

Appendix A: Brief summary of the key issues raised during public consultation

Section 1. Introduction		
Respondents	Support	Object (incl. qualified Support)
8	3	5
(Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cambridgeshire County Council supports the principle of exploring cycle routes and pedestrian connectivity through Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street, as well as other entrances to the Grafton Centre. Careful consideration of cycle parking will be needed to ensure enough is provided, whilst ensuring location of parking is convenient and does not detract from the streetscape. Cambridgeshire County Council supports the need for positive streetscaping and accessible routes for both the mobile and mobility impaired. The Grafton Centre development in the 1980's meant the loss of much traditional character – This is an opportunity to improve much of the area. Support proposal, however failure of implementing the Eastern Gate proposal and development concerns regarding s106 money. 	
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objections to the removal of current, convenient on-street cycle parking outside of retail facilities. Removal of signage will result in more traffic regulation and enforcement. 	
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New development will need to take account of cycle parking provision to ensure enough is provided, and it the right locations. We will ensure cycle parking locations are convenient whilst not detracting from the streetscape, where this can be avoided. It is noted that public realm improvements will need to conform to the County's requirements on design and materials. Following sentence added to paragraph 4.2.30: "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area." 	

Section 2. Site and Context		
Respondents	Support	Object (incl. qualified Support)
100	40	60
(Support)	<p>Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The amount of inactive or service areas fronting the streets can be greatly improved – redesigns need to be of high quality. Cambridgeshire County Council supports the need for electric charging points- this should also be encouraged in any redevelopment of the retail/public car park. The existing cycle parking is very heavily used and needs increasing while remaining convenient in location. Historic England welcomes the intention to undertake a review of cycle parking. Cycling should be permitted on Fitzroy and Burleigh Street through a safe and inclusive cycle route and should not be diverted to indirect surrounding routes – East Road and Newmarket Road 	

	<p>cycle lanes are very poor quality and must be improved as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle routes must avoid pedestrian areas however; claims that the current situation is dangerous to pedestrians are not backed by evidence. <p>Design/Character/Form/Layout</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support designation of historical buildings. • Support the sensitive redesigning of the Grafton Centre providing enhanced streets with diverse retail community and green planting.
(Object)	<p>Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relocating the bus stops from the current bus interchange to East Road would not provide benefit for the users of these services – New Square should be built as a bus terminal. • County Council recognises the opportunity to change the form of East Road, however, requires arrangements to be discussed between Cambridgeshire County Council, public transport operator Stagecoach and GCP following the outcomes from access study. • Not all Park and Ride services serve the Grafton Centre and should be addressed in the SPD to provide greater accessibility to the centre. • SPD does not mention the cycle way from Fair Street to East Road and should address this public right of way in the plans. • Access to Adam and Eve car park is poor with visibility to traffic approaching from Paradise Street also poor. <p>Services and facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A concern that new residents will not be eligible for Resident’s parking permits. • Any changes to servicing operations will need to be evidenced with some service areas labelled ‘redundant’ seen as necessary e.g. Burleigh Street is not wide enough to take over this functionality. • Objection to the SPD highlighting that 75% of shoppers shop online – giving the area a facelift is not going to make business profitable. • Objection to the inappropriate to mention specific retailers in a public policy document of this nature. <p>Design/Character/Form/Layout</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to development of high buildings destroying the character of the Victorian and Georgian residential surrounding area. • Need to mention Grade II and II* listed buildings such as Arts Theatre Workshop and Store on Newmarket Road. • Objection to development on the car park as properties on Maids Causeway will be significantly impacted – historic value/beauty. • SPD should refer to the Historic England’s publication of Streets for All and highlight the importance of retaining historic shopfronts. • Seating outside shop frontage restricts pedestrian accessibility. • Trees have a major adverse effect on roads and streets, object to planting in this area. • Historic England: Consideration should be given to appropriate new planting of trees.

Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend Figure 7: Add cycle route on Newmarket Road west of the junction with James Street. • Reference made in paragraph 2.4.15 to the grade II* Buddhist Centre (former Arts Theatre Workshop and Store) at 36 Newmarket Road and the remainder of the listed buildings in the area are all grade II listed. • Add reference to Historic England's publication, Streets for All and our advice for highways engineers and designers in paragraph 2.5.3. • Fourth sentence of Paragraph 2.5.5 to be amended to read 'Opportunities to retain and restore historic shop fronts should be taken in recognition of the positive contribution they make to the character of the area. Along with sensitive infill development this will raise the quality and continuity of the shopping streets particularly if focused on areas where the built fabric is of a lower of neutral quality.'
---	---

Section 3. Key Objectives		
Vision		
Respondents	Support	Object (incl. qualified Support)
32	14	18
(Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SPD offers a thorough review of the challenges and opportunities of the area with proposals providing positive impact to the conservation area and provide public benefit. • Universities Superannuation Scheme Limited support the mixed-use approach to the redevelopment, however clarification is sought about the retail evidence base. • Development offers an excellent opportunity to restore Salmon Lane as a Regency mews within the Kite Conservation Area. • Support the enabling of a through-route as the Grafton Centre itself acts as a barrier at night time when the premises are closed. • Support mix-use with suggestion of providing a concert hall. • Support the need for flexibility of design allowing for significant adaptation in the future. 	
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to the removal of free car parking facilities for people with disability. • Concerns that although the SPD has been devised in the Public Sector, lack of funding will result in a developer led scheme for shareholders compromising aspects of the Masterplan with selective redevelopment to retail in particular. • Such development will cause a great deal of disturbance to residents of Maids Causeway and surrounding roads as building works will be extensive. • Concerns for the loss of pedestrian precinct with taxi access strongly unnecessary. • Concerns for the size, height, mass and scale of the development in comparison to the surrounding area. • Objection to the suggestion of a hotel as the area is not suitable. • Concerns that future-proofing is not just in terms of building use, but also transport terms too – development must aim for fewer cars and delivery vehicles. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to the impact of the development on the City Centre e.g. demand on transport, increase in retail, leisure and residential.
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free parking for disabled users is not a requirement unless it is provided for nondisabled users. Both Grafton car parks currently offer up to 3 hours of free parking for disabled users. While there is no commitment from the car park operator to maintain this allowance, the City Council will request that due consideration is given for convenient disabled parking which is discounted if not provided free of charge as part of any scheme involving new car parking arrangements. • Any inconvenience caused by construction activities will be kept to a minimum. The hours of permitted construction will be restricted with the applicable planning permission. • The need for additional retail is based upon the Council's evidence base, in particular the updated 'Retail and Leisure Study' completed in 2013. The Grafton Area's city centre role is not expected to change other than making better use of the existing site by introducing additional town centre use to improve the area's appeal and attractiveness for day-to-day usage. • The Grafton SPD's second objective "A balanced and successful destination" supports future-proofing to ensure that the area is able to adapt according to changing retail and leisure habits.

Section 4. Strategies for Change – Movement and Access (4.2)		
Respondents	Support	Object (incl. qualified Support)
61	27	34
(Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the redevelopment of the car park in Grafton West to provide same number of spaces in a single basement level – this would enhance the area whilst maintaining current level of spaces. • Support the proposed new transport plan suggestion of an underground system; however, this could be located at the Grafton Centre instead of Drummer Street which already has high footfall. • Support the provision of better bus facilities on East Road but this must be in conjunction with proper cycle tracks and bus stops. • There are three major Anglia Ruskin sites along East Road resulting in large movement of young people which must be taken into account in the designs. • Support the principles of on-street servicing in the area. • The assumption that 'car ownership is well over 1 per household' is not evidenced – need for appropriate suggestion of spaces for cars. • Strongly support the suggestion of less car storage on public land in this area – Emphasis on the good transport links in Cambridge. • Support retention and increase of cycle parking spaces however, cycle parking must be spread out with a variety of short and long stay parking - SPD requires additional detail as to how 1,000 spaces will be achieved. • SPD should note the strong dislike of double-stacker cycle parking and provide emphasis of recommendation of Sheffield stands. • Strongly support removal of the feeder lane as it results in extremely poor pedestrian space. 	

(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to the provision of a segregated cycleway in the pedestrian area is not seen as beneficial. • County Council are not supportive of the reinstatement of Fitzroy and Burleigh Street for motorised vehicular traffic including taxi services due to safety implications for vulnerable road users. • Objections to taxi movement along Fitzroy and Burleigh Streets on top of proposed delivery movements – fewer motor vehicles should be using the streets to reduce safety hazards for pedestrians and cyclists. • Concerns for the period when the Grafton West car park is not operational as this will impact users of facilities such as Eden Chapel, particularly older and less able users. • Importance of upgrading the Napier Street entrance to improve access from Newmarket Road, especially for people arriving by cycle and bus. • Objection to the suggestion of ‘floating’ bus stops as East Road is dangerous enough and on-street servicing as it creates conflict with pedestrians and bike users. • Concerns for the lack of residents parking with suggestion that Dover Street car park is residents only with cycle parking. • Objection to the cycle parking in car parks with need for suggestion of inclusive cycle parking for cargo cycles and adapted cycles for persons with disabilities. • This section fails to note the poor cycling and walking connectivity from St Matthew’s Street to the Grafton Centre. • In the short-term, the Grafton East entry/exit roads should be reconfigured – The footway along Wellington St is interrupted here.
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any access changes to City Street would require an assessment to consider the wider impact of these changes. This would need to be completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular the City Access team. Residential streets should not be used for servicing any shops. • Any proposal to close the car park temporarily will need to have an agreed plan in place to minimise disruption to local occupants to allow day-to-day activities to continue. • Sentence added to paragraph 4.2.4 to reference poor connections between the St Matthew’s Street approach and the Grafton Centre. • Amend paragraphs 4.2.10, to remove reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street. • Add sentence to 4.2.17 explaining a servicing strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area. • Amend 1st sentence of 4.2.18 to read "Proposals involving servicing (and those including taxi access) will be subject to a clear servicing strategy and assessment." Add sentence at end of paragraph "Taxi movements will not be allowed on Fitzroy/Burleigh and the expectation is that taxi arrangements will be proposed in that context." • Add sentence to 4.2.18 explaining that the modification of the Traffic Regulation Order governing the streets concerned is a process outside the planning process and may not be deliverable. • Add the following sentence to paragraph 4.2.30: "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area."

Section 4. Strategies for Change – Land Use (4.3)		
Respondents	Support	Object (incl. qualified Support)
22	2	20
(Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support uses and suggest roof gardens and restaurants. Support the need for housing above shops, however, these should be affordable. 	
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection to the change in use – the plan should retain units that will be affordable for shops that serve local people such as charity shops and vacuum cleaner shops. Objection to the lack of affordable social housing with concerns for the likelihood of penthouse apartments and hotels. Concerns for the potential increase in vehicle traffic accessing Salmon Lane. Objection to the building of 2-3 storey houses as there are no 3 storey buildings currently on Salmon Lane – concerns for privacy as these properties will be overlooked. Objection to student accommodation as the area does not provide housing for lower paid workers or 40% affordable housing. Need for youth and community provision in the area with limit to night time activities as residents will be disturbed. Objection to the proposal of hotel use unless there is careful consideration to the listed buildings and its settings. 	
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both national and Local Plan policies support new hotels in town centre locations. Additional city-centre type uses will also broaden the area's attractiveness and remove the area's current reliance on retail activities to attract people. New hotel activities will also increase local Amendment to Figure 35 & 36 to show that Eden Chapel should have a separate 'community' designation. Add sentence to paragraph 4.3.7 acknowledging the current community use of Eden Chapel. Figure 9 will also be amended to reflect the community use at Eden Chapel will be retained as part of any redevelopment of the immediate area. Final sentence of paragraph 4.3.16 to be re-worded to read 'Housing adjacent to Salmon Lane will be domestic in scale to respond to the finer grain of the lane.' Affordable housing will be sought in accordance with the applicable Local Plan Affordable Housing Policy. 	

Section 4. Strategies for Change – Scale, massing and built form (4.4)		
Respondents	Support	Object (incl. qualified Support)
54	16	38
(Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the need for 17 Fitzroy Street to remain prominent in the streetscape; however the surrounding new development therefore must be of lower heights. Support the principle of finding a way to have a safe and inclusive cycle route on Fitzroy and Burleigh Street, however this should not be referred to as a 'contraflow cycle lane' because that presumes a 	

	<p>certain type of infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East Road most certainly would look better with cycle ways with trees and verges between motor traffic and people. • Support the proposal of allowing two-way cycling along Burleigh Street at all times. • Support the proposals for re-instatement of historic shopfronts.
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns that the SPD lacks appropriate management of servicing. • Objection to the vagueness of height restrictions with need for the sensitivity to the height of housing in the area e.g. the courthouses with new buildings reflecting character, scale and density of current housing. • Important that Salmon Lane is not narrowed and the grass and tree strip on the Grafton side of Salmon lane is maintained. • Strongly object to the space being used by pedestrians, bikes alongside taxis and servicing vehicles. • Insufficient signage for the cycle routes through the area posing risk to cyclists and pedestrians. • Need to improve Norfolk Street end with clearer cycling and walking routes to follow. • Reducing car parking spaces in conjunction with East Road new bus station will cause a significant increase in congestion (and pollution). • Objection to the addition of three new buildings as it risks over-developing this part of the site. • Object to blocked access to Fitzroy/Burleigh Street and suggest removal of the bollards along City Street to allow service vehicles access to the shops.
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend paragraph 4.4.7 to include reference to historic shopfronts. • Add sentence to paragraph 4.4.11 which reads: Any proposal must be in line with Policy 60: Tall buildings and the Skyline in Cambridge that identifies the expected methodology for consideration of tall buildings. • Add the following words to paragraph 4.4.19: 'and significance of heritage assets'. • Replace last bullet point of paragraph 4.4.24 referencing a contraflow cycle-lane' with the following bullet point: "Provision for a shared surface for both cyclists and pedestrians designed to ensure safety for all surface users is also key." • Both the Local and County Council support the approach of a shared user movement corridor between pedestrians and cyclists along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. • Amend paragraph 4.4.24, 4.4.28 8th bulletpoint to remove reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street.

Section 4. Strategies for Change – Landscape, environment and public realm (4.5)		
Respondents	Support	Object (incl. qualified Support)
57	19	38
(Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Agency support proposal – Any subsequent planning application must address: Sustainable surface water drainage, foul water drainage and contaminated land. Support the need for planting in the area to improve streetscape with suggestion of rooftop gardens or meadows above businesses, alongside energy capture on these roofs. Support the need for improvements to the quality of the area with need for reduction of noise and pollution. Strongly support the proposal of the cycle route however, needs to be more detailed description than just ‘shared space’ with designs legible for partially sighted persons and other disability. Support the reduction in carriageway width on East Road, however, some space should be used for creating protected cycle ways. 	
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the planting of greenery and trees unless they are properly maintained. Objection to large development as there will be increase of noise and disturbance to residents – Increasing links between the Grafton Centre and adjacent residential streets will not benefit residents. Concerns for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists if more motor vehicles are added to these streets. Objection as any reduction in road width will have impacts on the surrounding area – Need for identification of more arterial routes. Objection to any car/lorry/taxi access due to pollution increase. 	
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend paragraph 4.5.4 to remove reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street. Section 4 of the SPD identifies, at a high level, the improvements to be made in landscape, environment and public realm. However it is beyond the scope of the SPD to specify these details but they will be considered as improvements to the various streets and spaces are developed. 	
Section 4. Strategies for Change – Delivery and phasing (4.6)		
Respondents	Support	Object (incl. qualified Support)
3	0	3
(Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection to the shops offered in the Grafton Centre as they do not cater for all – more thought should be applied as to the user needs. Making the surfaces on the ground smoother will improve the noise pollution from lorries and vehicles accessing the area. 	
(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NHS England has identified shortfalls in capacity at existing premises covered by this SPD – Provision needs to be made within the SPD to address the impacts of development on health infrastructure and to ensure timely cost-effective delivery of necessary infrastructure improvements, in the interest of pursuing sustainable development. 	
Draft response and consequential changes to SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed matters involving the provision of local healthcare will depend on proposals for new residential development as will therefore need to be agreed as part of any relevant planning application during the Development Management process. 	