife corridor (railway line). Therefore support the inclusion of ecology as part of the environmental considerations. A number of biodiversity features could be secured as part of the fabric of the urban environment, such as biodiverse roofs and bird/bat access points. Such 'artificial' refuges provide vital resources for urban species and help to achieve a biodiverse 'hotspot'.
4.8.12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support measures to enhance biodiversity such as tree and other planting, water resources in association with sustainable drainage (SUDs) and landscape features, nesting opportunities for bird and bat species and habitats for insects, and should be implemented.
4.8.18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advise that planting schemes should include native species of local provenance to maximise biodiversity gain.
4.9.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest the following text is added after the sentence: "It is also possible that in addition to the provision of the Chisholm Trail through the site, other transport improvements will be needed off site." Add: "Such transport improvements and other necessary mitigation measures will need to be identified through the Transport Assessment process that will accompany any planning applications submitted to develop the site." Table 1 provides a summary of capacity for GP Catchment Practices once the additional development floorspace is factored in, including a cost estimate for providing new floorspace and/or related facilities. There is a capacity deficit in the catchment practices and a developer contribution would be required to mitigate the 'capital cost' to NHS England for the provision of additional primary healthcare services arising from the development. Sport England would be happy to advise further on the financial contributions required to provide for sport and recreation needs as part of this development. There is in no way enough detail here on what is going to happen with regards to school place provision. There is already a catchment 'black hole' in the area where children are being sent to schools several miles away because of a lack of places at their local catchment school. This issue is going to become critical with this new development, and see no real council engagement with how it is going to be solved. Would like to see concrete suggestions, not vague promises to address the problem at some future point.
Appendix – Glossary of Terms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest that the terms, 'Conservation Area' and 'Locally Listed Buildings' are added to the glossary.