

## Riverside Conservation Area - Draft Appraisal: Summary of Responses

1 = action taken

2 = not within the remit of this document

3 = no action taken

NB: Where the same comments have been made by different methods, these have only been included once e.g. where emails are making the same points as Comments Forms.

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Action
1	English Heritage East of England Region	(i) Green Belt should be referred to in the document and shown on the maps (ii) Cambridge Preservation Society is now Cambridge Past, Present and Future (iii) Butts Green may derive from archery butts set up in the area (iv) Cheddars Lane Pumping Station is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (v) Fourth listed boat house is Corpus Christi and Sidney Sussex not Gonville and Caius and Sidney Sussex (vi) More consistent to list the open spaces from the city centre outwards (vii) Brunswick area - it would be useful to note where houses have small gardens or where they are back of pavement (viii) A development brief should be prepared for Elizabeth Way/Newmarket Road roundabout (ix) There is an arc of view to the east/south east and to the west/south west (x) Overstatement that replacement windows can 'destroy' subtleties – suggest 'harmed by inappropriate alterations'	(i) Added to document and maps (ii) Text changed in document (iii) To research and add if correct (iv) Text altered (v) Text altered (vi) Text altered (vii) Additions made (viii) Noted (ix) Added to maps (x) Text altered	(i) 1 (ii) 1 (iii) 1 (iv) 1 (v) 1 (vi) 1 (vii) 1 (viii) 2 (ix) 1 (x) 1
2	Natural England	(i) Support extension of conservation area	(i) Noted	(i) 3
3	Cambridge Past, Present Future	(i) Strongly support extension of the conservation area to include commons, northern river	(i) Noted	(i) 3

	embankment and area next to Elizabeth Way roundabout		
(ii)	More descriptions required of greened front gardens and low walls which contribute to streetscape	(ii)	Text altered (ii) 1
(iii)	Spatial analysis with regard to building heights needs to be made clearer	(iii)	Text altered (iii) 1
(iv)	The areas proposed to be removed from the conservation area should remain within boundary	(iv)	Noted and reported to committee (iv) 3
(v)	Area north of towpath should include tree belt to rear gardens to ensure setting of river	(v)	Noted – mainly covered by TPOs (v) 3
(vi)	Colour schemes of railings, bridges and other street furniture missing	(vi)	Noted (vi) 3
(vii)	Definition and descriptions of the commons and their edges needs to be clearer	(vii)	Text altered (vii) 1
(viii)	Threats to Stourbridge Common need to be included	(viii)	Noted however not within the remit of this document (viii) 2
(ix)	River approaches study required	(ix)	Noted (ix) 2
(x)	Need to include the intensive recreational use as well as commuter use of the commons and the river. Major improvements still needed to enhance overall street furniture	(x)	Text altered (x) 1
(xi)	Are there any pinder (herdsman) issues?	(xi)	Not that are known (xi) 3
(xii)	Research should also cover issues relating to boaters and moorings	(xii)	Additional text added regarding the house boats (xii) 1
(xiii)	Inclusion of Penny Ferry welcomed. Should include more information about ferry crossings in this location.	(xiii)	Noted (xiii) 3
(xiv)	Open spaces strategy and management plans findings should be reflected in the appraisal	(xiv)	This would be duplication of information (xiv) 3
(xv)	The Green Belt should be more clearly described in the text	(xv)	Text altered (xv) 1
(xvi)	Chapel Meadows is also a City Wildlife Site. Boundary treatments to commons should be clearer described and actions for neglected areas scheduled	(xvi)	Addition made to map. Scheduling of actions not within the remit of this document (xvi) 1
(xvii)	Add additional text to last sentence in Key	(xvii)	Text altered (xvii) 1

		<p>(xviii) Characteristics Welcome the inclusion of Article 4 measures which needs to be clearer in the document and the City Council's overall stance</p> <p>(xix) Describe protection for each common</p> <p>(xx) Improvements requested for Walnut Tree Avenue have been ignored</p> <p>(xxi) Has street furniture been surveyed and historic features logged?</p> <p>(xxii) CPPF have recently requested the BLI designation of the Penny Ferry due to its location and history</p> <p>(xxiii) Suggested alterations to the boundary to include a larger area</p> <p>(xxiv) Suggested additions to townscape analysis map</p> <p>(xxv) Suggested text alterations</p>	<p>(xviii) Noted, however there are no Article 4 directions in the city</p> <p>(xix) Additions made to map</p> <p>(xx) Noted</p> <p>(xxi) Not within remit of this document</p> <p>(xxii) Noted</p> <p>(xxiii) Not deemed necessary at this time</p> <p>(xxiv) Alterations made</p> <p>(xxv) Text altered</p>	<p>(xviii) 3</p> <p>(xix) 1</p> <p>(xx) 3</p> <p>(xxi)2</p> <p>(xxii)2</p> <p>(xxiii) 3</p> <p>(xxiv) 1</p> <p>(xxv) 1</p>
4	Cambridgeshire County Council – Strategic Planning	(i) No comment	(i) Noted	(i) 3
5	Cambridgeshire County Council – Highways	(i) No comment	(i) Noted	(i) 3
6	Environment Agency	(i) Add the fact that the majority of the area is in the floodplain	(i) Text altered	(i) 1
7	Cllr Wright – Ward Councillor	(i) Consider inclusion other properties along Stanley Road	(i) The area suggested has been looked at but is not considered to be of the same character as the majority of the proposed conservation area	(i) 3
8	Cllr Rosenstiel – Ward Councillor	(i) Suggested corrections to the text	(i) Text altered	(i) 1
9	Cambridge Natural History Society	(i) The appraisal must be objective and authoritative. Bias towards architecture and little interest in the countryside	(i) Comments noted. The biodiversity of the city is addressed by other departments within the council. This document is mainly for the use of the Planning department when considering development.	(i) 3

10	Riverside Area Residents Association	<p>(i) In general the proposals are welcome. Would like to see more protection in place to retain and improve what remains. Urge Council to apply and enforce conservation policies robustly in future – do not understand how large modern developments that were approved are now considered for removal from the conservation area</p> <p>(ii) It would be useful to include the area around Elizabeth Way as a ‘zone of opportunity’.</p> <p>(iii) Strongly support inclusion of Godesdone Road and parts of Newmarket Road</p> <p>(iv) West’s site next to River Lane should also be classed as a ‘zone of opportunity</p> <p>(v) Modern blocks along Riverside should be kept in the conservation area and labelled as ‘zones of opportunity’</p> <p>(vi) The green space and landscaping around Regatta Court should be protected in some way</p> <p>(vii) Support inclusion of north side of river, Stourbridge Common and Ditton Meadows</p> <p>(viii) Strongly support adoption of Article 4 directions</p> <p>(ix) Support proposals to improve entrance to Stourbridge Common and to repaint railings</p> <p>(x) Welcome proposals to protect trees by St Andrews Church, plant trees on Walnut Tree Avenue and improve landscaping in front of Pepys Court and Water Street</p> <p>(xi) Any residents affected by the boundary change should be fully informed of the implications</p>	<p>(i) Noted</p> <p>(ii) Noted – already highlighted as an area for visual improvement</p> <p>(iii) Noted</p> <p>(iv) Reported to committee</p> <p>(v) Reported to committee</p> <p>(vi) Difficult to include without the buildings too which are of the same character as the rest of the conservation area</p> <p>(vii) Noted</p> <p>(viii) Noted, however there are no Article 4 directions in the city</p> <p>(ix) Noted</p> <p>(x) Noted</p> <p>(xi) Noted</p>	<p>(i) 3</p> <p>(ii) 3</p> <p>(iii) 3</p> <p>(iv) 3</p> <p>(v) 3</p> <p>(vi) 3</p> <p>(vii) 3</p> <p>(viii) 3</p> <p>(ix) 3</p> <p>(x) 3</p> <p>(xi) 3</p>
11	Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	<p>(i) Strong support inclusion of the suggested new areas</p> <p>(ii) Issue of most immediate concern to PACT is Elizabeth Way roundabout and stretch of road</p>	<p>(i) Noted</p> <p>(ii) Noted</p>	<p>(i) 3</p> <p>(ii) 3</p>

			along Newmarket Road immediately to the east, and its hostile environment				
12	2 email	(i)	There is no reference to the visual impact of the moored boats along this stretch of the river	(i)	Text altered	(i)	1
		(ii)	Support the proposal to remove Riverside Place from the conservation area due to the over exhaustive, time wasting and costly exercise involved in getting permission to do works to trees	(ii)	Noted	(ii)	3
13	2 comments forms	(i)	Fair analysis of area. Support inclusion Newmarket and Godesdone Roads. Elizabeth Way approaches should be classed as 'an area of opportunity' – should include West's garage and modern blocks Riverside	(i)	Noted	(i)	3
		(ii)	Would be good to have future liaison with Conservation team and Environmental Improvements re extending street improvements along Riverside – 'boulevard' aspiration	(ii)	Noted	(ii)	3
		(iii)	It would be good if could prevent people from vandalising front elevations of houses – e.g. by the installation of inappropriate windows	(iii)	Noted	(iii)	2
14	Save Our green Spaces	(i)	Supports aim to extend the conservation area and would like to encourage the Council to implement the tree planting recommendations in the document	(i)	Noted	(i)	3
15	Friends of Stourbridge Common	(i)	Whole-hearted support	(i)	Noted	(i)	3
		(ii)	Preservation of spaces, protection of grassland site, furthering biodiversity, provision of wildlife corridor and green space, important 'visual relief' in the city are all covered in the Appraisal	(ii)	Noted	(ii)	3
		(iii)	Every effort should be made to protect what has not already been ruined in Cambridge	(iii)	Noted	(iii)	3
		(iv)	A few specific points relative to Stourbridge Common	(iv)	Noted	(iv)	2