

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

Chapters	Comments	Officer Response	Amendments
1. Introduction	<p><i>'Looking at your updated Historic Core Appraisal it is apparent that few if any of the discoveries of recent archaeological investigations have been incorporated and it almost entirely simply reiterates the earlier document. The area covered has been subject to numerous archaeological investigations undertaken in response to development under the auspices of the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Team. The failure to take account of these means that the document is extremely outdated, flawed and misleading from an archaeological perspective'. (Resident)</i></p>	<p>New archaeological content has now been input from the County Archaeologist.</p>	<p>Replacement 2.2 "Historical Development of Cambridge".</p> <p>Outdated archaeological comment in the street sections & 4.3 to be deleted.</p>
	<p><i>Trees and the environment also need to be high on the list as the present idea of 'public realm' appears to be removing large trees and green areas and replacing with small spaces of 'municipal' greenery' and putting trees into holes in pavements instead of in verges.</i></p> <p><i>Transport should also be part of the Historic Core Appraisal as it is the roads that are changing the environment as much as the huge house building and slow removal of mature trees. Wide roads do not fit into Cambridge and pressure needs to be put on the planners to stop the idea of roads before residents.(Resident)</i></p>	<p>Important trees and Tree Preservation Order blocks are noted on the Street analysis maps.</p> <p>Road widening is a not proposed in the historic core.</p>	
	<p><i>Views: Why are good and poor views no longer identified or described? Many informed observers and conservationists would argue that first-rate townscapes deserve protection as much as individual buildings.</i></p> <p><i>This is particularly important for a city such as Cambridge whose Historic Centre is mostly owned by the Cambridge Colleges all acting as individual property developers. The need to engage the Colleges and the University, the 'guardians' (or not), of this famous heritage city in discussion of what constitutes the city's best views and how to protect those views is crucial.</i></p> <p><i>In cases where assessment of street significance and importance have</i></p>	<p>Key views and poor views are actually still shown on the street analysis plans.</p> <p>The <i>Local Plan</i> policies including about: Areas Of Major Change; Responding to Context; and Tall Buildings are intended to guide developers as to where and what they can build.</p> <p>Assessment of street significance</p>	<p>Add text (as left hand column).</p>

	<p><i>changed why has there been no attempt to explain why this has occurred?</i></p> <p><i>The River: Why is there no evaluation of the River as an important cultural and national heritage asset across the whole Heritage Core Area? 4. There is no coherent consideration of the management of River and the Backs, no acknowledgement of the Backs Management Plans.</i></p> <p><i>Change since 2006 Appraisal: The Assessment needs at the very least to include an analysis of what has changed since the last Appraisal in 2006 , and an analysis of the changes, with management strategies showing how the Council working with Colleges, University and input from city residents, also key stakeholders, plans to tackle this.</i></p> <p><i>Architecture: Why are recent examples of good building and architecture not even picked up on?</i></p> <p><i>Large Plan: Why is there no plan of the whole Appraisal area to attempt to show the individual street appraisal areas coloured according to the assessment of their importance? 8. Without such a plan how can policy makers dealing with major development projects, and their settings or with the public realm possibly hope to assess the significance of the historic core as a whole as well as its individual parts?</i></p> <p><i>Strategic issues or threats: The 2016 draft fails to consider strategic issues</i></p>	<p>and importance has reflected for example, new development or additional information in the street text.</p> <p>The river is referred to in the Historical Development section and in relevant street sections such as Silver Street and Chesterton Road. However, a more general passage on its importance could be added.</p> <p>Changes are noted in various parts of the appraisal, but it is agreed that a summary of what has changed since the last Appraisal in 2006 could be added.</p> <p>Recent buildings are mentioned. Which buildings are good examples may be subjective.</p> <p>Such a plan would not be readable at the scale necessary to fit within the appraisal document. If necessary, composite plans of adjoining streets can be put together for sites that straddle two or more streets plans.</p> <p>Strategic issues and threats Short commentary to be added</p>	<p>Add text to 4.4.2 “The Backs and the River Cam”. Based on: The landscape setting and historical / cultural significance of the river corridor is a vital part of Cambridge’s character.</p> <p>New 1.6: “Change since the last Appraisal in 2006”. Based on: Completion of the Grand Arcade and Bradwell’s Court; relocation of University Departments; expansion of Old Addenbrookes; conversion of city centre buildings (eg banks) to college accommodation; changes in retail and A.3 character.</p>
--	---	---	---

2016

	<p><i>or threats. The 2006 Appraisal's Chapter 4 was headed "Key management issues". Failure to consider strategic issues and threats is deeply concerning for a world famous heritage city such as Cambridge which has been under such tremendous development for the last ten years or so.</i></p> <p><i>Impact on the public realm: There is no mention of the impact of development on the public realm. e.g. Parker's Piece and Victoria Avenue.</i></p> <p><i>Lack of retail diversity: There is a clone town like lack of retail diversity in the city centre, and squeezing out of the small independent shops that once gave this beautiful city such an individual character. Many stakeholders who love and enjoy Cambridge would welcome the opportunity that an appraisal like this gives to identify and evaluate such issues and to engage all stakeholders in that evaluation and discussion, including the College landowner 'guardians' of the Core Area whose commercial policies many believe have had such a detrimental effect on its retail diversity.</i></p> <p><i>What were the successes or failures of the 2006 Appraisal? How effective has that Appraisal been at preserving or enhancing the Conservation Area over the last ten years? As a minimum, the Appraisal should include an assessment of what has changed since the 2006 versions, together with an analysis of the issues driving this change and a new management plan showing how the Council intends to tackle them</i></p> <p><i>Assess the impact of environmental capacity: There is no attempt to assess the impact of environmental capacity yet most people would say that this is one of the major concerns for this city which can often seem full to bursting. The Cambridge News now reports almost daily on issues of overcrowding on shared space: on the river, too many punt touts in the centre, too many bicycles and tourists crossing Garret Hostel Bridge, pressures of too many tourists and tourist buses, everyday conflicts between road users and pedestrians over space etc. The major problems of</i></p>	<p>after summary (new 1.6) of what has changed since the last Appraisal in 2006.</p> <p>Can be considered as part of a management Plan for the conservation area.</p> <p>Consider as part of above.</p> <p>A wide range of groups have been included in the consultation and have commented on the draft appraisal.</p> <p>It is proposed to prepare a Conservation Management Plan for the conservation area in order to address such matters.</p> <p>These are issues for possible consideration within a Conservation Management Plan. The Appraisal concerns the existing physical characteristics of the area.</p>	<p>After new 1.6 add: "Strategic issues and threats may arise from the impacts of development outside the historic core but still within the wider city; pressures from the greater Cambridge area; retail trends; housing pressure; or university or college needs. The Historic Core Appraisal is not intended to propose policy in respect of these. Rather, it is intended to that a Conservation Area Management Plan will be the opportunity to consider such issues and to propose measures to address them.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p><i>accommodating the traffic of a rapidly growing city are not even touched on.</i></p> <p><i>Trees: Green spaces are noted but there is no detailed consideration of trees, or a management strategy to replace over-mature or to use trees to deal with climate change and pollution. Yet most residents and city visitors love the trees and green spaces of this city. Other cities such as New York have policies in place to increase the number of city trees.</i></p> <p><i>Drainage: Green spaces and verges provide effective and attractive soakaway systems. Why no mention of this or of the excellent SUDS guidelines developed by Cambridge City Council for developers?</i></p> <p><i>The 2001 Open Space Conservation plans were developed as part of a planned and strategic approach that included the landscape Assessment, the Historic Core Appraisal and individual Conservation proposals in order to manage ‘enormous development pressure’ and ‘to guide the future of the city’. These plans need urgent review. Why is there no mention of that in this Appraisal?</i></p> <p><i>Bus Lanes: Why is there no integration of these documents with the plans for the City Deal which aims to build bus-lanes? These measures will increase the total number of buses in the city centre. Buses are a major source of exhaust emissions and atmospheric pollution. The increased numbers of buses are likely to impact on the structure of the city’s old buildings.</i></p> <p><i>Strategic Policy/Vision: Whilst we are wholly supportive of the revision of these documents, in our opinion the Historic Core Appraisal misses out on the opportunity to address the fundamental pressures that now threaten the city’s heritage. We appreciate that this may not be the main focus of the Appraisal, but in the absence of any meaningful strategic policy, it</i></p>	<p>Important trees and Tree Preservation Order blocks are noted. Beyond the remit of the appraisal there is a “Citywide Tree Strategy 2016-2026”.</p> <p>Not Appraisal matters. Local Plan policy 31 refers.</p> <p>The Appraisal does refer to the Conservation Plans.</p> <p>This is beyond the scope of the Appraisal but could be addressed within the Management Plan.</p> <p>The focus of the Appraisal is the physical surroundings. Strategic policy is provided by the Local Plan including its historic environment strategy (subject of</p>	<p>Refer to the Citywide Tree Strategy 2016-2026 in the natural environment section 4.5</p> <p>Add note to effect that the Open Space Conservation plans have not yet been reviewed.</p>
--	---	--	--

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<p><i>should provide a clear overview of the context in which it can be assessed. Certainly a Management Plan for the Historic Core Area is needed.</i></p> <p><i>Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations; a resident; Cambridge CPPF.</i></p>	<p>a Local Plan hearing session). As stated above, a Conservation Area Management Plan is also now intended for the historic core.</p>	
	<p><i>I too am concerned that the management issues previously part of the 2006 appraisal has not been included and updated in the new appraisal. Also that a number of the in depth conservation documents, such as for Parker's Piece (2001) have not been updated. They run the risk of becoming obscure and being ignored. I think it is important that these conservation reports should be kept updated regularly. (Resident)</i></p>	<p>Noted. The Open Space Conservation Plans were produced by the former Parks & Recreation Dept. Parks Department has recently begun compiling updated management plans for Christ Pieces and Jesus Green.</p>	
	<p><i>1. 'Key Views'. We cannot find within the document a definition of 'Key views'. It is therefore not clear whether the key views are of historic significance and what that significance is. There is no reference within this section providing details of the key views set out within the associated plan. We do not consider that there should be key views within the Grand Arcade Shopping Centre given it forms part of the commercial architecture and is a modern development. To identify them as key views is misleading within the context of a historic core appraisal, especially without any explanation as to what defines them as key views, Further explanation is required if these are to be retained in the appraisal.</i></p> <p><i>2. Redevelopment Opportunities. The redevelopment opportunities should be aligned with the Local Plan. In addition, the document should not preclude opportunities to enhance these assets.</i></p> <p><i>In the same vein, references to changes of use should be aligned to development management policies within the Development Plan and cognisant of permitted development rights. This is particularly key for</i></p>	<p>Key views and poor views are actually still shown on the street analysis plans.</p> <p>Area-wide views, were not identified in the 2006 Appraisal but are now within the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Local Plan policies including about: Areas Of Major Change; Responding to Context; and Tall Buildings are intended to guide developers as to where and what they can build.</p>	

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<p><i>assets that are not listed, are positive contributors and are of low significance. There needs to be clearer distinction within the document as to which assets the text is applicable to and the rationale behind statement rather than being so general. (DeLoitte LLP)</i></p>		
	<p><i>Whilst the College supports the aim to provide greater guidance within the historic core it feels that the approach adopted places too great an emphasis on preventing change rather than managing it. The College believes that its record of stewardship of its historic estate in the City – much Listed at Grade I –speaks for itself. Those buildings have, however, evolved over centuries and remain working buildings in which the College must continue its activities of education and research and provide accommodation. This requires that they remain fit for purpose now and in future, and can evolve to meet those needs whilst remaining sensitive to their historic character. Similar considerations apply across much of the historic City Centre. If such carefully managed evolution is not achieved, the essential character of the City – which is what the Core Appraisal is seeking to protect - will change. (Beacon Planning on behalf of Trinity College)</i></p>	<p>No such emphasis on preventing change is recognised. That buildings are enabled to evolve is evidenced by the many consents granted for alterations and by the lack of college buildings falling out of use.</p>	
	<p><i>My opinion is that Midsummer Common and the view from Elizabeth Way bridge should be included in the consultation. Midsummer Common plays a central part in the life of the city and it seems irrational to exclude it from the appraisal. The city would be greatly improved if the bridge were closed to cars. This would allow the view to be put to use. There are many ways that the view could be exploited to the city's advantage. By ignoring this gem the city is missing a trick. By reducing traffic on Elizabeth Way the amenity of Midsummer Common would also be greatly improved, as would that of the Riverside area. (Resident)</i></p>	<p>This falls within the Riverside & Stourbridge Common Conservation Area Appraisal area. Traffic issues may though, be addressed in related strategies.</p>	
	<p><i>Whilst the college supports the aim to provide greater guidance within the historic core, it feels that the approach adopted is largely predicated on preventing change rather than managing it (Beacon Planning on behalf of Magdalene College, Trinity, St John's, Downing College and Christ's</i></p>	<p>We recognise no such emphasis on preventing change (see response to Beacon on page 14). Assessment of change is founded on national and local</p>	

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<i>Colleges)</i>	policy.	
	<p><i>The Historic core in the 21st Century should now include "New Museums site" a show case of "20th Century buildings" of different sizes relevant to British Science & the First and Second world war e.g. Mond building, Arup Building, Sir John Cockcroft lecture theatre (Nobel Prize) and many others. This Historically significant site is bordered by Bene't street and Pembroke street. This will be important for future generations</i></p> <p><i>These Historic sites are so important to Britain and its history, the council cannot just let the public decide or strange data analysis companies!. Cambridge is Unique and needs preserving everywhere.</i></p> <p><i>(Resident)</i></p>	<p>Most New Museums Site (NMS) buildings are covered in the street analyses bordering the site. The NMS SPD addresses the site as a whole.</p>	
	<p><i>The College feels that there are a number of significant issues raised by this document and a great number of mistakes and inaccuracies. It trusts that another draft of the document will be produced for consultation before it is approved.</i></p> <p><i>(Beacon Planning on behalf of Downing College)</i></p>	<p>It is intended that mistakes and inaccuracies are picked-up in the process of this single report back to the Portfolio Holder.</p>	
	<p><i>What constitutes a a key view, or a positive building or focal feature?</i></p> <p><i>Transparent Assessment – where decisions have been made to introduce a ‘designation’ to a building, space or structure, a clear justification should be articulated in the relevant section of the document , either within the supporting text for the street (in some instances this does occur, but not consistently) or within the notes section of the table of buildings. Where designations or narratives have changed between this appraisal and the 2006 Historic Core Appraisal (HCA), commentary should be provided on why the change has taken place, especially in instances where no material changes on the ground have taken place in the meantime (e.g. downgrading the significance of Fitzwilliam Street).</i></p>	<p>Key View: e.g. into or out of a street or to a feature.</p> <p>Positive Building: One that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>Focal Feature: A strong visual feature.</p>	<p>Add (see left) to text.</p>

	<p>3. The introduction of 'Positive Buildings' - The introduction of the 'Positive Buildings' designation, to sit alongside Buildings of Local Interests (BLIs), is a new feature of this updated document. While its introduction could be seen as a useful tool, the criteria for designation is not defined (see point 1 above), and the statement in the introduction (section 1.3.3) groups both 'positive buildings' and BLIs together as one, effectively giving them the same status (e.g. The demolition of such buildings, or their disfiguring alteration, is unlikely to be supported). Whilst there is a formal process that leads to the designation a BLI, including consultation with the landowner, no such transparent process has been provided for the allocation of the 'positive building' designation. This gives rise to a concern that such, otherwise undesignated, buildings could be considered under policy 4/12 of the current Development Plan (draft policy 62 in the new Local Plan).</p> <p>Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that 'When considering the designation of conservation areas, local planning authorities should ensure that an area justifies such status because of its special architectural or historic interest, and that the concept of conservation is not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest'. The same principles should apply here.</p> <p>On the basis of the above, the University objects to the provision of the 'positive buildings' designation being introduced into this document. If they are to be retained, we would expect a clear distinction to be established between 'positive buildings' and BLIs, to ensure that they are treated accordingly.</p> <p>4. Conflict with adopted SPD(s) and up to date planning decisions - While the appraisal concentrates on the historic core, it will become one of a suite of documents used to inform development control decisions. Where documents have been through due process and have been adopted (for example the Old Press Mill Lane (OPML) SPD) the two documents should be consistent when read together.</p> <p>There are instances where the HCA does not use, or does not appear to have been informed by, a more detailed historic appraisal. Some documents, such as the New Museum Site Draft SPD, have not been used as a reference tool or even mentioned. There is concern that, by not being consistent with other documents, the HCA has the potential to jeopardise the comprehensive master planning of sites (see also point 5 below) and also confuse/over-complicate the decision making process.</p> <p>Where planning decisions have been made and are in the process of being implemented, up to date information should be incorporated in the appraisal. Examples within the document when the assessment is out of date, are Fen Causeway and Tennis Court Road, where structures are cited and assessed in the appraisal, and given a certain degree of weight with regard to the character of the area, but no longer exist in their current form in reality.</p>	<p>"Positive buildings make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area, and therefore merit consideration in accordance with clause 72 of the 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act. Some buildings have also been identified as Buildings of Local Interest in their own right and may be considered as undesignated heritage assets in accordance with paragraph 135 of the NPPF."</p> <p>"Positive Unlisted Buildings" or "Buildings Important to the Character" have long been identified within the Council's other Conservation Area Appraisals (e.g. West Cambridge CAA; Castle & Victoria CAA etc.). Best practice supports identifying positive elements in conservation area appraisals. This helps guide formulation of development proposals.</p>	<p>Add (left) to Paragraph 1.3.3</p>
--	---	--	--------------------------------------

	<p>5. Street Frontage Focussed – <i>The majority of the assessments are street frontage focussed. This decision presents an issue when some of the interior spaces and buildings within the sites are as important to the character of the Conservation Area as the frontage. For example, the New Museums site fringes are described in the text for the adjoining streets, but there is no commentary regarding the site itself and the Masterplan/SPD. In some instances, the street narratives have failed to identify and discuss the opportunities to improve the Conservation Area due to the lack of a broader appraisal.</i></p> <p><i>(Cambridge University)</i></p>	<p>A consequence of the basis of the original appraisal.</p>	<p>Add reference to approved New Museum Site applications and development. Also, refs to emerging proposals for Mill Lane and Downing sites</p>
	<p><i>Cambridge is undergoing incredibly fast changes these last few years and this is a development to continue for another decade or more. Though growth is to be welcomed, at present growth is red-hot and soon unsustainable leaving our once fine city abandoned and areas derelict at its fringes and houses, built or half-built, discarded. Planners and bad architects destroy this jewel. The city urgently needs a Historic Environment Strategy to protect what will otherwise be destroyed by developers. It needs to re-apply for World Heritage Status, soon. (Resident)</i></p>	<p>The Local Plan includes a strategy.</p> <p>World Heritage Status is outside the scope of the appraisal.</p>	
<p>2. Understanding the City</p>	<p><i>Chapter 2 covering the city’s history and setting is sound. (Cambridge PPF)</i></p> <p><i>1. Don’t agree with the assessment as ‘the grounds of a large Country House’.</i> <i>Suggest delete reference and add a comment about the City’s own asset-Queen’s Green.</i> <i>The Backs are without a doubt Cambridge’s most famous landscaped area. The character is defined by wonderful trees, fine vistas and the presence of the river. The interplay of grand college buildings and verdant landscape is perhaps the most enduring image of central Cambridge. Queen’s Green, a remnant of old Common land, provides an understated contrast to the</i></p>	<p>But many of the components (e.g. bridges, park, vista) are similar.</p> <p>Agreed re adding ref to Queen’s Green.</p>	<p>Add to 2.1.4 : Queen’s Green, a remnant of old Common land, provides an understated contrast to the formal avenues.</p>

	<p><i>formal avenues. ? *****</i></p> <p><i>2. Update the river crossings.</i></p> <p><i>Alert to a risk register if there is one. Action needed in management plan.</i></p> <p><i>Footfall needs measuring. Better controls on large buses and the dreadful blunderbuss - the 'official Stage coach tourist buses.</i></p> <p><i>The river crossings are key nodes and under pressure from residential, student and visitor growth. Garret Hostel, Magdalene and Silver Street bridges are still gateways to the historic core and transition points in between the peace of the green spaces and the activity of the town. In summer the routes are popular with tourists attracted to the punt stations, cafes and bars. Garrett Hostel lane in particular suffers from overcrowding - due to the increase in footfall from the development of West Cambridge and Tourist coach parking on the Backs.</i></p> <p><i>At peak times the thoroughfares have reached full capacity for comfortable access by foot or cycling and pose a danger. Silver Street and Bridge Street are further exasperated by local and tourist buses unsuitable for the medieval street scale. Illegal Punt touts need addressing.</i></p> <p><i>(Resident)</i></p>	<p>Outside the scope of this document.</p> <p>Refers to 2.3.3</p>	<p>For consideration in a Management Plan</p>
<p>3. Street-by-Street Analysis</p>	<p><i>Annex 1:</i></p> <p><i>The Street descriptions are, with some notable exceptions, improved in relation to the historic aspects. We consider the current version gives less emphasis to the streetscape issues and enhancement than the 2006 version did and that the street descriptions are not nearly as successful. Examples of this include:</i></p> <p><i>1)Views, where identified, are not distinguished as "positive" or "negative"</i></p> <p><i>2) The maps no longer identify areas of poor floorscape or other poor features, although the text of many of the street descriptions notes under "streetscape enhancement" include areas of poor floorscape identified in 2006 which are still extant. This applies to Bene't St, Botolph Lane, Emmanuel Rd / Short St, Fitzwilliam St, Free School Lane, Garret Hostel Lane, Granta Place, Guildhall St, Laundress lane, Lensfield Rd, Little St Mary's Lane, Lower Park St, Malcolm St, Manor St, New Park St, Park</i></p>	<p>A separate Conservation Area Management Plan is now proposed.</p> <p>"Negative views" to be introduced to map key boxes.</p>	

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<p><i>Terrace, Parker St, Parkside, Pembroke St, Portugal Place, Portugal St, Regent St, Regent Terrace, Silver St, Tennis Court Rd, and Trinity Lane. Our comments on the street descriptions highlight the ever-increasing pressures on the fabric of a market town which has become a city, notably in terms of physical capacity of streets and spaces to accommodate the number of people, cycles, and vehicles. The damaging ad-hoc intrusion of bus “facilities” is a repeated issue, as is the damaging pressure on public space exemplified by the intrusive cycle parking taking over newly-created public space on Peas Hill.</i></p> <p><i>(Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>Accommodation of e.g. bus and cycle facilities may be addressed in the proposed Management Plan or Spaces & Movement Strategy.</p>	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Paragraph 2.5.19 - Modern University Buildings - this paragraph needs revisiting. Phrases such as “dotted around the University’s sites” and “often designed by known architects” (renowned?) appear too loosely worded for a formal document. 2. The document states that the University Centre could be considered uncompromising, whereas comments within the listing (which has occurred between appraisals) mention that it ‘combines a thoughtful, compact plan with a sophisticated exterior treatment and design’. The HCA should acknowledge this. 3. Para 2.5.20- University Laboratories - the comment that these types of buildings are marred by ad-hoc additions (air conditioning ducts, safety access features, etc.) should really be qualified by the fact that these additions are reflective of a working University and are needed to enable the use to fully function and the Departments to operate. <p><i>(Cambridge University)</i></p>	<p>Agreed (though refers to 2006 version text not to new text).</p> <p>As the UC is now Listed, some acknowledgement is appropriate.</p> <p>Again, this refers to 2006 version text not to new text.</p>	<p>Amend 2.5.19: “ ...are also found on the University’s sites and are often by renowned architects.”</p> <p>Amend to The University Centre, which is the catering and social centre for graduate members of the University, has been listed for its particular qualities.”</p> <p>Amend 2.5.20 to:”... and are often marred by the ad-hoc additions (air conditioning ducts, safety/access features, etc.) required for the functioning of the developing Departments concerned.”.</p>

2016

	<p><i>Add Bridges as new criteria. Define their look, date character. Major part of Approach to core area. Develop the connection to the main arterial roads. Reassess Hierarchy of the Approach roads and Ring Road.</i></p> <p><i>Guidance documents now refer to: 'All thoroughfares within urban settings and rural boundaries should normally be treated as streets. Reference should no longer be made to road hierarchies on terminology such as local distributor/local access roads.'</i></p> <p><i>The Ring Road. Should that still be considered the Boundary of the Historic Core? The appraisal does cover roads (Northampton street for example) but how does it connect to the defining character of all the approach roads and the setting of the City. (Suburbs and approach roads studies). With the threat of City Deal and disregard to the suburbs treating them as transport corridors- can they get better protection from the threat of empty bus lanes, trams or worse? Who is writing the Cambridge Access study? Is this historical relationship understood?</i></p> <p><i>The Bridge Street bollards and cycle lanes- are grim and no longer fit for purpose. Bikes with baskets and trailers etc.</i></p> <p><i>Add Peas Hill and could refer somewhere to the impact of new cycling racking. Risk of poor design and taking up pavements space.</i></p> <p><i>[Peas Hill- in my view looks poorly treated, ugly block of cycle racks, and a bench with bin dumped together]</i></p> <p><i>2.6.6 - Update with better critical analysis. Pros & Cons.</i></p> <p><i>St Andrew's Street and Sidney Street are also reasonably wide in places. The former is wider in some places due to a mercifully never-realised road-widening scheme. Other areas of 'space' in the city include Quayside and Fisher Square – the latter which was successfully improved in 2007, from being a forlorn space into paved area enhanced with a sculpture by Peter Randall-Page. Between the lines. 2007.</i></p> <p><i>[Sculpture underappreciated. - Note case history of another dept. in Council making it a no smoking area and painting yellow lines around it]!</i></p>	<p>Bridges referred to within street analyses. A reassessment of road hierarchy is not within the scope of the Appraisal.</p> <p>Noted. local distributor/local access roads is not terminology used.</p> <p>The boundary of the Historic Core is appropriate in terms of encompassing the most important area of historic interest. Relationship with City Deal and Access Study is for the Spaces & Movement Strategy.</p> <p>2.6.6 – Update.</p>	<p>2.6.6- Amend to: "St Andrew's Street and Sidney Street are also reasonably wide in places. The former is wider in some places due to a mercifully never-realised road-widening scheme. Other areas of 'space' in the city include Quayside and Fisher Square – the latter which was successfully improved in 2007, from being a forlorn space into paved area</p>
--	---	---	--

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<p><i>The construction of the Grand Arcade [date] creates a large area of covered Mall-style shops that have created a new urban ‘covered’ streetscape. Although popular with leisure shoppers – some residents find the marbled interior shopping block, out of character to central Cambridge texture, street grain and scale.</i> (Resident)</p>		<p>enhanced with a sculpture by Peter Randall-Page, “Between the lines” 2007. The construction of the Grand Arcade c. 2007 created a large retail mall - with a new, urban, ‘covered’ streetscape. Popular with leisure shoppers – some residents find the marbled interior shopping block, out of character to central Cambridge texture, street grain and scale.”</p>
	<p><i>Whilst some of the Street-by-Street descriptions are an improvement on the 2006 Historic Core Assessment and this is to be applauded, there is no attempt to assess the positive or negative aspects of the changes, there is nothing on achievements and failures. There are factual and typographical inaccuracies and surprising omissions.</i></p> <p><i>Downgrades/Upgrades: again the reasoning is not explained. For example Fitzwilliam Street is downgraded from High to Significant, and the same with Park Parade.</i> (Resident & FeCra)</p>	<p>See Fitzwilliam St below.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Saints Passage 	<p><i>“It is Y-plan with one arm focusses on St John’s College gate and the other on Trinity College Chapel.” Should be “focussed” not “focusses”. I think the craft fair use of the garden is more than occasional these days. The archaeological section omits mention of the burial ground found during the Divinity School development. I’m slightly surprised to see no mention of the Doctors’ surgery (used by me and my family), formerly occupied by U3A that I presume must be number 2, a prominent corner building with large windows facing onto the passage.</i> (Resident)</p>	<p>The Doctors’ surgery (No.2) is referred to in the table.</p>	<p>Change “focusses” to “focussed”. Address archaeology.</p>

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benet Street (open space) 	<p><i>The Arts School was the "Scientific Periodical library" for over 200 years in close proximity to the historic Cavendish Laboratory. We do not know who changed the name of a grade 2 listed building 18 months ago? This is a Historic area.</i></p> <p><i>This is in close proximity approx. 25m to the 1000 year old church (Bene't street)/Corpus Christie. The council should not encourage a large flow and concentration of people & bikes/sheds next to a large group of Grade 1 listed buildings in an area of high significance. This is not the correct place for a student service centre.</i></p> <p><i>I object to "Historic Buildings" name changes by the University or Council as the building will lose its Historic significance e.g. change of name of Historic Bene't street Science library to Arts Library "Near Bene't street open space". Changing names can have political or religious significance distorting the fact of British history.</i></p> <p><i>(Resident)</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Relates to New Museums Site SPD.</p>	<p>Add to table: The Arts School formerly housed the "Scientific Periodical library".</p>
	<p><i>Arts School courtyard text under 'Open Space' heading – narrative includes no reference to the emerging NMS SPD, with its aspirations to create a new public site entrance through this space with upgraded open space. Also no reference to the consented planning and listed building applications which provided detailed designs to develop the NMS SPD aspiration.</i></p> <p><i>(Cambridge University)</i></p>	<p>Reference to the consented applications can be made but detail of the site is for the NMS SPD.</p>	<p>Add: Recent consents granted for the NMS entail an improved setting for the Arts School building."</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benet Street 	<p><i>There is a red arrow annotated on map facing into Bene't Yard, but no reference in the map key (true of all keys within this document). It is assumed that this should be labelled 'Negative View' or similar ('a negative view' is used in the New Museums Site SPD).</i></p> <p><i>The table notes regarding the Arts School should include commentary regarding the current planning status (approved refs. 15/0777/FUL & 15/0779/LBC)</i></p>	<p>"Negative view" to be added to map keys.</p>	<p>Incorporate approved application reference numbers in the table.</p>

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<i>(Cambridge University)</i>		
• Botolph Lane	<i>The lane description as “an informal terrace white painted houses and cottages, which now provide a mixture of domestic accommodation and small shops and cafes” is now a bit misleading. There are just the two shops now, one of which houses a café, with the housing wholly institutionalised, mostly by the owning colleges. (Resident)</i>	Agreed. Change text.	Amend to: “formerly providing a mixturenow reduced to a single shop and a café and college rooms.”
	<i>It is noted that the Corpus Christi Master’s Garden is now identified as positive green space, despite not having been identified in 2006 and with no obvious visual relationship with the street. Similarly, an area of the Corpus Christi site is now noted as an area of historic paving, despite no narrative in the document to explain why. (Cambridge University)</i>	The text does refer to the trees and “roof of greenery” in the open space. No historic paving is shown.	No action taken
• Bridge Street	<i>(South of the junction with St John’s St) This area gets very high levels of foot traffic, with many tourists using it as a route from the river to the market square area. The footpaths on this particular stretch are simply not up to the level of use which is asked of it. I would suggest extending the pedestrian-only feel of Sidney Street all the way to the Round Church, and routing buses along Park Street and Round Church Street. (Resident)</i>	That the street here is busy for pedestrians, cycles and buses is acknowledged in the text. The suggestion for re-routing buses may be a matter for associated strategies.	No action taken
	<i>The gap between nos. 33 – 34 Bridge Street is identified as a ‘key view’. This glimpse down an alleyway is often blocked by parked vehicles and the view is closed by a building not identified as positive. How can this possibly be a key view? Similarly the even narrower passing glimpse down the alley between nos. 36 – 37 is not a view fundamental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The same applies to the gated gap between Nos.67 & 68 Bridge Street. The pavement on both sides of Bridge Street has been identified as ‘historic</i>	These glimpsed views represent the intermittent gaps created by entry-points as noted in the text and are an important element in the street. This is intended to indicate good	No action taken Map key has been changed

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<p><i>paving'. This was laid in the early 2000s and, although attractive, is of no historic interest.</i></p> <p><i>The green spaces fronting Bridge Street and to the east of the Master's Lodge have been identified as 'positive green spaces', however these are small areas which are not considered to be significant because of their scale, particularly those around the Forecourt parking area, which is essentially landscaping around the parking area. A focal feature has been identified on the eastern elevation of the south wing of the North Court along Bridge Street. It is not clear what this focal feature relates to, but it is assumed this is intended to mark the stone engraving on the side of the building which is not considered to be a focal point just a detail of the building.</i></p> <p><i>The trees to the east of the forecourt along Bridge Street have been identified as 'important trees', however there is no justification for this as they are immature and unremarkable trees. (Beacon Planning on behalf of Trinity College)</i></p>	<p>quality pavement (not necessarily historic).</p> <p>Though small, these green spaces are notable elements in a streetscene where most elements are of modest size.</p> <p>The trees add soft landscaping to a built up area</p>	<p>to 'Quality Paving' rather than 'Historic Paving'</p> <p>No action taken</p> <p>No action taken</p>
	<p><i>"C18 town houses in brick C19 commercial buildings are interspersed with the older buildings". That doesn't make sense. Should it be "and instead of "in"? The reference to "University Union" on page 4 should correctly be a reference to the "Cambridge Union Society" (of which I am a member). Strictly speaking it is independent of the University. (Resident)</i></p>	<p>Agreed. Amend</p>	<p>Amend to: "C18 town houses and brick C19 commercial buildings..." Amend "University Union" to "Cambridge Union Society"</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chestert on Lane 	<p><i>On Chesterton Lane, again there is no explanation as to what is important about the view eastwards or the view which passes over the roof of the Master's Lodge) What is historic about the paving on the corner of Chesterton Lane / Magdalene Street (shown only on the Chesterton Lane plan)? (Beacon Planning on behalf of Magdalene College)</i></p>	<p>The explanation is in the "Townscape Elements" text.</p> <p>The map key has been changed to reflect quality paving rather than just historic</p>	<p>No action taken</p> <p>Map key has been changed to 'Quality Paving' rather than 'Historic Paving'</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chestert on Road 	<p><i>In the absence of any criteria being produced, the College object to the inclusion of Benson Hall (Magdalene Street) and The Cripps Court Buildings as 'positive buildings'. Note also that the latter are not coloured on the map. (Beacon Planning on behalf of Magdalene College)</i></p>	<p>The frontage building at Cripps Court is coloured on the map. For Benson Hall see Magdalene St.</p>	<p>No action taken</p>

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<i>On Chesterton Road, the College object to the suggestion that all the properties at the western end of Chesterton Road are positive buildings. Whilst the identification of the homogenous blocks such as that including the Arundel House Hotel is more understandable (though made more difficult by the lack of any criteria for judging them) the lower numbers at the western end are much more varied and a number unremarkable. (Beacon Planning on behalf of Trinity College)</i>	These buildings are considered to contribute positively to the streetscene even if they are not remarkable as individual buildings.	No action taken
• Christ's Lane	<i>The newly reopened Christ's Lane is not described. (Cambridge PPF)</i>		To be added
• Christ's Pieces	<i>I take some exception to the emphasis on the CPs area as a 'walk-through' and do not believe that the recreational use of the park has declined. " ... the space was laid out as a park for local people with appropriate recreational facilities. These uses, although still important, have somewhat declined in recent years and today it is better known as an important pedestrian thoroughfare, linking the city centre with the Grafton Shopping Centre. ... Christ's Pieces is an important route for pedestrians heading between the Grafton Shopping Centre and the city centre,.. (Resident)</i>	See responses to the Christ's Pieces Residents Association below	See responses to the Christ's Pieces Residents Association below
	<i>The Christ's Pieces description references to the Christ's Pieces Conservation Plan, but this is not available on the web. There is also no reference to the recurring very contentious threats to encroach on the space to improve the bus station.</i>	It is confirmed that this document is not available online. The document deals with the conservation area as it currently is. Any proposals for development will take into account the character and appearance of the area as described within the appraisal.	Consider putting the document online No action taken
	<i>This paragraph wrongly refers to Willow Walk: "The area of Willow Walk, on the northern edge of the park is marred by the untidy storage areas and wheelie bins of restaurants and the Champion of the Thames public house. Use of the triangular space behind the Champion of the Thames for car parking has a negative impact on the</i>	The Willow Walk reference is not correct as it appears that the footpath to the north of Christ's Pieces does not have a name.	The path is referred to as the 'footpath on the northern edge of the park' rather than Willow Walk in the revised document.

2016

	<p><i>character of the northern end of Milton Walk as an entrance to the park". I think the path along the rear of that part of King Street is in fact Milton's Walk and the pub references are meant to include the King Street Run. I just don't understand what the second sentence is about. There is no space used for car parking behind either pub. I agree that the whole area is marred by bins, however.(Resident)</i></p>	<p>There is occasional vehicle parking, but this is by the city council maintenance shed. The references to the pub parking will be removed.</p>	<p>The reference to the use of the triangular space for parking behind the Champion of the Thames has been removed.</p>
	<p><i>Could we ask your committee to include the following in the introductory paragraph: 'Christ's Pieces has always been a recreational area since it was given to the town 150 years ago, and that now it is also important as a pedestrian route between the city and the Grafton Centre'.</i></p> <p><i>Townscape Elements: Create an additional entrance to Christ's Pieces by the Bowling Green. This is a very busy part of Emmanuel Rd; with the Guided Bus, park and ride buses, long distance buses, ordinary town buses, a plethora of taxis, emergency traffic, and the Ballet School. We assume if you make another opening it would entail another pedestrian crossing. There would not be enough space between the two crossings to allow the traffic to move safely. The area around the Bowling Green is a well-designed section of the park with 2 park benches positioned in such a way as to catch the morning sun, and overlooking the flowerbeds. Any new path would spoil the design, and the benches would have to be rearranged to allow space for the path. It would be quite costly, and as we already have an opening at Drummer St and another at the traffic lights on Emmanuel Rd, it would seem quite unnecessary.</i></p>	<p>This has been added to the introduction.</p> <p>This comment is in the analysis of Emmanuel Road/Short Street.</p>	<p>The introduction has been altered to read: Christ's Pieces has always been a recreational area since it was given to the town 150 years ago, and now it is also important as a pedestrian route between the city and the Grafton Centre</p> <p>Please see Emmanuel Road/Short Street</p>

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<i>(Christ's Pieces RA)</i>		
	<i>Page 3 (under opportunities)..... possible redevelopment of the bus station should contribute positively to the character of the space. Our Committee isn't aware of any plans for the redevelopment of the bus station, and feel this must refer to an earlier appraisal, we would suggest the sentence be removed from the revised plan. (Christ's Pieces RA)</i>	This comment has been brought through from the 2006 appraisal which also discussed the redevelopment of Bradwell's Court which has since gone. The reference to the possible redevelopment of the bus station will be removed as it is not a current proposal.	Under Opportunities, 'and possible redevelopment of the bus station should contribute positively to the character of the space' has been removed
• Coe Fen/Sheep's Green	<i>The Coe Fen and Sheep's Green description completely omits very significant views into the historic core from Coe Fen and the riverside path. Kings College Chapel, the Pitt Building and the Emmanuel Church Tower are also not mentioned as skyline landmarks, nor is the white-painted riverside former warehouse noted as a focal point. The consideration of veteran trees has also been omitted. (Cambridge PPF)</i>	The map indicates key views across the space both into Coe Fen/Sheep's Green and from here towards the city centre. However more long range views will be added. The former warehouse is a Building of Local Interest and is depicted as such on the map. The text does discuss the trees in the area and their management under Landscape Enhancement	Key views to be added to the map No action taken No action taken
	<i>Key views from the riverside path are not mentioned, of King's College Chapel, the Pitt Building and Emmanuel Church as important skyline to be retained.(Resident & FeCra)</i>	The map indicates key views across the space both into Coe Fen/Sheep's Green and from here towards the city centre. However more long range key views have been added to the map	Key views to be added

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<p>1. <i>The non-paved paths across the Fen, created from people following their desire lines when walking across the Fen are becoming increasingly worn. In the past they would recover in the summer after being worn down in the winter. However with the increase of pedestrian traffic across the Fen, they are not recovering during the summers. I'm not sure what should be done about this but I believe it should be noted in the appraisal.</i></p> <p>2. <i>The new Whittle Building at Peterhouse College detracts significantly from the historic long boundary wall of Peterhouse College. In particular the various utility pipework and air conditioning ductwork, that are below the first floor of the building but visible from the Fen through the arches on the Fen side of the building, are lit up by fluorescent lighting at night and are a visual horror. (Resident)</i></p>	<p>1. This may be considered in a management plan.</p> <p>2. This building was subject to planning legislation and approval during the planning process.</p>	<p>No action taken in this document</p> <p>No action taken</p>
	<p><i>Consideration might be given to identifying the Garden House Hotel as a poor quality feature in the conservation area. (Historic England)</i></p>	<p>This building had planning approval. The document does not highlight negative buildings.</p>	<p>No action taken</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corn Exchange Street 	<p><i>The report does not highlight the unsightly bins to the side of Lola Los nightclub which could also be discretely housed to the benefit of the area. (Cambridge Live)</i></p>	<p>Comment added to the reference to the rear of nos. 6-7 Corn Exchange Street</p>	<p>Text added to Gap Site paragraph: 'due to the large capacity bins being stored in this location.'</p>
	<p><i>We question whether Fisher Square (under Corn Exchange St) can be described as an area of historic paving. (Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>The key for all of the maps has been changed to 'Quality Paving'.</p>	<p>Key changed for all maps</p>
	<p><i>"The corner of the street with Wheeler Street is formed by the ornate frontages of the Red Cow Public House, a late C19 public house built with elaborate detailing, including an eye-catching corner turret." The pub became the "Cow" some years ago and is no longer a pub but only a restaurant. Perhaps it would be best to call it "the former Red Cow Public House"? This applies to the parts referring to Guildhall Street too. The hotel is no longer called the Crowne Plaza either, but the Cambridge City Hotel (also applies to Downing Street) and the Arup Building has also changed its name, I think to the Attenborough Building. The photograph captioned "Street views of the Grand Arcade" is in fact</i></p>	<p>The reference to the Red Cow is now the former Red Cow. The name of the hotel has been changed to the Hilton. The Arup building references have been changed to the David Attenborough Building.</p> <p>The caption for this photograph</p>	<p>References to the Red Cow Public House have been changed to 'the former Red Cow Public House'. The references to the Arup Building have been changed to 'the David Attenborough Building (formerly the Arup Building)'.</p> <p>When the photographs and</p>

	<p><i>almost entirely a view of the side of the hotel and not of Grand Arcade. (Resident)</i></p>	<p>will be changed</p>	<p>final document are compiled, the caption will be changed to the Hilton Hotel</p>
	<p>1. <i>There is no reference to NMS SPD.</i></p> <p>2. <i>Reference to the Arup Building are out of date – should be updated to refer to the David Attenborough Building (DAB)</i></p> <p>3. <i>Unclear whether references to the assessment of the impact of the DAB are based on its current or previous form. For example, use of materials and edge treatment has changed the street interface.</i></p>	<p>When this document was reviewed, the New Museums Site SPD had not been drafted. The document looks at the buildings and landscape on the street frontages and how they add to the character and appearance of the city centre. The SPD is a set of objectives whereas the appraisal is what is there now.</p> <p>The name will be changed</p> <p>The refurbishment of the David Attenborough Building has now been completed and the alterations have 'lifted' the character of the street. The reference to the 'drab and incongruous dark red brick' are no longer as relevant.</p>	<p>No action taken</p> <p>References to the Arup Building have been changed to 'the David Attenborough Building (formerly the Arup Building)'.</p> <p>The paragraph under Townscape Elements starting 'Negative features' etc. has been changed to 'the confined, urban character of the highways environment and modern street surface is a negative feature. The single tree and lack of greenery in the street scene is relatively unusual in central Cambridge'.</p>

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<p>4. <i>The map identifies the DAB as a positive building/structure, yet this change of status (not previously identified in 2006) is not explained explicitly – is this a product of the refurbishment? If so, what about it has driven the improvement? This appears at odds with the current text, which identifies negative elements under the ‘Townscape Elements’ section.</i></p> <p>5. <i>Dates in the table reference to the DAB should be updated – improvements continued 2013-2016. Official reopening 2016.</i></p>	<p>See comment above</p> <p>Dates in the table reflected the situation when the document was drafted. The refurbishment date will be updated.</p>	<p>See comment above</p> <p>Date of refurbishment works has been changed from 2013 to 2013-2016</p>
•	<p><i>Consideration might be given to identifying the Hilton Hotel on Downing Street as a poor quality feature in the conservation area. (Historic England)</i></p>	<p>This building had planning approval. The document does not highlight negative buildings.</p>	<p>No action taken</p>
• Drummer Street & Christ's Lane	<p><i>(Comment moved to Christ's Pieces)</i></p>		
	<p><i>Drummer Street is omitted from the 2016 draft and it is unclear why considering the 2006 Appraisal had significant comments about the bus station. (Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>Drummer Street has not been omitted. It is Drummer Street and Christ's Pieces</p>	<p>No action taken</p>
	<p><i>Again, a reference in the third General Overview paragraph to St Andrew's Road should be to St Andrew's Street. The comment about the coach stops is a bit of a pointless bleat unless a practical alternative location is suggested. (Resident)</i></p>	<p>The reference should be to St Andrews Street</p>	<p>Reference to St Andrew's Road has been changed to St Andrew's Street</p>

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Downing Place 	<p><i>The photo caption has Sedgwick misspelled. The building at the rear of Hobson House has the grander title of former Chief Constables House. Until 1964 the city had its own separate constabulary and Chief Constable. I don't think it's at number 7 either but next to the south of the entrance to the former police station yard and referred to as "Townhouse" in the document.</i></p> <p><i>"On the west side of the street the redundant lamppost standing adjacent to its replacement should be removed." Should this say "east side"?</i></p> <p><i>Without checking on site I can't be sure if this is still so but Google Street View confirms my recollection that there never were lampposts on the west side of Downing Place. (Resident)</i></p>	<p>The spelling mistake will be changed and the text updated to include the former Chief Constables house. According to our maps it is at No 7.</p> <p>This is a mistake and west will be changed to east.</p>	<p>Text amended to include former Chief Constable's house.</p> <p>Text amended.</p>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Tilley Lecture Theatre building and Physiology Building (Downing site) have now been identified as positive buildings/structures, despite no meaningful change to form in the intervening period since 2006. There is no narrative in the text to explain/justify this increase in status. The boundary to the western side of Downing Place was identified as a poor boundary in the 2006 appraisal, is now identified as a positive structure and a positive green space. There is no narrative in the text to explain/justify the increase/changed status. This is largely a uniform painted metal railing, of historic value. For both points it should be noted that this area of the site largely serves as an area of play for children with air handling units, ducts and risers attached to the façade of the building, offering a significant contribution to the street scene. <p>(Cambridge University)</p>	<p>In the 2006 appraisal, Positive Buildings were not identified. The Conservation expert who reviewed the appraisal identified the Tilley Lecture Theatre Building and Physiology Building as positive buildings.</p> <p>The metal railing provides a positive boundary to this space. However the depiction of green space is not correct as only the tree now sits in a small bed.</p>	<p>No action taken</p> <p>Reference to positive green space removed from map</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Downing Street 	<p><i>'The picture captioned 'The Sedgwick Museum' is the Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology; the photo captioned 'C20 McDonald Institute' is in fact the Department of Plant Sciences (formerly Botany). The Law School has not been located here for many decades. The 'main entrance' to the Sedgwick Museum is not from Downing Street but from the Downing site courtyard. The map has these details correctly named. The "imposing Neo-classical frontage" of the Crowne Plaza Hotel, (now City</i></p>	<p>These errors will be corrected. Reference to the "main entrance" will be changed to arched entrance.</p>	<p>Text amended to account for these changes.</p>

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<p><i>Hotel) is a disgraceful confection of plastic columns stuck onto a brick frontage.’ (Resident)</i> <i>The Sidgwick Site area would have been better for Bicycles and Sheds. It is better for people to walk around shops than go on bikes, can people walk into the town centre?. (Resident)</i></p>		<p>No action taken</p>
	<p><i>The Downing Street description includes a photo and description of the Arup Building, which is not within the street. The McDonald Institute caption may also be wrong.(Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>The view of the David Attenborough Building is taken from Downing Street</p>	<p>Caption amended Caption for McDonald Institute amended.</p>
	<p><i>The Crowne Plaza Hotel has been renamed as noted above. I believe it was actually built in the 1990s and opened as the Holiday Inn. The hotel name is correct in the Lion Yard & Grand Arcade section. The John Lewis store is on the corner with St Andrew’s Street, not St Andrew’s Road. My comments on the name of the Arup Building above also apply. I wonder what a “Highly vaired roofscape” might be? A “Highly varied roofscape” perhaps?(Resident)</i></p>	<p>The name change is noted This has been amended in the text. Vaired has been corrected to varied.</p>	<p>Text amended. Name changed Text amended</p>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General overview appears confused – it starts by describing the start as being at the bell Road, but almost immediately cites the ‘Humphrey Museum Building’ on the corner of Ct (Please note, that, to the best of our knowledge, the HMB is not a designation ever ascri this is part of the Department of Zoology, built originally for the Cambridge Medical Scho Schroeder Prior). 2. The second paragraph describes access to the courtyard to the rear via a low tunnel. On referring to the archway between the Zoology Building and 1907 Building, but this is less suggest that terminology is updated for consistency with other LPA documents, including Site SPD. Typically this feature is described as an archway elsewhere. 3. The references to the interior courtyard on the NMS do not appear to observe any of the recent alterations to the DAB, nor do they approach discussing/referencing the NMS SPD. Whilst we do not disagree that this area of open space is important, this needs to be defined in the context of 	<p>This has been noted and the text changed. Lack of clarity noted. Reference to the access and courtyard will be removed as the courtyard does not form part of the street scene. When this document was reviewed, the New Museums Site SPD had not been drafted. The document looks at the</p>	<p>Text amended. Text amended.</p>

	<p><i>the modified building, which dramatically alters the form & nature of this space.</i></p> <p><i>4. The grassed areas of the fringes of the Downing Site, on the southern side of Downing Street are noted as positive green space. Other than the limited visual amenity value, these areas are of a generally poor quality, difficult to maintain and offer no recreational value. The designation is not obviously justified in the document and should be reviewed. The exception to this is the large grassed area located within the main courtyard which does not have a functional recreational and amenity value, given its scale and overall relationship with adjoining buildings.</i></p> <p><i>5. The West Building and the laboratory block that forms the southern perimeter of the primary courtyard (Botany and Mineralogy), as the site is first experienced upon entering the Downing Site from Downing Street, has been identified as a positive building structure, despite not having been identified as such in the 2006 Appraisal. No narrative has been offered to justify this increase in status, nor have the buildings been subject to significant change in the intervening period such that would justify an enhanced designation.</i></p> <p><i>(Cambridge University)</i></p> <p><i>Consideration might be given to identifying the Hilton hotel on Downing Street as a poor quality feature in the conservation area.</i> <i>(Historic England)</i></p>	<p>buildings and landscape on the street frontages and how they add to the character and appearance of the city centre. The SPD is a set of objectives whereas the appraisal is what is there now.</p> <p>The text states that “the buildings on the South side are set back behind low walls with a narrow lawn in front, making the buildings more remote but complementing the grandeur of the Jacobean Revival architecture.” This point justifies the use of positive green space in the map.</p> <p>In the 2006 appraisal, Positive Buildings were not identified. The Conservation expert who reviewed the appraisal identified these as positive buildings.</p> <p>This building had planning approval. The document does not highlight negative buildings.</p>	<p>No action taken</p>
--	--	---	------------------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emmanuel Road 	<p><i>We would like to invite you to amend the description of Nos 4 and 14 Emmanuel Road. They were built at the same time as Charles Humphreys Clarendon House, the adjacent Mews, and Nos 5 and 13 Emmanuel Road, so around 1825. They are shown on the attached map of 1836, well before the other Victorian buildings in the area. Nos. 5 and 13 are at the two ends of the Mews block.</i></p> <p><i>Nos. 4 and 14 Emmanuel Road are shown on the 1836 map, not set back (like Nos. 5 and 13) but abutting "Miller's Lane" (later Emmanuel Road). There is a description of "the original octagonal pilasters" which flank carriage entrances to the Humphrey's estate, one of which is attached to No. 14 Emmanuel Road. A later wall has halved the width of the original carriage entrance. We think the date of these houses should be given as 1826-8.</i></p> <p><i>Further evidence of their belonging to the Humphreys estate is the fact that they are side-on to Emmanuel Road and, like the cottages in Orchard Street, both originally had their windows looking away from the estate. The bricked in windows can still be seen on their other side, and were replaced, evidently after the demise of Clarendon House, by windows on the present side, which look towards the mid-Victorian buildings between Earl and Victoria Streets. (Mr & Mrs Tait, residents)</i></p> <p><i>Townscape Elements:</i> <i>Create an additional entrance to Christ's Pieces by the Bowling Green. This is a very busy part of Emmanuel Rd; with the Guided Bus, park and ride buses, long distance buses, ordinary town buses, a plethora of taxis, emergency traffic, and the Ballet School. We assume if you make another opening it would entail another pedestrian crossing. There would not be enough space between the two crossings to allow the traffic to move safely.</i></p> <p><i>The area around the Bowling Green is a well-designed section of the park with 2 park benches positioned in such a way as to catch the morning sun, and overlooking the flowerbeds. Any new path would spoil the design, and</i></p>	<p>The reference to these buildings is within the table.</p> <p>This comment is not part of current proposals and will be removed.</p>	<p>Dates for nos. 4 and 14 Emmanuel Road have been changed to 1826-28 to tally with others of the Charles Humfrey estate</p> <p>Reference to the opening up of the railings on the southern end of the street will be removed.</p>
---	---	--	--

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<p><i>the benches would have to be rearranged to allow space for the path. It would be quite costly, and as we already have an opening at Drummer St and another at the traffic lights on Emmanuel Rd, it would seem quite unnecessary.</i> <i>(Christ's Pieces RA)</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fen Causeway 	<p><i>With regard to the Department of Engineering Building the University objects to the extent of the BLI status within the HCA.</i> <i>(Cambridge University)</i></p>	<p>This building was designated as a BLI prior to the review of the appraisal. This building has an interesting roof form, including a tall brick chimney, which are important to the character of the BLI. The area covered by the BLI polygon includes the saw tooth roof and the chimney and the other parts of the Engineering Works building</p>	<p>No action taken</p>
	<p><i>Consideration might be given to identifying the petrol station canopy as a poor quality feature in the conservation area.</i> <i>(Historic England)</i></p>	<p>The document does not highlight negative buildings/structures</p>	<p>No action taken</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fitzwilliam Street 	<p><i>The General Overview refers to "Tennis Court Lane" when "Tennis Court Road" is meant. Bridget's Hostel has been demolished. "The hostel closed in 2003 in consequence of moves towards the integrated housing of all students in College or University accommodation in the wake of Disability Discrimination Act and ongoing financial difficulties" (Resident)</i></p>	<p>The comments have been noted and actioned</p>	<p>Lane changed to Road and the reference to Bridget's hostel has been removed</p>

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<p>1. The street has been 'downgraded' from 'high significance' in 2006 to 'significant' in 2016, no analysis of this change is offered, this despite 13a (The Henry William Building) which is listed as a potential site for redevelopment in the 2006 HCA having been redeveloped in the intervening period 'in harmony with the street's earlier buildings.' (Cambridge University)</p>	<p>Will be changed back to High Significance as it meets the criteria due to the high number of historic buildings from the 19th century.</p>	<p>The significance of the street has been changed back to High</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Free School Lane 	<p>The surface of Free School Lane changes it is historic near the church and tarmac further down. The historic patina and paving should be repaired and not repaved. Barbed wire is a cheap effective way to protect corpus Christie. I cannot recall a master lodge on the lane? In general all surfaces to remain original cobbles and paving not to lose historic ambiance of Historic Centre. Repair to historic paving by experts rather than breaking up historic flag stones. I Object to breaking up of Cobbles or ancient flag stones only the careful repair or small drainage holes for surface water in all streets. (Resident)</p>	<p>Comments noted. The barbed wire is unsightly and its removal would be an enhancement of the character of the street. Corpus Christi's Master's Lodge is behind the high wall. This is shown on the plan. The preference is for the use of quality materials for street surfaces and their repair.</p>	<p>No action taken</p>
	<p>1. The Heycock lecture theatre on south-east corner of street has been allocated positive was not identified in the 2006 Appraisal and does not appear to be discussed in the text. This designation should be justified or deleted. 2. No references are made to the New Museums Site SPD aspirations/links, in terms of enhancements etc. This should be corrected. 3. The Mond building annexe is noted as a BLI, despite having been granted planning permission. The status allocation appears erroneous in that regard, given the assessment through which it resulted in the permission. We are also aware that the Council has received independent advice with this view. (Cambridge University)</p>	<p>1. In the 2006 appraisal, Positive Buildings were not identified. The Conservation expert who reviewed the appraisal identified the Heycock Lecture Theatre as a positive building as it was incorrectly not shown as a BLI in the 2006 document. 2. When this document was reviewed, the New Museums Site SPD had not been drafted. The document looks at the buildings and landscape on the street frontages and how they add to the character and appearance of the city centre. The SPD is a set of objectives</p>	<p>1. Map changed to show Heycock Lecture Theatre as a BLI as shown on the Pembroke Street map. 2. No action taken</p>

2016

		<p>whereas the appraisal is what is there now.</p> <p>3. When the appraisal was being reviewed, the Mond Annexe was still in place. Now that it has been demolished, it will be removed from our maps and the list of BLIs.</p>	<p>3. The Mond Annexe BLI polygon will be removed from the map</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Garret Hostel Lane 	<p><i>The Garret Hostel Lane description should include the Jerwood Library, Trinity Hall as a “positive building”. The conflicts on the bridge between tourists and increasing cycle traffic should be noted as well as the issue of the punting challenges.(Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>The Jerwood Library is already shown as a Positive Building and a Focal Feature on the map. Text added under Townscape Elements stating that it is a positive building in the streetscape.</p> <p>The issue with tourists and cycle traffic is seasonal. It is not considered necessary to add a comment to the document which is assessing the street’s overall character</p>	<p>The Jerwood Library building has been described as ‘a positive building in the streetscape’ under Townscape Elements</p> <p>No action taken</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Granta Place 	<p><i>The Ward Library is identified as a positive building on the plan, but with no status in the list. This building should not be considered as positive. (Note. This building is covered elsewhere in the Little St Mary’s Lane section also) (Cambridge University)</i></p>	<p>The Ward Library is in the table as ‘Peterhouse Library (part of)’. This will be changed to Ward Library. It is considered to be a positive building due to its materiality, its industrial character (which is part of the</p>	<p>The name of the library has been changed in the table.</p>

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

		character of the city in this location) and its connection to the listed part of the building	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Street 	<p><i>The Green Street description makes no mention of the white-painted window reveals, which make a very significant contribution to the rhythm and modelling of the facades. The "streetscape enhancement" section's reference to parked cars at the western end are baffling. (Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>Not all of the windows have white painted reveals and therefore this detail is not a dominant feature of the character of the street.</p> <p>Although mainly a retail street, there is some residential, mainly students, and this does lead to on street parking/loading. The wording has been changed to reflect the occasional rather than dominant nature of the parking.</p>	<p>No action taken</p> <p>Under General Overview, the last sentence has been changed to read 'There is occasional on street parking which detracts from the attractive quality of the street'. Under Streetscape Enhancement, the first sentence has been altered to read 'On street parking at the western end of the street can mar views and negatively affects the use of the street as a commercial area'.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guildhall Street 	<p><i>Despite the heading there is an erroneous reference to "Guildhall Passage" and also one to "Lions Yard". The Red Cow is referred to correctly as "former" here but only once. The architect of the Lion Yard is described as "Arup Associates". They were consultant architects but as I recall the bulk of the work was done by commercial architects (Fielden?). I served on the City Council's Central Developments Action Panel during the latter part of the building of Lion Yard and I remember there were some issues between the two sets of architects. Philip Dowson was involved on behalf of Arup's. I recall a principal contribution as being the slate roof. (Resident)</i></p>	<p>The reference to Guildhall Passage has been changed to Guildhall Place. Lions has been corrected to Lion.</p> <p>As Arup Associates were one of the architectural teams for the scheme, they will remain in the table. Should the name of the other company be found, they too will be added.</p>	<p>The text has been changed as per the comments made</p> <p>No action taken</p>
	<p><i>Strictly speaking the paving to Fisher Square is not Historic, though I would</i></p>	<p>The key for all of the maps has been changed to 'Quality</p>	<p>Key changed</p>

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<i>agree it is positive. (Historic England)</i>	Paving’.	
• Hobson Street	<i>In the absence of any criteria being produced, the College object to the inclusion of the building north of First Court lining Hobson Street as a ‘positive’ building. This is identified differently in the list of buildings – and the College would not necessarily agree that it is curtilage listed. (Beacon Planning on behalf of Christ’s College)</i>	This building is shown on historic maps prior to 1947 and is therefore considered to be curtilage listed to the college buildings. The materials, style and location of the outbuilding make it a positive contribution to the streetscene.	No action taken
	<i>The Hobson Street description has too many collegiate photos, whilst the mathematical tiles (best example in Cambridge) should be illustrated. “Pitching eye” needs further explanation. (Cambridge PPF)</i>	The photographs used give a flavour of the mixture of properties in the street, many of which are college buildings. It is felt that they give a good representation of what is in the street. The term ‘pitching eye’ has been replaced with ‘hayloft door’ which is more self-explanatory.	No action taken Text has been changed to read ‘and a hayloft door’ rather than ‘pitching eye’.
	<i>The introductory paragraph and General Overview refer to “King’s Street” an irksome and all too common error. There is also a reference to Hobson’s Street on page 4. Can authors of reports like this please be banned from using apostrophes without supervisory permission? Another one has crept into “Beaufort’s” in the St Andrew’s Street section. I’m not sure the phrase “Hobson’s Choice” was actually coined by Thomas Hobson. It would have been more likely coined by his customers, I would have thought. The Lloyd’s Bank building is actually an extended building as the table recognises. That might explain the contrasting building styles. (Resident)</i>	References to King’s Street are incorrect and have been altered to King Street. Comment regarding apostrophes has been noted. The sentence regarding Hobson’s Choice has been re-worded.	Text changed as per comments made ‘Named after the Cambridge carrier Thomas Hobson, who coined the phrase ‘Hobson’s Choice’ has been changed to read ‘who inspired the phrase’.

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jesus Green 	<p><i>The Jesus Green description makes no mention of development issues. The view of the west side of the Green should include the Thompson's Lane Hotel as well as St John's College Chapel. (Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>It is agreed that references should be made to some of the less celebrated buildings that can be seen from this important open space.</p>	<p>Text added regarding the Varsity Hotel in Thompson's Lane and Henry Giles House in Chesterton Road</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jesus Lane 	<p><i>The traffic lights at the junctions with Park Street and Malcolm Street seem entirely redundant, throw-backs to traffic use that is no longer the norm. Removing them would make this area where Jesus Lane becomes narrower much less cluttered, and even potentially safer.(Resident)</i></p>	<p>Traffic control is dealt with by the County Council Highways and is not within the remit of this document.</p>	<p>No action in this document. The comment will be forwarded to the County Highways Team</p>
	<p><i>The draft report states: "Nos. 18-22 now form part of The Forum, a shopping arcade". This is out of date. The shopping arcade closed some years ago. Number 18 is now the Cambridge Science Centre. Also, the former Wesley House Rank Building is currently undergoing alterations following incorporation of it and 19-22 into Jesus College. So the Rank Building picture in the report is now history.</i></p> <p><i>I would have thought the south side street listing should note that the gap between 48 and 49 Jesus Lane is the original course of Manor Street. It is of more historic significance than the listed gate to a private yard between numbers 49 and 50. Traces of the street nameplate can still be made out on the side wall of number 48.</i></p> <p><i>The paving at the Four Lamps corner isn't recorded as historic although the area is so recorded in the King Street document.(Resident)</i></p>	<p>This note has been carried through from the 2006 appraisal and will be removed.</p> <p>The Rank Building will be refaced but will remain therefore the photograph is still appropriate.</p> <p>Historic maps show that this is the case and text regarding Manor Street will be added.</p> <p>The historic paving does not start where the features on the map for this street do. Therefore</p>	<p>Text removed from the Notes of the table</p> <p>No action taken</p> <p>Under 47 & 48, and 49, the following text has been added ' The former route of Manor Street was between these two buildings and traces of the name plate can still be seen on the side of no. 48'.</p> <p>No action taken</p>

		the map is correct.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> King Street 	<p><i>The College also objects to the inclusion of Nos.6-10 and No.18 King Street as being 'positive'. The assessment ignores the fact that Nos. 6-10 are little more than facades (at first and second floor) altered in the second half of the C20 and the very negative visual impact which they have on the College buildings beyond. No. 18 is an unremarkable building which does not form part of a terrace and appears isolated in relation to its neighbours. There is no logic to the position of many of the 'key view' arrows along Hobson Street.</i></p> <p><i>It is not clear what about the Old County Hall building (now the Todd Building) makes it a 'focal point'.(Beacon Planning on behalf of Christ's College)</i></p>	<p>These buildings provide continuity in domestic scale between the older and newer elements along King Street.</p> <p>There are many views of historic buildings in Hobson Street which are worthy of note. These have been depicted by the use of 'key view' arrows. The former County Hall (Todd Building) is of classical design and proportions which means that stands out from other buildings in the street, making it a 'focal point'.</p>	<p>No action taken</p> <p>No action taken</p>
	<p><i>The King Street description needs to note the de-listing of nos. 70-84 (erroneously noted in the Gazetteer as Listed Buildings 62-86 (even)), and the reasons for this. The "streetscape enhancement" section needs to note the role of landlords in facilitating both occupation by specialist shops and appropriate refurbishment of the buildings. (Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>The date of the de-listing should be added to the notes in the table for clarity. (The reference to the Gazetteer cannot be found.)</p> <p>A note regarding the need to work with the landlords will be added.</p>	<p>Text added to the table, 'De-listed in June 2007'.</p> <p>Text under Streetscape Enhancements includes 'working with the landlords would help to improve the streetscape' at the end of the second to last paragraph.</p>

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<p><i>98 King Street - I find it extraordinary that a house dating from 1820 should have been quite so neglected by the City Council for so many years. In the 1971 "Cambridge Townscape" report it is inexplicably classified, along with many buildings at the eastern end of the street, as "Redevelopment Acceptable". This draft appraisal now at least classifies the same buildings as "Positive Building/Structure" but reflects little on the history of some of the earliest domestic buildings of the area not in college ownership, especially those dating from the Georgian period. I find it remarkable that the Knight and Mortlock (note correct spelling) Almshouses at least are not even Buildings of Local Interest.</i></p> <p><i>The report seems to overlook Pike's Walk and Milton House, Christ's Pieces, traditionally included with King Street. As scandalously as the other buildings mentioned about, 1 & 2 Pike's Walk were classified as "Redevelopment Acceptable". Milton House as a group value building category 1. None deserve to be ignored.</i></p> <p><i>The text is incorrect to refer to Cromwell Court as 1970s. I can't remember if it was built in the 1980s or 1990s but the planning reference of C/80/0886 with decision notice issued Wed 26 Nov 1980 suggests the 1980s. For the record, Malcolm Place dates from 1970 and Manor Place from 1975.</i></p> <p><i>I find the description of the 1990s building of numbers 32-42 a bit misleading. The façade there was provided by the typically iconoclastic Lasdun Christ's College New Court (of which only phase 1 was ever built). Strongly criticised by many City residents as typical of the university in showing its ugly rear end to the city, Christ's eventually accepted the criticism and built numbers 32-42 to hide their embarrassment and Lasdun's structure.</i></p> <p><i>The plan shows an area of paving at the Four Lamps end of the street in</i></p>	<p>Spelling of Mortlock to be corrected. These almshouses are considered worthy of consideration as BLIs and will be added to our list to follow up. They are highlighted as Positive Buildings on the map.</p> <p>Pike's' Walk and Milton's Walk have been addressed on the Christ's Pieces appraisal. Milton House is depicted as Positive on that map.</p> <p>Correct dates noted</p> <p>Additional text regarding the 1990s building which screens the rear of the Lasdun building</p> <p>The maps will be updated to</p>	<p>References to 'Morlock' have been changed to 'Mortlock'.</p> <p>No action taken</p> <p>Date for 91-101 King Street changed from 1970s to 1980s on the table</p> <p>After 'This building was constructed in the 1990s' has been added 'to screen the back of Denis Lasdun's college building behind ...' The date for the frontage building has been changed to 1990s in the table.</p> <p>Alterations made to the</p>
--	--	---	--

2016

	<p><i>front of the north end of Wesley Church and around the corners of Jesus Lane and Short Street as “Area of Historic Paving”. I’m not sure how that term is defined. The area of paving in front of the church has been re-laid and extended in modern times while the York Stone paving outside 96 & 98 King St, which I would have thought dated back long enough to be historic, is ignored. The paving outside Epworth Court was re-laid with new York Stone slabs when that development was carried out, presumably because that paving was thought to be historic too. The report ought to reflect that larger area as historic paving, all the more so considering the extent shown as such in Short Street and Emmanuel Road.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, I suggest the paving on the corner with Belmont Place is truly historic. Not only do a few of the large in situ cast concrete slabs from early in the last century survive but one has the street name (“Belmont Place”) inlaid in brass lettering. Although it was common to inlay the laying dates in similar slabs all over the city centre, this is the only example of which I am aware of the street name being inlaid. More’s the pity that thoughtless cable television installers slightly damaged one edge of the lettering some years ago. (Resident)</i></p>	<p>show the areas of good quality paving as well as the historic.</p>	<p>map</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> King’s Lane 	<p><i>King’s Lane is omitted completely (as with the previous Appraisal), and so its poor quality and the need for enhancement go unrecorded.(Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>King’s Lane does not have its own appraisal, but it is mentioned in the Queens Lane text</p>	<p>The name for Queens’ Lane will be changed to Queens Lane and Kings Lane</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> King’s Parade/ Senate House Hill 	<p><i>King’s Parade and Senate House Hill have an improved statement of value, but the east side buildings are wrongly captioned “west”. The height ranges from 3 to 5 storeys and attics. The need for long term replacement of the horse chestnut tree remains an issue, not least because it sits on the border of King’s College and University ownership (distinguished by differences in the mowing of the lawn). (Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>Wrongly captioned photograph and incorrect text in document altered.</p> <p>Comment regarding the horse chestnut is noted.</p>	<p>Under General Overview ‘The west side’ has been changed to ‘The east side’. ‘The scale varies between three and five storeys’ to the scale varies between three to five storeys and attics...’ When the document is re-compiled, the correct</p>

			caption will be added to the photograph
	<p><i>Consideration might be given to including the views out over the city from the top of the tower at Great St Mary's Church. (Historic England)</i></p>	<p>Key views are shown on the map which go to and from Great St Mary's Church.</p>	<p>No action taken</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laundress Lane 	<p><i>1. There is conflict between what is identified as a BLI and/or Positive building within this document and the adopted OPML SPD. Some of these conflicts may prejudice the successful implementation of comprehensive planning of the area.</i></p> <p><i>2. The library (south of the Anchor PH) is listed within the document as a BLI, yet it was recognised within the OPML SPD that this building has potential for demolition or substantial alteration, and potentially a space for public space adjacent to the river. While identified as a BLI, Plan 10 within the OPML SPD clearly sets out that the extension to the Anchor is only of moderate significance. Comments apply also in Coe Fen/Sheep's Green section.</i></p> <p><i>3. No 15 Bike Workshop – This has been listed as a positive building, yet it was recognised within the OPML SPD that this building has potential for demolition or substantial alteration.</i></p> <p><i>4. University Sports and Social Club – This is listed within the table as no status, yet is shown on the plan as a 'positive building.' It was recognised within the OPML SPD that this building has potential for demolition or substantial alteration. This should not be a positive building (as shown correctly in the Mill Lane section.) –</i></p>	<p>The buildings still remain and the SPD is a set of objectives whereas the appraisal is what is there now.</p>	<p>No action taken</p>

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<i>(Cambridge University)</i>		
• Lensfield Road	<i>The small front gardens of the properties along Lensfield Road have been identified as ‘positive green spaces’, as well as the low wall and railings being shown as ‘positive structures’. This is considered to be wholly disproportionate to the actual contribution these make to this busy road. The ‘key view’ from Lensfield Road which offers a glimpse into the grounds is simply a gap between two houses and not considered to be ‘key’. (Beacon Planning on behalf of Downing College)</i>	The green spaces and the walls and railings in front of these properties are positive contributions to the character and appearance of the conservation area. They give a sense of unity and spaciousness to the buildings. The key view through the gap between the houses gives glimpse views of mature trees in the grounds of Downing College which add to the character of the street.	No action taken
	<i>1. The introduction cites Lensfield Road as a ‘leafy suburban area’ which appears at odds with following acknowledgement that it forms part of the city ring road and is heavily trafficked.</i>	Lensfield Road is on the edge of the historic centre and could therefore be considered suburban. The fact that there is a lot of traffic does not diminish this character.	No action taken
	<i>2. We would query whether the positive green space allocations add anything of significance to the HCA, given their use and combination with designated landscape features (e.g. TOP trees). (Cambridge University)</i>	The positive green spaces give a sense of unity and spaciousness to the street.	No action taken
• Little St Mary’s Lane	<i>Little St Mary’s Lane needs proof-reading for typos and omissions. (Cambridge PPF)</i>	Noted	Text edited to amend typos and omissions.
	<i>1. We would question why the Bailey Grundy Barratt (BGB) Building has been ‘upgraded’ to a positive building. The building’s significance or merit is not referred to in either the previous HCA or the OPML SPD (where it is considerate moderate). The listing of the building within the table identifies its status as ‘none.’</i>	1. In the 2006 appraisal, Positive Buildings were not identified. The table has been corrected to show that it is recognised as a Positive Building due to its character and detailing.	Table text has been changed to class the building as positive.

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<p>2. <i>The Ward Library is identified as a positive building on the plan, but not included on the list. This building should not be considered positive. (Cambridge University)</i></p>	<p>The Ward Library is in the table as the Museum of Classical Archaeology which is what the building was used as until 1984. The table has now been changed. It is considered to be a positive building due to its materiality, its industrial character (which is part of the character of the city in this location) and its connection to the listed part of the building</p>	<p>The table has been altered to read 'Former Museum of Classical Archaeology – now the Ward Library'.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lion Yard and The Grand Arcade 	<p><i>Consideration might be given to identify the new John Lewis building as a positive building in the conservation area, while as noted above, the Hilton Hotel might be considered to be a poor quality feature. (Historic England)</i></p>	<p>The Downing Street and St Andrews Street frontages will be highlighted as positive.</p> <p>This building had planning approval. The document does not highlight negative buildings.</p>	<p>The map will be changed to show the frontages of the John Lewis building as positive.</p> <p>No action taken</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower Park Street 	<p><i>The sentence "Doors are alternately painted green or white and are panelled timber doors with very little detail to the openings" is a little misleading and now out of date. The white doors were the ones shut up out of use due to most of the houses being combined in pairs to single houses in shared student occupation. All the doors are now painted green whether in use as such or not. Those not in use lack front paths. The positive description of this street and its listing contrast particularly strongly with the 1971 Townscape report where the terrace was described as "Subject to Redevelopment Proposals". The Inner Relief Road which would have caused their demolition wasn't formally abandoned until 1973. My knowledge of this street stems from 30 years as a manager and governor of Park Street School, from before I met my wife to a year after my younger daughter ceased to be a pupil. I still know it well as my granddaughter is now a pupil there.(Resident)</i></p>	<p>Door colour noted</p>	<p>Reference to door colour changed to all being green.</p>

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Malcolm Street. 	<p><i>The reference to “Stevenson Building at Christ’s Church (North East Range, Third Court)” should be to Christ’s College, surely? (Resident)</i></p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Text changed</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Market Hill 	<p><i>The physical description of Market Hill makes no reference to the vitality of the market or the significance of the continuing sale of local produce connecting the city to its hinterland. No 5 Market Hill has hung, not mathematical tiles. No 4 Market Hill has painted mathematical tiles. (Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>The text states that “The square has remained the vibrant heart of the city and is popular with residents and visitors alike.”</p> <p>The reference to mathematical tiling at No 5 has been taken from the statutory list description.</p>	<p>No action taken</p> <p>No action taken</p>
	<p><i>Please consider refurbishing of the market square and install removable market stalls so that they can easily be moved for special events and evening activities (e.g. the Christmas Lights turn-on event). (‘Jacks on Trinity’)</i></p>	<p>This issue does not form part of the appraisal document and is being looked at by another Council department</p>	<p>No action taken</p>
	<p><i>Under the “General Overview” heading this starts “Lying between the two principle routes through the city centre”. It should of course be “principal”. “Braun’s map of 1575 records a market cross that stood on the eastern edge of the market place near the entrance to St Mary’s Passage”. Surely it was the western edge? St Mary’s Passage and GSM are to the west of the market. “A shire hall was added in front in 1749, which is thought to have been a raised structure with an arcaded covered market beneath.” That should be “thought” not “though”, surely? “The building was designed by Charles Cowes Voysey and includes a large balcony at the front from which, once again, important proclamations (such as the announcement of peace in 1945, could be made).” The closing bracket should come after “1945”. (Resident)</i></p>	<p>All errors have been noted.</p>	<p>Text changed to amend the errors</p>

2016

	<p><i>Market Hill. Streetscape enhancement PH Comment. The Streetscape and Guildhall building in particular is marred by clumsy placing of bins on the front façade close to the sculpture. Action – encourage bin staff to review and check for better locations- put the bins around the side? There is no townscape manager who checks the appearance of the City? Public Art committee- walk about and ‘look’/review should be in their ToR? The Fountain- restore- makes a priority? (Resident)</i></p>	<p>This issue has been noted. There is no Townscape Manager within the Council. These detailed matters are not for within this appraisal. They may be considered in a detailed Management plan or a Spaces and Movement Strategy.</p>	<p>These issues have been added to the street enhancement section. No action taken</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Magdalene Street/ Northampton Street 	<p><i>Whilst there is no objection to the identification of key views along the river (subject to criteria being produced), it is not clear why the view of the new kitchen buildings from Magdalene Bridge is ‘key’. There is no logic at all to the other ‘key views’ on Magdalene Street and Northampton Street. Many are into backland or aimed at specific domestic-scaled buildings. What are meant to be the ‘focal features’ on Benson Hall (Magdalene Street), Nos.4-10 Chesterton Road and the College buildings on the north bank (shown on the Quayside sheet but not on the Magdalene Street one)? Why is River Court considered to be a positive green space? This is shown only on the Quayside Plan and not the Magdalene Street one. Why is the part of the Master’s Garden on the Chesterton Lane / Magdalene Street corner considered positive? The high wall actually prevents any views of this. (Beacon Planning on behalf of Magdalene College)</i></p>	<p>Views within the conservation area are not always focussed on a single feature or building but are long views highlighting the diversity and variety within the area. Focal features with the appraisal are used both for their legibility in the street scene and their historic interest. Benson Hall has a fine Venetian window on the side elevation which draws the eye when walking down Magdalene Street. Similarly the long view over the wall from the corner of Castle Street is important. From here can be glimpsed the tranquil garden and historic college buildings including the Pepys library.</p>	<p>Map revised to show River Court as a positive green space.</p>

	<p><i>The College object to the inclusion of the Art Room to the north east of the School of Pythagoras as a 'positive building' on the Magdalene Street / Northampton Street plan. This is a modest brick and timber building of no particular historic or architectural interest and is not readily visible from the public realm.</i></p> <p><i>A key view has been identified from the south of no. 21 Northampton Street looking south towards the Cripps Building. This view is across the College car park and servicing area towards the Cripps Building which is not considered to be an important aspect of its setting. This is not a prominent location within the conservation area as the view is from private land.</i></p> <p><i>Why is the corner of the St John's Chop House a focal feature? Whilst the gable end does pinch the view when looking west, the 'positive' view towards it is identified looking east.</i></p> <p><i>The pavement on the southern side of Northampton Street between no. 22 – 38 has been identified as historic paving, however it is not clear whether this relates to the whole pavement or just the cobbles along the road and the part of the pavement between nos. 22 – 26 is of no historic interest at all. (Beacon Planning on behalf of Trinity College)</i></p>	<p>As stated in the appraisal text the Art Room forms part of a group of buildings including the School of Pythagoras and Merton Hall set around a yard which resemble an historic Fenland farm. The significance of a part of the conservation area does not lessen because it can only be glimpsed in views from the public realm.</p> <p>The view looking towards the Cripps building is a good example of the juxtaposition of the Cripps building with historic buildings and highlights the variety of built form within the conservation area.</p> <p>Focal features with the appraisal are used both for their legibility in the street scene and their historic interest. St John's Chop House adds legibility to the street scene and is revealed in views as you walk down Northampton Street.</p> <p>The areas of historic paving have been clarified on the map.</p>	<p>No action taken</p> <p>No action taken</p> <p>No action taken</p> <p>Revisions to the map.</p>
--	--	---	---

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<i>The streets of the historic core have a finite capacity for people and buses but the appraisal appears to have nothing to say about this. For example, it seems astonishing that so many bus routes are permitted to pass through the narrow streets in the historic core. Watch the numerous buses trying to negotiate Magdalene Street, Magdalene Bridge and the sharp corner from Jesus Lane into Bridge Street, and you wonder why these streets cannot be freed from buses and most other traffic, at least during the working day, as is successfully done in many similar cities on the continent. (Resident)</i>	The comment has been noted. The appraisal does state that the use of the road for private vehicles is restricted although it is still busy. However the enhancement scheme to improve the pavement surfaces and reduction in traffic has been successful in raising the quality of the environment.	No action taken
• Mill Lane	<i>The Mill Lane description as a “significant opportunity for redevelopment” even though almost all the buildings are identified as Buildings of Local Interest or positive buildings. We noted this in the Cambridge PPF assessment of the area during the preparation of the Mill Lane SPD; the SPD should be referenced here. (Cambridge PPF)</i>	The appraisal document looks at the buildings and landscape within the conservation area and how they add to the character and appearance of the city centre. The SPD is a set of objectives whereas the appraisal is what is there now.	No action taken
	<i>Mill Lane is recognised presumably in positive terms as ‘quiet’ and then the university buildings are referred to as ‘inactive’ – which is perhaps meant negatively. There is lack of clarity. Apart from the fact that students prefer peace and quiet to study, the epithet ‘inactive’ is inaccurate. There is plenty of university related activity as student burst out the Mill Lane lecture rooms periodically and academic staff go about their day-to-day business. I am particularly concerned at the lack of attention given to Millers Yard, which though a BLI may be subject to demolition by Pembroke College. This needs to be stopped and the building upgraded to proper listing. It provides an ideal setting for a college court, in an enclosed space. Darwin College was to take a lease on this. (Resident & FeCRA)</i>	Noted As a BLI, Millers Yard will be given any due attention in any future development and Council policies will apply.	Term inactive removed. No action taken
	<i>Several key differences between the adopted OPML SPD and the new HCA which may prejudice the comprehensive planning of the site. (Cambridge University)</i>	The appraisal document looks at the buildings and landscape within the conservation area and how they add to the character and appearance of the city	No action taken

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

		centre. The SPD is a set of objectives whereas the appraisal is what is there now.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Northampton Street 	<p><i>4.5 Castle Street are listed as BLI. In the 2006 Appraisal, this building was erroneously marked as a listed building. The status of the building, attached to Kettle's Yard, and having been largely neglected following a fire in the former post office is questionable. The designation also does not appear to pay any heed to the planning permission alterations to Kettle's Yard Museum, which includes the redevelopment of this structure. That project is presently underway on site, targeted for completion in 2017. This should be acknowledged and referenced in the narrative in the table item.</i></p> <p><i>(Cambridge University)</i></p>	Noted	The following has been added to the text: "redevelopment of Kettle's Yard has been approved and is underway"
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parkside 	<p><i>The appraisal seems to approve of the new building on the corner of East Rd and Parkside which is at least one story too high (the architecture of greed). Residents become rather tired of "architectural statements "which are no more than an excuse for cramming more revenue-generating rooms onto a site. This would seem to pave the way for similarly oversized (relative to the Georgian buildings to the west) to be put onto the Police Station site.(Resident)</i></p>	There are no such current proposals. The scale of the fire station may not be regarded as a precedent for any future development. The existing building received planning approval.	No action taken
	<p><i>I am also concerned that some of the area appraisals are lacking. For instance the Parkside Appraisal states "Redevelopment of the fire station has sustained the use of the site and associated activity whilst enhancing the architectural quality of the street." This is hardly credible. The planning department refused permission for the tower originally, the developer won on appeal. I would think most people would see the tower as a monstrosity that intrudes on the skyline viewed from various locations. It does not enhance the architectural quality of the street which is predominantly 19th century. No comment is made of the de-facto long distance coach/bus station now present on the street. (Resident)</i></p>	Noted	That sentence has been removed from the text. Have added a comment within the text on the bus stops.

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<p><i>The south side of Parkside is no longer open to Parker's Piece. The use as a bus station (and an inadequate one, with no facilities) severely compromises what should be a pleasant green character. This should be specifically addressed in the map and the "enhancement and redevelopment" text.(Cambridge PPF)</i></p> <p>Please add that the temporary bus stops and parked busses on Parkside ruin the vista from Parker's Piece and should be relocated. (Resident)</p>	Noted	Have added a comment within the text: The use of the southern side of Park Street as a bus station has led to the incremental installation of clutter including signs, bus shelters and a ticket office. This gradual change has eroded the open character of the street.
• Park Parade	<p><i>On Park Parade, the College objects to the inclusion of the front boundary walls as 'positive structures'. These walls are only five courses of brick high, many have been rebuilt, some removed and a number have lost their copings (as the photos in the document show). There is no logic as to why these insignificant walls have been picked out for special attention when the boundary walls to other domestic properties in neighbouring streets have not.(Beacon Planning on behalf of Trinity College)</i></p>	These low walls continue to give a sense of enclosure to the front gardens along Park Parade. The retention of them can enable railings to be put back at a future date.	No action taken
	<p><i>Park Parade wrongly includes a view up Portugal Street to St John's Chapel. (Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	Noted	Photo removed
• Parker's Piece	<p><i>My comment would be that it should be better controlled. The Town and Country fair is an example of good use of the space, as is its continuing use for cricket matches. But the most recent ice rink was dire. Including a loud and vulgar funfair in a site so close to the town centre was regrettable. There are already plenty of those on Midsummer common. (Resident)</i></p>	Noted	No action taken
	<p><i>Donkey Common and Petersfield. These two important open spaces do not appear to be in the Central Area nor the Mill Road Conservation Area. If they are not included is there a reason? They frame the entrance to Mill Road and the approach to Parker's Piece. (Resident)</i></p>	Donkey Common is within the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area and Petersfield is within the Kite Conservation Area	No action taken

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<p><i>We question whether the use of Parker’s Piece for ice skating for 1 month, followed by weeks of damage repair, can be correctly described as an “event”. The north side trees play a vital role, not least in masking the intrusion of buses and bus paraphernalia along Parkside. The Conservation Plan needs to be updated to guide proposed enhancements, and tree management. Reality Checkpoint has been redecorated. What about the inclusion of the football statue that is to be erected? (Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	Noted	Text altered regarding the redecorating of Reality Checkpoint. Reference to the bus stops is within the text for Parkside.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Park Street 	<p><i>On the Park Street plan (which differs in some cases from the Round Church Street one), we agree that the view to the rear of the CUS is negative (if that is what the red arrow is meant to show – it is not noted on the key here or on any streets). It is difficult, however, to understand why the junction and paving with Jesus Lane is thought to be poor, but not that to the rear of the CUS or along Round Church Street, or the gable end of No.5 Round Church Street. (Beacon Planning on behalf of Trinity College)</i></p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>This is a prominent corner and it is considered to be generally poor streetscape with the clutter of bins and cycle parking.</p>	<p>Alterations have been made to the map key for all streets</p> <p>No action taken</p>
	<p><i>The widening of this street and consequent building demolition took place more in the mid than late 20th century, in the 1960s I believe. That and the car park are the only completed elements of the thankfully scrapped Inner Relief Road scheme.</i></p> <p><i>I am a bit surprised that the gap left by the site of numbers 17 and 18, used for many years for car parking and a bit of a blot on that part of the street, is indicated as “Positive Green Space” when it is nothing of the kind. It is a matter of considerable personal regret to me that my attempts to persuade Jesus College to bring forward plans to replace the houses demolished there in the 1960s met with failure.</i></p> <p><i>(Resident)</i></p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>No action taken</p> <p>Changed the colouring on the plan so that the reference to positive green space in this location has been removed.</p>

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<i>1. The ADC Theatre is marked as having redevelopment potential in the 2006 Appraisal, yet is marked as a positive building in the draft Appraisal. No narrative in the document to offer an explanation of the changes in status. The change in status is queried in any case, given the form of the building and that it has not been altered materially since the 2006 Appraisal. (Cambridge University)</i>	This building was reassessed when improvements were made in 2008 and it was found to be older than realised.	No action taken
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Park Terrace 	<i>Park Terrace needs to be updated to include redevelopment of the University Arms. (Cambridge PPF)</i>	Noted	Text has been updated.
	<i>Surely Park Terrace was developed by Jesus, not Emmanuel College? Jesus owned it until some 34 years ago when they sold it to Emmanuel. Planning permission to convert it to student housing was granted in 1982. (Resident)</i>	Noted	Reference removed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peas Hill 	<i>The Peas Hill description plan notes neither the successful repaving, nor the subsequent intrusion of cycle racks. (Cambridge PPF)</i>	The text refers to the recent extension of the paving which accommodates large numbers of cycle parking. It also states that the entrance to the street from the north is dominated by cycle parking.	No action taken
	<p><i>Review of Cycle park structure recommended.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The cycle parking is an overbearing block and does not enhance the streetscape.</i> <i>Cycle racks could be positioned at an angle to give more room for pedestrians.</i> <i>Use the opportunity for greening with planters to break up the monotonous block of metal racks.</i> <i>The benches are crudely placed facing the cycle rack, and blocks the flow of the street.</i> <i>The rubbish bins are sited directly next to the benches.</i> 	Noted. See responses to this respondent elsewhere.	No action taken

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<i>(Resident)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pembroke Street 	<p>1. The New Museums Site SPD is not referenced anywhere and should be, as it includes a number of that affect Pembroke Street.</p> <p>2. The Heycock Lecture Theatre has been upgraded to a BLI since the 2006 Appraisal, yet no narrative in the document to explain this status change.</p> <p>3. The Goldsmiths Laboratory has been downgraded from BLI status since the 2006 Appraisal, yet no offered in the document to explain this status change. This is also contrary to the status identified in Museums Site SPD.</p> <p>4. The Shell building is shown as a BLI, contrary to the New Museums Site SPD. This is a C20 building quality, and is identified as being removed to facilitate new public open space in the NMS SPD. This inconsistency should be corrected.</p> <p>5. The NMS SPD identifies the NMS frontage on Pembroke Street as an area for public realm enhancement opportunity, yet the Appraisal on page 3 makes no reference to this. Furthermore, the document also states that there are no redevelopment opportunities. This is incorrect given the aspiration in the SPD to redevelop NMS to improve both the buildings and public access to the site, with particular opportunities to enhance access from Pembroke Street.</p>	<p>1. Refer to Introduction regarding the NMS SPD</p> <p>2. This is a mapping error and should be shown as a BLI</p> <p>3. This building is a BLI.</p> <p>4. The appraisal document looks at the buildings and landscape within the conservation area and how they add to the character and appearance of the city centre. The SPD is a set of objectives whereas the appraisal is what is there now.</p> <p>5. Not within the remit of this document</p>	<p>No action required under this street</p> <p>Map changed</p> <p>Map changed</p> <p>No action taken</p> <p>No action taken</p>
	<i>(Cambridge University)</i>		

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Petty Cury 	<p><i>The Petty Cury description makes no mention of under-use of upper floors on the north side, or the lack of maintenance which led to fallen masonry in the recent past.(Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>Under the Building Enhancement section the appraisal states that the upper storeys of the some of the buildings appear little used and there may be some potential for them to be converted in to residential or other uses.</p>	<p>No action taken</p>
	<p><i>We question the need for the inclusion of an analysis of the covered environment within Lion Yard and Grand Arcade as part of the Appraisal. The shopping centres are late 20th century and early 21st Century redevelopment, described as additions to the ‘commercial architecture of the city. We therefore seek clarification as to why the covered shopping environments should feature within this document given the nature of the redevelopments, their offer and their environment alongside the purpose of this document.</i></p> <p><i>We would consider that the wider Appraisal which addresses the external elevations of the shopping centre in the relevant sections is a sufficient assessment of these assets. The additional details on the external frontage of St Andrews’s Street for example, within this section could form part of another section. The covered environment should not be the focus of this Appraisal and is, unsurprisingly, referenced to be of ‘low significance’ given the extensive redevelopments. (DeLoitte LLP)</i></p>	<p>The text refers to the Lion Yard colonnade as it is a feature of the street frontage in Petty Cury and the appraisal is an assessment of the street environment.</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>No action taken</p> <p>No action taken</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post Office Terrace 	<p><i>We do not agree that there should be key views along the Post Office Terrace to the rear of No.4 or towards the substation (private property). Again, there is no explanation as to why this is a key view. We also seek further information on the focal point of Post Office Terrace (DeLoitte LLP)</i></p>	<p>This is highlighted as a negative view but there is no key to explain the arrows.</p>	<p>Map key amended to include negative views</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queen’s Lane 	<p><i>We are surprised to see no mention of the historic Milne Street in the Queen’s Lane description. (Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>Milne Street is mentioned on page 2.</p>	<p>No action taken</p>

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Queen's Road 	<p><i>Queen's Road has no cross-reference to the Backs Management Plan, no consideration of tree management, planting and renewal, and no mention of the new cycle route across Queen's Green.(Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>The Backs Management Plan is a separate document and not relevant to the appraisal of Queens Road.</p>	<p>No action taken</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quayside 	<p><i>The 'positive' trees identified lining the river by Bright's Building are all young specimens and not of great townscape value. These are only shown on the Quayside plan not on the Magdalene Street one. How can the paving laid on Quayside in the early 1990s be considered to be historic? (Beacon Planning on behalf of Magdalene College)</i></p>	<p>This line of trees will continue to grow and their presence now and in the future is of townscape interest. They should be included on the map for Magdalene Street.</p> <p>The key has been altered to refer to quality paving rather than historic.</p>	<p>Map altered</p> <p>Map key changed to refer to 'Quality Paving' rather than 'Historic Paving'.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regent Street 	<p><i>The pedestrian crossing at the junction with Gonville Place and Lensfield Road have recently been upgraded and in the process have become difficult to use. There are no longer pedestrian signals (i.e. red/green man) on the opposite side of the road that you are trying to cross, and so you can no longer stand facing the way you want to walk, but must keep looking to your left or right (or behind you) to see if it is safe to cross. This is a nuisance when foot traffic is light, but when there are many people you have no choice but to stand frustrated hoping that someone else is keeping an eye on it. The worst is walking west bound on the south side of Gonville Place trying to cross towards the Catholic Church - here the only pedestrian signal is beside the button which is against the wall not on the kerb, and so if you are standing at the kerb waiting to cross there is no way of knowing when it is safe to do so.(Resident)</i></p> <p><i>Regent Street needs updating to include redevelopment of the University Arms Hotel. Downing College SCR should be noted as a positive building, and possibly put forward for listing. (Cambridge PPF)</i></p> <p><i>1. The University Arms Hotel – reference to this should be updated to reflect the current position. (Cambridge University)</i></p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>No action taken</p> <p>Comment Added</p> <p>Comment added</p>

	<p><i>The Kenny A and B and Howard Lodge buildings have been identified as positive buildings in the Tennis Court Road plan, but not on the Regent Street plan. The College object to these relatively modern buildings and the Library being identified as positive buildings.</i></p> <p><i>The view from Regent Street at the junction with Park Terrace looking south east towards the Roman Catholic Church is identified as a 'key view'. This is a very wide and long-ranging view and no assessment is made of whether any buildings or features, other than the Church, are considered to be important.</i></p> <p><i>Several views into the College from Regent Street and Tennis Court Road have also been identified as 'key views', however these only offer glimpses into the site. In particular, the view from Tennis Court Road looking east through the northern gate is towards the College's car parking areas which is not considered to be positive and certainly not 'key'. Moreover, several views have been identified within the College which are only gained from private land and not from the public realm, in particular the views from The Quadrangle looking south towards The Paddock. As noted in the appraisal, the College was designed around a formal grid and courtyard and it was originally intended to have a southern range to enclose The Quadrangle. Therefore the sense of 'wide-openness' and the 'attractive vistas' that the appraisal identifies do not contribute to the original formal design of the College which intended to focus attention on the buildings that enclose the northern part of the site. The key views – if they are considered justified at all – should be towards the buildings themselves.</i></p> <p><i>Almost all of the site has been identified as positive green space, however no assessment is made of the character of these spaces to justify why they make a positive contribution. This includes the small areas of grass between buildings, such as around the library and 'N' staircase. It also includes the area of tarmac used for parking just beyond the main entrance from Regent Street and the hard-surface tennis courts in the south east corner of the site, which are not considered to be particularly positive. The supporting text notes that the open space within the site is split into</i></p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Views within the conservation area are not always focussed on a single feature or building but are long views highlighting the diversity and variety within the area. However the point of views highlighted on private land is noted and these have been removed.</p> <p>Noted. The internal site should be greyed out on the map as the appraisal is focussed on the street front.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>Map altered to show buildings as positive</p> <p>Map changed to remove key views on private land</p> <p>Map changed to remove emphasis on college site</p> <p>See comment above</p> <p>See comment above</p>
--	---	--	---

2016

	<p><i>the more formal northern part – known as ‘The Quadrangle’ – and the southern part which is less formal. It goes on to say of the southern part that ‘the space continues into the less formally landscaped grounds to the south, creating a sense of wide openness and attractive vistas...’. It should be noted that the southern part – known as ‘The Paddock’ – is laid out as sports pitches which are used by students on a regular basis. It is therefore not considered to be ‘more naturalistic in character’ as described in the appraisal, apart from the belt of trees along the southern boundary. Trees to the west of Kenny A have been identified on the Tennis Court Road plan as ‘important trees’, which is not shown on the Regent Street plan. The College objects to the identification of several of the buildings along Regent Street as ‘positive buildings’ and/or with historical shop frontages. These are a varied collection of buildings and many have modern shop frontages inserted which are not considered to have any positive impact. (Beacon Planning on behalf of Downing College)</i></p> <p><i>Considerations should be given to identify the Senior Common Room at Downing College (designed by Howard, Killick, Partridge and Amis 1969) as either a Building of Local Interest or a positive building in the conservation area. Personally I find this building of greater architectural interest than the Downing College Library (Erith and Terry 1991). The photograph of the University Arms is out of date as this element has been demolished and again where this is identified as a poor quality feature on the map with negative views may need to be reviewed. (Historic England)</i></p>	<p>Wording changed to ‘creating a wide open vista’</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>There are a number of historic shop fronts along Regent Street and the positive nature of these buildings also arises from their upper floors many of which are early 19th century.</p> <p>This building will be added to the list of potential BLI’s for future assessment.</p> <p>Noted. A new photograph will be inserted and a section of amended text reflecting the new building.</p>	<p>No action taken</p> <p>Map altered to add important trees</p> <p>No action taken</p> <p>No action taken</p> <p>Photo and text amended.</p>
--	--	---	---

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regent Terrace 	<p><i>The Regent Terrace description should note that the former factory was built for Avery Scales Ltd, a significant name in Cambridge industrial history. The recent change of name is highly regrettable. (Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>Changing the name of a public house does not require consent. The text will be altered to remove the words 'retains its name'.</p>	<p>Text changed from 'but retains its name and early C20 industrial character' to 'but has now lost its name but retains some early C20 industrial character'.</p> <p>In the table 'Avery' changed to 'Grain Store'.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Round Church Street 	<p><i>Trinity College has taken a significant long term lease from the Cambridge Union Society on land at the corner of Round Church Street and Park Street. The College and CUS object to the identification of Nos.3-5 Round Church Street as positive buildings. These buildings are an unremarkable survival of a longer terrace. In particular, there is nothing positive about the eastern gable end – the scar left from when No.6 was demolished in the 1960s. The 'historic shopfront' identified has not been a shopfront for many years and is simply a large plate glass window in a stone surround.</i></p> <p><i>Moreover, why is No.5 considered to be a focal point?</i></p> <p><i>The 'key views' identified are difficult to understand. The true key views along Round Church Street are a long view looking west which focusses on the St John's College Chapel tower and arguably the way the street is enclosed by the Park Street terraces looking east with the significant trees behind.</i></p> <p><i>It is difficult to understand why the draft Appraisal does not consider the squash courts as a negative feature. Why is there a key view looking at them and No.3 Round Church Street?</i></p>	<p>These buildings are considered to add to the character of the street.</p> <p>The former shopfront is still visible, despite it not being used as such for a number of years. The form of the opening is part of the character of the street.</p> <p>No. 5 is a focal point due to the increased height of the building which is at the end of the small terrace</p> <p>There are short and long views to the varied buildings along and at the end of the street.</p> <p>The appraisal does not highlight negative buildings.</p>	<p>No action taken</p> <p>No action taken</p> <p>No action taken</p> <p>No action taken</p>

2016

	<p><i>The 'positive trees' identified to the north of the church prevent views of an important part of the CUS building and views into the green space, which the text suggests is a positive attribute of the street.</i></p> <p><i>The 1930s alterations to the CUS have never been a 'sculpture studio'!</i></p> <p><i>The CUS was built in 1866 with extensions in 1886 and 1933. The latter were by H. Tomlinson.</i></p> <p><i>It is surprising that not only is Park Street car park not identified as being a negative feature on Round Church Street (it is on the Park Street plan!), but the text actually suggests that the materials and detailing make it noteworthy. It is hard to imagine that this view is shared by many people in the city or that were an application made to build now with similar materials and detailing that this would be given consent. (Beacon Planning on behalf of Trinity College)</i></p>	<p>The trees add a softness to the character of the street and do not detract from the buildings.</p> <p>Words 'sculpture studio' will be deleted.</p> <p>The table will be changed to include mention of H.Tomlinson.</p> <p>The map will be changed to show the car park as a poor quality feature as it is on the Park Street map. The materials of the car park are varied, for example the stone panels by the public lavatories. The future of the Park Street car park is currently under consideration.</p>	<p>No action taken</p> <p>'Sculpture studio' removed from text.</p> <p>Text in table changed to add H. Tomlinson.</p> <p>Map will be changed to show the car park as a poor quality feature</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> St Andrew's Street 	<p><i>The northbound foot traffic on the west side of the road approaching the junction with Downing Street is very heavy and just where pedestrians have to bunch up to cross Downing Street, the footpath becomes very narrow. There is a strange sort of portico at the corner which seems to be part of the bank and yet is widely used by pedestrians, this seems unsatisfactory both from the bank's point of view and for pedestrians. I would suggest making this section of St Andrew's Street (between Downing Street and say no. 36) single lane for cars/buses with the use of traffic lights to manage the flow. The large dead area controlled by the lights would be inefficient from a road traffic point of view but would allow a much wider and safer</i></p>	<p>Highway management is a matter for the County Highways Department.</p>	<p>No action taken.</p>

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

<p><i>pavement.(Resident)</i></p>		
<p><i>On St Andrew's Street, how can the paving running south from Christ's Lane which was paved when Bradwell's Court was rebuilt in 2008 be considered historic?(Beacon Planning on behalf of Christ's College)</i></p>	<p>The key to the maps has been altered to reflect 'Quality Paving' rather than 'Historic Paving'.</p>	<p>Key to all maps has been changed to show 'Quality Paving'</p>
<p><i>Lion Yard and the Grand Arcade: the superstructure (photo page 4) above the refurbished listed buildings needs to be mentioned, as does the view of the rear of the listed buildings from the first floor bridge within John Lewis. We suggest that the following needs to be added to the last line of the description, "However, this is only possible because the bulk of the new building that now intrudes into views from these spaces." (Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>This cannot be seen from St. Andrew's Street; reference has been made in Emmanuel Street pages. Views internal to the shopping arcade are not relevant to this street.</p>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p><i>The St Andrew's Road error occurs at the bottom of page 1. It should be St Andrew's Street of course. The reference to the 1950s Loggie Plan should be the Logie Plan. It is a pity that no reference is made to the enclosed yard behind St Andrew's Street accessed via Post Office Terrace which is very poor development. It is dominated by the remaining parts of the central telephone exchange not redeveloped for Grand Arcade. This is behind Barclay's Bank which is not the courts as described in the table. They are part of the Grand Arcade development behind the former Robert Sayle façade. (Resident)</i></p>	<p>No reference found. Post Office Terrace is private access and largely invisible from St. Andrew's Street.</p>	<p>No action taken No action taken</p>
<p><i>Apart from the stray apostrophe in "Beaufort's" the table gets confused at numbers 9-11. All the former Post Office building frontage, however numbered, is now Barclay's Bank. (Resident)</i></p>	<p>The apostrophe will be removed.</p>	<p>The table will be changed to correct numbering</p>
<p><i>The overbearing nature of the Grand Arcade buildings rising inharmoniously behind the newly restored listed shop fronts. Negative</i></p>	<p>This cannot be seen from St. Andrew's Street; reference has</p>	<p>No action taken</p>

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	impact. (Resident & FeCRA)	been made in Emmanuel Street pages. Views internal to the shopping arcade are not relevant to this street.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> St. Edward's Passage 	<p><i>The description in the 2016 Appraisal recognises it as a quiet haven and the 'tightly spaced vernacular cottages, preserving a sense of the cheek-by-jowl nature of the early town'. It appreciates that the attractive character is given by the very sense of enclosure (presumably applied in the positive sense here-later 'narrowness' is used which breaks happily with the planner speak). Incomprehensible that it does not refer to David's Bookshop by name. Nor is the successful timber access to the upper floors of the King's College building overlooking King's Parade, reminiscent of a mediaeval building. Enhancement overlooked.</i></p> <p>(Resident & FeCRA)</p>	Noted. References changed to reflect comments made.	G. David's shop name inserted. Mention made of timber-framed access gate. Text altered as street lighting has been enhanced since first draft.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senate House Passage 	<p><i>It is very surprising that the Senate House Passage description does not note the view to the C14 Old Schools behind the c18 façade. Equally surprising that the architect Cockerell is misnamed Cockcroft.</i></p> <p>(Cambridge PPF)</p>	Noted. References changed to reflect comments made.	Spelling corrected. Extra line about the re-fronting of buildings inserted.
	<p><i>Review management.</i> <i>Streetscape enhancements.</i> <i>The cobble path was dug up by utilities [date? Last 6 years].</i> <i>Floorscape replaced with inappropriate large cobbles. Patches now lifted.</i> <i>Low level of workmanship. The character of the street is adversely affected & a trip hazard.</i> <i>Needs repair.</i> <i>Recommendations. (Management section).</i> <i>Street repairs in Historic Core floorscapes need better supervision and checks before signing off. (Resident)</i></p>	Issues such as supervision of street works is not within the scope of the document.	Comment on poor paving workmanship inserted.

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sidney Street 	<p><i>The “tired” surfaces of Sidney Street have been replaced. The refurbished War Memorial should be noted as a positive building. (Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>The surfacing in the street remains very poor [major potholes, cracked footways, etc.].</p>	<p>War Memorial Shelter inserted into table as positive. No alteration on paving.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Silver Street 	<p><i>1. 16 & 17 Mill Lane (buildings to the south of the Pitt Building fronting Silver Street). The block outlined in the HCA is too generic and the buildings should be separated and assessed individually (see OPML SPD). This has been listed as a positive building, yet it was recognised within the OPML SPD that some elements of these buildings have potential for demolition or substantial alteration.</i></p> <p><i>2. 16 Silver Street – identified as a positive building in the table but not coloured as such on the plan. This building should be considered positive.</i></p> <p><i>3. 1 (Ede & Ravenscroft) – identified as a positive building in the table but not coloured as such on the plan. This building should be considered positive.</i></p> <p><i>(Cambridge University)</i></p>	<p>The document is a record of the CA as it exists, not as it might be.</p> <p>The map will be changed</p> <p>The map will be changed</p>	<p>No action taken</p> <p>The map will be changed to reflect the positive buildings.</p>
	<p><i>The concept of making it more ‘permeable’ seems out of keeping with what should be University aspirations, namely to provide a quiet haven for study. The through-flow of tourists and visiting school children among university buildings would be very disturbing for those who work and live there. To build another riverside plaza like the Quayside, when the latter has been downgraded (for reasons not given) is incomprehensible and would be severely detrimental to the river front view. There is an opportunity to carry out some first rate, sensitive infill buildings, similar in nature to the Jerwood Library, whilst obviously keeping those which are listed. But the old warehouse on the river next to Silver Street Bridge should be retained.</i></p>	<p>The document is a record of the CA as it exists, not as it might be.</p>	<p>No action taken</p>

	<i>(Resident & FeCRA)</i>		
	<p><i>1.Add. RESIDENTS to narrative. Street scape enhancement. Given its high value as a pedestrian route for City residents and tourist entering the City Centre, upgrading the narrow and uneven surfaces to reflect the historic character of the street (,,) could further enhance residents and visitors' experiences).</i></p> <p><i>2. Silver Street Bridge as listed Grade 2 bridge designed by Edward Lutyens, should not solely be treated as a coach park waiting zone and toilet service area. Residents should be able to enjoy the fine views without looking at advertising signage or being pestered by punting touts. The broader area of pavement on the bridge where tourists tend to congregate – is impoverished by random municipal bins, benches, a hot dog kiosk, tourist nik-nak kiosk, punt operators signage and cycle stands with abandoned bikes. The area could be improved by rationalising the bins and benches. Needs a dose of civic pride. Recommend there are stricter controls on size and scale of signage and removal at night of any temporary signage. Here and elsewhere – press for Removal of 'A' Boards...</i></p> <p><i>3. The toilets on Silver Street. Appraise? They are tired but well designed and thoughtfully integrated into a difficult location. The bold 1970's iron work railings and the iron work door at the bottom of the steps are fine workmanship. The toilet block area is neglected and the City should restore and repair. Risk. [There is an options paper on the toilets 2016. One suggestion is to move toilets and put student housing there. [!] Another was to put toilets on Queens Green].</i></p> <p><i>In theory - historic core appraisal would prevent this at early stage of</i></p>	<p>The text will be added.</p> <p>This may be addressed within the spaces and movement strategy.</p> <p>This may be addressed within the spaces and movement strategy.</p> <p>The toilets are currently under consideration for upgrading.</p>	<p>The word 'residents' has been added.</p> <p>No action taken</p> <p>No action taken</p> <p>No action taken</p>

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<p><i>consultation. Or BEFORE it went to consultation?</i> <i>Significant View of the river.</i> <i>Appraise?</i> <i>Door in the wall by river bank.</i> <i>Record characterful public access to the river and view of the river beside the toilet block.</i> <i>(Resident)</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Views from the bridge are shown on the map.</p>	<p>The views are depicted on the map.</p> <p>No action taken.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> St John's Street 	<p><i>On St John's Street, the grass area east of First Court is not part of the Historic Park and Garden. It is also difficult to understand what is 'historic' about the carriageway along St John's Street. (Beacon Planning on behalf of Trinity College)</i></p>	<p>This area is shown as Registered on both official paper & electronic maps. References to historic paving in the key have been changed to quality paving.</p>	<p>No action taken.</p> <p>Key changed on all maps to 'Quality Paving'.</p>
	<p><i>All Saints Square - Please consider installing a power point to this area so that more events could be held. A Christmas tree for example would be lovely and lights for the market traders when they are there in the winter months. ('Jacks of Trinity')</i></p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tennis Court Road 	<p><i>The status of the boundary wall along Tennis Court Road is not clear whether it is considered to be listed or a positive building, as there are discrepancies between the plan and the gazetteer. Also, the Kitchen Yard Gates are described on the list as a 'timber vehicular access gates' which is totally inaccurate as they are wrought iron in common with the Kenny and Fitzwilliam Gates. (Beacon Planning on behalf of Downing College)</i></p>	<p>Noted. Alterations made to the map to reflect the comments made.</p>	<p>The map will be changed to show the Listed wall extending for the entire length of TCR. The description of the gates has been changed.</p>
	<p><i>1. Page 3 describes the east side of TCR, most notably describing the relationship between the Judge Business School and the street. It should be noted that this is the west side, not the east. Furthermore, this description includes references to the former nurses' hostels which were demolished in the latter part of 2015 to make way for the consented extension to CJBS to provide an executive education facility. No reference to the current positive</i></p>	<p>The comments have been noted and the text will be altered.</p>	<p>The "east" has been changed for "west". Reference to the further extension of the Judge B S has been made.</p>

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

	<p><i>or the changing dialogue with the street is mentioned, which leaves the assessment factually inaccurate. This should be updated to account for the consented scheme and lack of the former hostels.</i></p> <p><i>2. The aforementioned former hostels are marked on the plan as being positive buildings. This needs to be corrected given that they no longer exist.</i></p> <p><i>3. Streetscape enhancements. This needs to reflect the changes to the street approved adjacent to the new CJBS extension, which provides for an enlarged footway in the region near the former hostels.</i></p> <p><i>4. Table to be updated, as per the above comments (Bridget's Hostel).</i></p> <p><i>5. The buildings on the Downing site which front TCR are all listed as positive buildings without an explanation as to why. (Cambridge University)</i></p>	<p>The polygons for the positive buildings will be removed</p> <p>These buildings & their qualities are mentioned clearly in the 'Overview'.</p> <p>Table to be altered</p> <p>The appraisal has depicted positive buildings in all of its streets where they are considered to be important to the character</p>	<p>Map changed to show demolitions.</p> <p>No action taken</p> <p>References to Bridget's Hostel removed</p> <p>No action taken</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trinity Lane 	<p><i>1. Area of Historic paving. An area of historic paving has been introduced where the 2006 HCA identified poor floorscape. No analysis of this change is provided, especially given no change has happened on the ground. (Cambridge University)</i></p>	<p>Noted. 'Quality' and 'poor' are not mutually exclusive.</p>	<p>Key changed to quality paving.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trinity Street 	<p><i>On the section covering Trinity Street, the photo entitled 'Gonville and Caius College's Tree Court' is in fact Trinity College's Whewell Court. Similarly on Garrett Hostel Lane, the 'view to St John's College New Court' is in fact Trinity College New Court. (Beacon Planning on behalf of Trinity College)</i></p>	<p>The photo captions will be corrected.</p>	<p>Corrections made when final document is compiled.</p>
	<p><i>No mention of the successful streetscape enhancement. (Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>It is mentioned in the 'Townscape Elements' section.</p>	<p>No action taken</p>
	<p><i>City Core scheme road floorscapes in Trinity Street have held up well. Sensitive treatment. Use of good materials & lack of yellow lines a success. Make the economic argument of money well spent long term. (Resident)</i></p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>More detailed description of highway materials added.</p>

Appendix 1: Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation - Summary of representations

2016

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thompson's Lane 	<p><i>The St Clements Gardens terrace is shown as a row of positive buildings. These have been demolished, with consent granted two years ago! A hostel for Trinity Hall is replacing them. (Beacon Planning on behalf of Magdalene College)</i></p>	<p>The map will be changed to indicate the new building, called Wyng Gardens.</p>	<p>Text changed to reflect demolition and new building.</p>
	<p><i>Thompson's Lane: it is not just the roof terrace of the hotel which detracts from the skyline.(Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>This building had planning approval. The document does not highlight negative buildings</p>	<p>No action taken</p>
	<p><i>One believes, perhaps naively, that the designation 'historic core' will afford some protection against inappropriate development. However, it is widely agreed that, for example, the building in Thompsons lane, now a hotel, originally planned as flats, disfigures the skyline as viewed from places like Jesus Green. It towers inappropriately over the listed buildings nearby, notably those of Magdalene College. There must surely be something amiss with a planning system that allows a development of this sort in such a sensitive location? But the appraisal appears to have nothing to say that might reassure us that the historic core will in future be protected from such intrusions. (Resident)</i></p>	<p>This building had planning approval. The document does not highlight negative buildings</p> <p>Developments in the Historic Core are subject to the policies contained within the Local Plan.</p>	<p>No action taken</p> <p>No action taken</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trumpington Street 	<p><i>It is incredible that the Trumpington Street description includes no issues or enhancement opportunities- compared with the 2006 Appraisal that mentioned the following been:</i></p> <p><i>Streetscape Enhancement...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The ugly crossover between nos. 55-59 and Corpus Christi could be improved upon.</i> <i>The two disused road sign support posts opposite nos. 11 and 12 could be removed.</i> <i>The pink dimpled concrete slabs at this point are rather obtrusive.</i> <i>Although, the street is one of the very few in the city, to have a complete run of York stone paving from end to end, there are some unsympathetic PCC slabs in front of the Royal Cambridge Hotel and</i> 	<p>Acknowledged. See amendment.</p>	<p>The 'Streetscape Enhancement' section has now included these comments.</p>

2016

	<p><i>running along the School of Architecture and History of Art. There is also some tarmac in front of no 39. These areas should be replaced to be more in keeping with the majority of the street.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Pitt Building would benefit from a more sympathetic lighting scheme.</i> <i>The removal of the rather unattractive (temporary) Institute of Visual Culture building will significantly improve the northern side of the Fitzwilliam Museum.</i> <i>The hard space in front of no 74 is wasted and could be enhanced to create a better entrance to the building.</i> <p><i>(Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>Not within the scope of the document.</p> <p>The temporary building has now gone.</p> <p>Not within the scope of the document.</p>	<p>No action taken</p> <p>No action taken</p> <p>No action taken</p>
	<p><i>1. General – The plan does not have a key- same colour assumed as rest of document.</i></p> <p><i>2. Fitzwilliam Museum – More detailed analysis/study is needed from the Council in relation to the museum site. The diagram highlights that the later extension of the Fitzwilliam is not listed; there is no breakdown of this within the list referring only to the main part (Grade 1) listed.</i></p> <p><i>The listing description for the Fitzwilliam Museum concentrates on the Founders Building in the listing description and does not mention any of the later extensions. Similarly, for Grove Lodge, the description only deals with the 18th century part of the building and doesn't mention the 19th century additions which would provide greater clarity over the parts of the building that are less significant.</i></p> <p><i>(Cambridge University)</i></p>	<p>A key will be included with the map</p> <p>The list description for the museum has recently been enhanced and includes references to the later additions.</p>	<p>Key added to the map.</p> <p>The map will be altered to reflect the extent of the Listing.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wheeler Street/Parson's Court 	<p><i>In the section marked 'Streetscape Enhancement' in the former the document states that: 'Restriction of the vehicles using Wheeler Street to delivery vehicles would create a more pleasant pedestrian environment and make access to the public buildings and venues more agreeable'. If we have understood that correctly then you are potentially suggesting re-routing cars exiting Grand Arcade car park so that they do not have to come down Wheeler Street. We feel this is fine and would actually create a safer environment for patrons leaving our venue after shows. We do obviously need delivery vehicles to have the usual access as this is business critical. Re. the following comment: 'Parson's Court could be made more attractive by providing more discrete housing for refuse bins.' We agree with this and were planning to discuss the same idea with the City Council. The bins are somewhat of an eyesore and discrete housing of them is definitely required. (Cambridge Live)</i></p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>LPA will await contact via the pre-application process.</p>	<p>No action taken</p> <p>No action taken</p>
	<p>1. <i>No reference is made to the NMS SPD, or the consented scheme which sees alterations to Parson's Court and the negative view marked on the plan.</i></p> <p>2. <i>The red arrow has no legend in the map key. (Cambridge University)</i></p>	<p>The document relates to an appraisal of what exists, not of what may be.</p> <p>The key for all maps has been changed to include the red arrow as a negative view.</p>	<p>No action taken</p> <p>The key to all maps will be changed.</p>
<p>4. Good Practice/Management</p>	<p><i>The Issues and Management analysis in Chapter 4 also neglects to reconcile the issues between heritage protection and development. For example, the Appraisal simply states that an area has opportunity for re-development when it is well known the University has plans for the Mill Lane site, which includes a number of Listed Buildings and BLIs that will be potentially threatened. But we realise that there is a question of where you draw the line in relation to including information about upcoming developments. 2.5 There is also a lack of integration of these documents with the plans for</i></p>		<p>Add reference to approved New Museum Site applications and development. Also, refs to emerging proposals for Mill Lane and Downing sites (see same at page 9 above).</p>

2016

	<p><i>the City Deal, which seeks to improve bus-lanes. As this will potentially increase the number of buses in the city centre the impact of this on the heritage is not adequately covered in Chapter 4 either in relation to Traffic Management other than the siting of interventions to reduce traffic. Buses are the principal source of exhaust emissions, and the damage to the structure of the city's old buildings caused by the high levels of atmospheric pollution, which often breach the legal limit, is not mentioned.</i></p> <p><i>Although we feel the Appraisal needs more work, Cambridge PPF is still encouraged that the City Council is undertaking this work, and Cambridge PPF are willing to work with the Council as previously discussed. We do urge the Council to give greater consideration to Cambridge's irreplaceable heritage.</i> <i>(Cambridge PPF)</i></p>	<p>City Deal plans to be addressed via Spaces and Movement strategy – which reference to will be added to the Appraisal.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Add reference to Spaces and Movement strategy / City Deal.</p>
--	---	--	---

2016

	<p><i>All good material but reads as a preamble. Would like to see stronger writing with direct references to key policies embedded in the narrative rather than referring to the Local plan. Plays a bit safe. It could be more authoritative and demanding of standards. Needs dates and goals. The Lay out – I found the 2006 table format easier to find information on policies and see issues and impacts. The 2016 narrative sections look lightweight in comparison.</i></p> <p><i>Contacts - Would be useful to have list of department headings and a contact name for who is responsible for cleaning graffiti-, managing bins, benches – referenced against criteria. (See Westminster adopted Public realm strategy for Harmonising with Partners code).</i></p> <p>4.1.2. Lighting</p> <p><i>Be more honest of the problems from the Balfour Beatty Contract. Lesson learnt. As well as success of retaining Richardson candles. Make this a case history of how the consultation was done late and the problems it created. Date when the County Council contract was done.</i></p> <p>4.1.3 Sector signage? REMOVE. No longer relevant?</p> <p><i>Signage removed. Measure it as a success. Conservation bodies to get rid of the bogus signs nobody liked or used.</i></p> <p>4.1.4. Street Clutter</p> <p><i>Could be tougher on policy and intent. State the project plan. Dates, Audit. Measuring successful outcomes. What is the method? 20 mph implementation.</i></p> <p><i>Ref to latest thinking. Place before movement. (Scottish).*** Historic England. ‘Save our streets’, ‘Less is more’.</i></p> <p><i>Add robust review of cycling infrastructure. Colour of roads, signage, and bollard controls. Make it ‘belong ‘as part of place making. More beautiful. County engineers or Campaign groups cannot dictate specifications without collaboration & consulting City Conservation & design departments and residents.</i></p> <p>4.1.5 Public Realm strategy.</p> <p><i>Refer to key literature. Dates. Targets. All a bit vague.</i></p>	<p>The Planning system does not intend CA appraisals to be planning policy documents (nor are appraisals part of the Development Plan). Appraisals are an assessment of the conservation area – a snapshot. Dates and goals may be appropriate for a Management Plan not for this appraisal.</p> <p>A list of contacts would very quickly become out of date – especially given the Shared Service agenda.</p> <p>4.1.2 is considered sufficient for the Appraisal.</p> <p>4.1.3 agreed no longer relevant.</p> <p>Not appropriate in an appraisal.</p> <p>Consider for Spaces & Movement Strategy. CA Management Plan/ Spaces & Movement Strategy matters.</p> <p>4.1.5 Needs update with ref to SPD & City Deal consideration.</p>	<p>Delete 4.1.3 Sector Signage paragraph & re-number.</p> <p>Amend 4.1.5 to refer to proposed CA Management</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p><i>Needs to mention threat of City Deal. Residents want to feel confident that the City Conservation department have the authority to oversee City Deal proposals to the highest sensitive environmental design standards.</i></p> <p><i>4.1.6 Core Traffic.</i> <i>Set out the ambition. Vision. Future Smart Traffic management implications. Removal of rising bollards. Threat of more cameras?</i></p> <p><i>4.1.7 Cycle parking</i> <i>Needs design guides. Aiming for best practice. Review what has been put down recently. (Peas Hill - functional but not enhancing. Bins and benches an afterthought –‘could do better’. Put cycle racks at angles to give more pavement area).</i></p> <p><i>4.1.9.</i> <i>Control of reinstatement works.</i> <i>Can there be tougher scrutiny and retrospective repairs to poor quality work. A 2 year period? What is training for operators and seminars for staff and public? Get Conservation of the City – out in the public debating realm.</i> <i>People are concerned and interested.</i> <i>(Resident)</i></p>	<p>These are beyond scope of a CA Appraisal and are matters for possible inclusion in a CA Management Plan/ Spaces & Movement Strategy.</p>	<p>Plan and Spaces & Movement Strategy.</p>
<p>General</p>	<p><i>The overall street by street structure is a logical method for addressing such a large and historic area. The only drawback in this approach is that some areas of potential major change (e.g. the New Museums Site) are considered in a fragmented manner in a number of different locations. I was also uncertain as to whether the whole of the University Downing Street site is considered? Given the depth of this site, have only the frontage buildings been considered?</i></p> <p><i>The maps are clear and helpful and it is good to see that they record historic paving. Areas of good contemporary paving might also be recorded (should they exist). Had it been possible to reproduce the maps at a slightly larger scale, it might then have been possible to identify positive items of street furniture (e.g. K6 phone boxes, or Richardson Candles) as well as</i></p>	<p>This is a consequence of the “inherited” layout. However, the bulk of these sites are covered.</p> <p>The approach taken to paving is now to record both historic and good quality contemporary paving. Map scale is a constraint. Consideration of views is set out</p>	

	<p><i>negative elements of street clutter (pedestrian barriers, intrusive signage etc.). The maps include the identification of views within the historic core, but one of the overall maps might have been used to record important views into or out of the historic core.</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 1.3.3 Considers Positive Buildings and Buildings of Local Interest, but does not attempt to differentiate between them by identifying which are considered to be more significant. Does the Council consider them to be of equal significance? When considering applications for the demolition of such buildings, it would be helpful to have a clear understanding of the weight that should be given in determining such applications.</i></p> <p><i>Positive buildings might be considered to make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area, and therefore merit consideration in accordance with clause 72 of the 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, whereas Buildings of Local Interest may be considered as undesignated heritage assets in their own right demanding consideration in accordance with paragraph 135 of the NPPF. Most, but perhaps not all, Buildings of Local Interest are also likely to be Positive Buildings in the conservation area. A clearer steer in this document would help in development management.</i></p> <p><i>(Historic England)</i></p>	<p>at Appendix F of the Local Plan 2014 (proposed Submission version).</p> <p>Most, but perhaps not all, BLIs are also likely to be Positive Buildings in the conservation area. In a conservation area, the key consideration is the contribution to that area. BLIs have been identified according to a different (often complimentary) set of criteria – and importantly, not from a systematic survey of the CA.</p>	<p>Add to <i>Paragraph 1.3.3:</i></p> <p>“Positive buildings make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area, and therefore merit consideration in accordance with clause 72 of the 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act. Some buildings have also been identified as Buildings of Local Interest in their own right and may be considered as undesignated heritage assets in accordance with paragraph 135 of the NPPF.”</p>
--	--	--	---