



To: **Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport**
Report by: **Head of Planning Services/ Head of Joint Urban Design Team**
Relevant scrutiny committee: **Environment Scrutiny Committee** **4th October 2011**
Wards affected: **All wards but specifically Abbey, Market, Petersfield**

Adoption of Eastern Gate Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

1. Executive summary

- 1.1 The Eastern Gate study area lies to the east of the city centre. It encompasses a sizeable area that stretches from the Crown Court, past the Elizabeth Way roundabout to the beginning of the Cambridge Retail Park. Proposal sites 7.01 and 7.03, located south of Newmarket Road and East Road and identified within the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), fall within the study area.
- 1.2 There is widespread recognition of the need to improve the physical environment within the study area. In addition, increased developer activity within the area has created growing pressure such that formal planning guidance needs to be produced to help coordinate and guide future redevelopment in line with the Council's Local Plan policies and objectives.
- 1.3 The purpose of the Eastern Gate Development Framework SPD is threefold:
1. To articulate a clear vision for the future of the Eastern Gate area;
 2. To establish a development framework to help co-ordinate and guide decisions (by the City and County Councils and other public and private partners); and
 3. To identify a series of key projects which will attract and guide investment and support future public and private projects (by the City and County Councils and others) within the area.
- 1.4 The production of a Development Framework as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the Eastern Gate area was identified in the 2010/2011 Joint Urban Design Team Service Plan and will form part of the Local Plan Review for Cambridge. In progressing the SPD

to date, the work has been split into three parts. Firstly, a Visioning Document was produced in consultation with the local community, members and key stakeholders. This document was approved by the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth on February 15th, 2011. Secondly, the approved Visioning Document acted as the basis for preparing a Development Framework for the area in the form of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Finally, in accordance with the process of preparing an SPD, consultation on the draft Development Framework was carried out over a 6-week period between Monday 13th June to Monday 25th July 2011.

- 1.5 Appendices A1 and B1 summarise the representations received for the draft SPD and SA and set out proposed responses. Appendix C1 provides a track-changed version of the SPD. As no changes were proposed for the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) the original has been included as Appendix D1.

2. Recommendations

2.1 The Executive Councillor is recommended:

1. To agree the responses to the representations received to the draft SPD (Appendix A1) and SA (Appendix B1) and the consequential amendments to the SPD (Appendix C1)
2. To adopt the Eastern Gate Development Framework SPD with immediate effect

3. Background

Purpose of the SPD

- 3.1 Over the past several decades, the Eastern Gate area has experienced significant change. The large-scale highway interventions of the 1970s, the application of standard highway solutions and the introduction of unsympathetic, bulky buildings that have little relationship with the public realm have eroded the qualities of the area and severed neighbouring communities. Many sites within the area have been subject to a number of planning applications, several applications having been considered recently by the City Council and some of which are still extant. Fragmented landownership within the area further complicates matters.

- 3.2 In terms of site-specific planning policy allocations, proposals sites 7.01 and 7.03 as identified in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) fall within the Eastern Gate study area. The SPD is intended to compliment and expand upon these site based policies, as well as expand and compliment the saved policies contained within the Cambridge Local Plan, more specifically policies 3/4 (Responding to Context), 3/6 (Ensuring Co-ordinated Development), and 3/7 (Creating Successful Places).
- 3.3 A public meeting held on the 9th of November 2009 was the first step in seeking the views of local residents about the sort of place the area could become. The issues and ideas that were generated during the meeting were used to assist the Joint Urban Design Team with the preparation of the draft "Visioning Document" that was subject to an 8-week consultation period between 26th July 2010 and 17th September 2010. Following this initial consultation period a day long staffed public exhibition took place from 2pm-9pm on the 11th October 2010 at Christ Church, which is located close to the study area. The key issues and main findings arising from consultation, along with the final version of the document, were considered by Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee on 14th December 2010. The Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth subsequently approved the final Visioning Document at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee on 15th February 2011. The Visioning Document has been used as the basis for a Development Framework for the area in the form of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The current draft of the SPD can be viewed online at www.cambridge.gov.uk/easterngate.
- 3.4 Once adopted the SPD will form part of the Local Plan Review for Cambridge and will be a key material consideration in the determination of planning applications. This is an important factor given that there will be further development interest and activity in the area driven by the private sector and so detailed, material planning guidance will be important in ensuring high quality, coordinated development activity can occur. It will also help ensure properly funded, designed and coordinated infrastructure improvements can take place within the area.

Public Consultation

- 3.5 After being approved for public consultation at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee on 22nd March 2011, the draft Eastern Gate Development Framework SPD and its accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA) were the subject of consultation for 6 weeks between Monday 13th June and Monday 25th July 2011.

- 3.6 In line with the consultation standards set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended), the consultation documents were sent to statutory and other consultees identified in Appendix C of the 22nd March 2011 Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee Report. This schedule included all participants from the stakeholder workshops, consultees from the Visioning Document and attendees from the public exhibition. In addition, the consultation material and response forms were made available at the Customer Service Centre and were also sent to the City Centre public library. All of the consultation material was made available on the Council's website and an online consultation system was utilised to allow consultees to submit their comments via the internet (hard copies of the response forms were made available to those who do not have access to the internet). A notice was placed in the Cambridge Evening News on Monday 13th June 2011 containing information about the consultation and how consultees could get involved.
- 3.7 A leaflet drop advertising the draft SPD was organised for public consultation. The leaflets were sent to approximately 2, 450 residential and business properties within and surrounding the Eastern Gate study area. A series of static exhibition boards outlining the strategies and key projects contained in the draft SPD were also displayed at the Customer Service Centre during the consultation period.
- 3.8 The draft SPD and its supporting documents remain available on the Council's website at www.cambridge.gov.uk/easterngate.
- 3.9 At the end of the consultation period a total of 235 separate representations were received, made by 35 respondents. Officers have worked through all representations and have drafted responses. Summaries of all representations and proposed responses with recommended changes to the SPD have been attached as Appendix A1 and B1 to this report.
- 3.10 In total, sixty-three responses of support were received (26.8%), 135 (57.4%) comments and 37 objections (15.7%). The responses came from a variety of sources including local residents, planning consultants, statutory bodies, and Cambridgeshire County Council Highways Authority. There was a broad consensus that the area was in need of enhancement and that existing roads were particularly hostile to pedestrians and cyclists. Local residents, including Riverside

Area Residents Association (RARA) and Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT), expressed their strong support for the principles of the document, making particular note of the likely benefits arising from the key projects and welcoming the proposals which would reconnect the communities of Petersfield and St Matthews and enhance the environment for cyclists and pedestrians.

- 3.11 Thirty-seven representations raised objections to a range of different issues within the draft SPD. These include changes to the Vision and Objectives of the SPD, additional sites, building heights and roof forms, minimum cycle lane widths, the re-introduction of two way traffic on Harvest Way and New Street, the redevelopment of the Howard Mallet Site and its implications for open space, the creation of physical and visual links across development sites on Newmarket Road. These key issues are discussed further in the table below.
- 3.12 Two responses were received in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) by Natural England. Natural England was generally satisfied with the scope and detail of the draft SA. No further changes to the SA have been proposed, as such the original SA has been included as Appendix D1

KEY ISSUE 1 - Vision	
<p>Concerns</p> <p>Reps 5286, 5216, 5318 (Para 1.4.1)</p>	<p>Three representations made comments regarding the Vision of the SPD, suggesting it was confusing and should embrace the opportunities for redevelopment</p> <p>Sustrans (5318) noted the Vision needed to be expanded to emphasise the need for "street", "people" and "connectivity".</p> <p>Allia Limited (5286) noted the Vision was awkwardly expressed, and as a consequence, will come across as rather unintelligible to most readers. The wording of the Vision ought to be simplified and should perhaps express some ambitions for the quality of the area 15/20 years hence, once much of the regeneration that is currently envisaged has occurred.</p> <p>Anglia Ruskin University (5316) noted the Vision and Objectives were confusing. The Vision relates to barriers and connections, however, much of the document is about far more than this, for example, seeking to set development parameters. The Vision should embrace the opportunities for redevelopment within the area to help improve the quality of place.</p>
<p>Draft response and consequential changes to the SPD</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Vision will be reworded as follows :</p> <p>" The Vision for Eastern Gate is to regenerate and transform this key approach to the city through high quality development coupled with key projects that will connect people and places."</p>
KEY ISSUE 2 - Objectives	
<p>Concerns</p> <p>Reps 5318 (Para 1.4.1) Reps 5317, 5312, 5325, 5287, 5388 (Para 1.4.2)</p>	<p>Respondents including local residents, Sustrans, Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge Cycling Campaign and Allia Limited raised concerns that the objectives in paragraph 1.4.2 were confusing, limited, or required rewording to reflect their importance.</p>

<p>Draft response and consequential changes to the SPD</p>	<p>The objectives set out in paragraph 1.4.2 are high-level and have been assessed against the Sustainability Objectives identified in Stage A (Scoping Report) of the SA process. In response to representations received, several minor amendments have been made to the SPD objectives as detailed below:</p> <p>The second objective will be amended to read as follows: 'Create safer, more civilised and inclusive streets, which prioritises pedestrians and cyclists'</p> <p>The 8th objective will be brought forward to become objective 4 in order to respond to concerns about ordering and hierarchy.</p> <p>The 9th objective will be reworded to read as follows: 'Preserve or enhance the conservation area and the setting of historically significant buildings'.</p> <p>An additional objective has been added, which will read as follows: 'Delivering regeneration and redevelopment of the underused assets of the areas as a means to enhancing the entrance to the city centre'.</p>
KEY ISSUE 3 - Additional development outside of the SPD Study Area	
<p>Concerns</p> <p>Reps 5415, 5416, 5367, 5427 (Para 5427) 5289 (Figure 2) 5361 (Figure 29) 5452 (Figure 31) 5365 (Figure 38)</p>	<p>A. <u>Additional development sites</u> Several respondents including local land owners, residents and developers commented that the Eastern Gate study area boundary should be enlarged to encompass the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East Road as far as Norfolk Street • The length of Newmarket Road to the Railway Bridge • Fitzroy Street • Cambridge Retail Park <p>B. <u>Atrium Club site</u> Unex Holdings Limited raised objections that the former Atrium Club Site, as bounded by Severn Place, Newmarket Road and East Road should be listed as a 'Other Potential Development Site' on figure 2 and included on the following plans: Figure 29 Opportunities; Figure 30 Movement and Circulation Strategy; Figure 38 Built Form Scale and Massing Strategy.</p>
<p>Draft response and consequential</p>	<p>A. <u>Additional development sites</u> The study area has been drawn to include areas which contain potential development sites, both allocated in the 2006 Cambridge Local Plan and unallocated, as well as</p>

<p>al changes to the SPD</p>	<p>areas where the quality of the public realm has been significantly undermined by 'standard' highway solutions.</p> <p>B. <u>Atrium Club site</u> It would be inappropriate to set out the scale and massing of redevelopment of the Atrium Club site without detailed discussion and ideally agreement with the owner. Accordingly officers consider it would be problematic to include this site on other plans at this stage. By not including the Atrium Site the Council is not prejudicing future development options that may come forward on this site.</p> <p>No changes to the SPD are proposed.</p>
------------------------------	--

KEY ISSUE 4 - Building Heights and Roof Forms

<p>Concerns</p> <p>Reps Figure 38 5490, 5282, 5433, 5246, 5345, 5441 (Para 3.2.3) 5428 (Figure 31) 5445, 5432 (Para 3.4.10),</p>	<p>A. <u>Indicative building heights</u> A key concern of respondents was building heights. Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA) expressed concern that indicative building heights were high relative to local residential properties. RARA also raised concerns that the principles of avoiding unbroken rooflines would need to be robustly enforced. A number of residents felt that the Council had failed to achieve these objectives at the Travelodge Site and the future Residential scheme on Newmarket Road. Local planning consultants working on behalf of Allia Limited supported the proposal to test the suitability of building heights, which were above the indicative heights stated within the SPD through the use of computer modelling.</p> <p>B. <u>Justification of building heights and roof forms</u> Two key stakeholders objected to the inclusion of building heights, suggesting they had not been justified. Savills commented that the buildings heights shown on figure 38 make no assumptions about roof shape or design, suggesting a flat roofed structure of 4 storeys may be lower than a pitched roof structure of 3 storeys. Another representation noted the Built Form Scale and Massing Strategy did not consider buildings that did not have shoulder heights, eaves or ridge lines, suggesting the strategy pre-supposed certain typologies and building styles.</p>
---	---

<p>Draft response and consequential changes to the SPD</p>	<p>A. <u>Indicative building heights</u></p> <p>Proposed maximum heights indicated in figure 38 have been informed through a comprehensive townscape analysis of the area, the Cambridge City Council's building heights data model and previous planning applications. Heights relating to the Newmarket Road frontage have been informed through the following applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Eastern Gate Residential Site, (08/0205/FUL)</u> proposed 6 storeys with a recessed 5th floor. The scheme was originally refused permission and later appealed against, the appeal was dismissed as the height of the proposed building and its mass at upper levels would have a harmful effect on the environment. ○ <u>The Travelodge site</u>, the original approved outline application for proposed office use (C/02/0739/OP) set a precedent for a 5-storey building with a 4th floor setback. The recently approved Travelodge (10/0851/FUL) is in accordance with the outline application at 5 storeys. <p>Officers believe the combined planning history, building heights model and context analysis of the area forms a robust starting point for the consideration of maximum building heights for development proposals. Proposals that seek to break this guidance will need to be tested in a robust way, and applicants will need to demonstrate through the use of 3D computer modelling the impact on key views and vistas to ensure proposals do not unduly impact upon the surrounding context, in line with saved Policy 3/4 of the 2006 Cambridge Local Plan (as required on page 40 of the draft SPD).</p> <p>It must also be noted that figure 38 should be read in conjunction with the supporting text on pages 40-45, which together are seeking to achieve well designed buildings that fit into their context and respond to key views across the Conservation Area. In addition, the City Council are in the process of developing a Skyline Strategy which will set out a robust methodology for assessing 'tall building' proposals. For clarity, tall buildings are defined as buildings which break the skyline and/or are significantly taller than the surrounding built form.</p> <p>In order to address representations regarding roof shapes and design, the document will be reworded to include</p>
--	--

additional sections after section 3.4.3, as set out in section B below. Figure 38 will be reworded to clearly show height expressed as both shoulder height and overall height.

B. Justification of building heights and roof forms

Comments noted. Add the following paragraphs to section 3.4.3

“Building heights are normally expressed in two ways, either in absolute metres or as the number of storeys. Storey heights provide a simple concept of measuring building height, which directly relates to building organisation and use. It is deemed that the location of the study area, being outside of the historic core, justifies the use of storeys within the SPD rather than absolute height measurements. Nevertheless some general assumptions have been made in relation to measured heights. It is assumed that where commercial ground floor uses are proposed, the floor to ceiling height will typically be around 3.5m. Upper floors are assumed to have a 2.7m floor to ceiling height (assuming 300 – 400 mm construction depth for floors).

It is acknowledged that there will be some difference in floor to ceiling heights between buildings. However small changes are acceptable and indeed can help to provide a greater variation in roofscape.

Two figures are referred to within the SPD in respect to heights; shoulder height and overall height. The building shoulder height is the sheer height of a building at the back of the footway up to the eaves or parapet height. It is recognised that many buildings have additional storeys as a set back or within the roof space. Overall height refers to the height of the building measured from the level of the pavement to the ridge of the roof or the top of any flat roof, including set back floors”.

Figure 38 will be amended to indicate the shoulder height and overall height of buildings, for example 2 +1 - 3+ 1. This signifies that building heights should generally have a shoulder height of between 2 and 3 storeys and an overall height of between 3 and 4 storeys, providing the upper floor is set back. In the event of a building not having a shoulder height, reference will be made to the overall height.

KEY ISSUE 5 - Minimum Cycle Lane Widths

<p>Concerns</p> <p>Reps 5311, 5371, 5381, 5401 (Para 3.2.5) Reps 5354, (Para 4.1.6) Reps 5336, 5340, 5356, 5360, 5372, 5373, 5386, 5387, 5409 (Para 4.4.4) Reps 5341, 5342, 5357, 5356, 5363, 5364, 5369, 5370, 5379, 5396, 5410(Para 4.4.5, bullet point 3) Reps 5362, 5386, 5406 (Figure 50) Rep 5385 (Para 4.2.1)</p>	<p>Twenty-two representations raised objections and 7 raised comments in relation to the width of proposed cycle lanes on Newmarket Road. These comments were submitted by local residents, Cambridge Cycling Campaign and Sustrans (East of England). The draft SPD document states that a minimum width of 1.5m will be provided for the two proposed cycle lanes on either side of Newmarket Road. Representations suggested the minimum width should be 2m.</p>
<p>Draft response and consequential changes to the SPD</p>	<p>Although it is preferable to insist on 2m minimum continuous cycle lanes across the city, the physical space within road corridors will not always permit this. Section 6.2.5 of Manual For Street 2 states: "Cycle lanes should be 2m on busy roads, or where traffic is travelling in excess of 40 mph. A minimum width of 1.5m may generally be generally acceptable on roads with a 30 mph limit"</p> <p>Section 4.3.5 of the SPD states: "The design strategy for the improvement of Newmarket road/ East road is based upon the premise of a design speed of around 20 mph. This could be enforced by a formal speed limit, but must be linked to a detail design that changes the character, width and geometry of the streetscape".</p> <p>Newmarket Road and East Road are highly constrained. The draft SPD has allowed for a minimum 1.8m wide footpath on either side of the street, two 3m wide vehicle carriageways, two</p>

	<p>3.1 m wide bus lanes and two 3m wide bus shelter islands in some sections.</p> <p>As part of the detail design of any project, City Council Officers will endeavour to maximise widths of cycle paths to 2 metres.</p> <p>The design of the key projects will require extensive consultation with Cambridge County Council Highways. Traffic modelling will be undertaken to assess a variety of options in relation to road layout.</p> <p>No changes to the SPD are proposed.</p>
<p>KEY ISSUE 6 - Two Way Traffic on Harvest Way (As proposed in Key Project 5)</p>	
<p>Concerns</p> <p>Reps 5259 (Para 3.2.11) 5459 (Para 4.5.1 5461, 5265 (Para 4.5.7)</p>	<p>Two residents raised objections and the Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT) made two comments to Key Project 5 which proposed the re-instatement of 2 way traffic to Harvest Way and New Street, such objections centralised on the potential for ‘rat-running’ and road rage. Cambridge Cycle Campaign supported the proposals but suggested New Street and Harvest Way needed to be designed to slow traffic to prevent them being used as a ‘rat-run’ for cars dodging the Newmarket Road/East Road Junctions.</p>
<p>Draft response and consequential changes to the SPD</p>	<p>Key project 5 explores ways of improving the gateways into the Petersfield area and offers a fresh approach to creating civilised and inclusive streets which prioritises the needs of residents. Manual For Streets 1 and 2 and The Cambridge Design Guide, along with numerous High Street redevelopments including Kensington High Street and Ashford Ring Road, take an alternative approach to managing vehicles in the urban environment. Given the location of Harvest Way and New Street in the wider network, Officers feel that it is appropriate to investigate an alternative approach to highway design given the existing highway arrangement.</p> <p>Key project 5 looks at the whole of New Street and Harvest Way to deliver a coherent arrangement and not just to the reinstatement of two-way traffic. The project will include a comprehensive review with Cambridgeshire County Council Highway Authority to examine the feasibility of the proposals.</p> <p>No changes to the SPD are proposed.</p>
<p>KEY ISSUE 7 - Character Appraisal (Figure 20)</p>	
<p>Concerns</p>	<p>A. <u>Character appraisal (Figure 20)</u></p>

Reps 5421, 5504 (Figure 20)	<p>Representations received from some residents suggested figure 20 was confusing as the character appraisal had been based on the historic period of building construction and considered that the poor quality buildings fronting Newmarket Road and East Road form a character area in their own right and should be identified separately. Representations from Cambridgeshire County Council suggested Figure 20 showed areas where no character had been identified.</p>
	<p>B. <u>Classification of Open Space areas</u> Further representations suggested areas surrounding the Howard Mallet Centre should be highlighted as open space area.</p>

<p>Draft response and consequential changes to the SPD</p>	<p>A. <u>Character appraisal (Figure 20)</u> Figure 20: character appraisal will be amended. In line with best practice, Townscape Character areas and Townscape Types will be differentiated. Townscape Character Areas are geographically unique areas of a town, and Townscape Types are generic and can occur in different parts of the town. Townscape Character Areas are likely to reflect a high degree of consistency of factors such as layout, vegetation and building type, but be unique in terms of their location. It can also be the case that a Townscape Character Area contains a high degree of small-scale variation and diversity and it is that which creates a strong sense of place. It is proposed to produce an additional townscape character area map, which will show geographically specific areas. The existing Figure 20 is more akin to a townscape type map. This plan will be amended to include a new type - Principle Transport Route along Newmarket Road and East Road.</p> <p>Figure 20 will be amended to townscape character areas and townscape types.</p> <p>B. <u>Classification of Open Space areas</u> The open space area indicated on St Matthew's Piece in figure 20 represents the area designated as Protected Open Space. Land to the north and south of the Howard Mallett Centre site lies outside of this designated area and should not be shown as open space.</p> <p>No changes to SPD are proposed.</p>
KEY ISSUE 8 - Open Space Provision	
<p>Concerns</p> <p>5465 (Para 1.4.1) 5421 (Figure 20) 5448 (Para 3.3.7) 5462 (Para 3.4.17)</p>	<p>A. <u>Identification of the former Howard Mallet Centre as a proposed redevelopment site</u> Local residents, PACT and Cambridge Past, Present and Future (PPF) raised a number of objections in relation to the identification of the former Howard Mallet Centre as a proposed redevelopment site within the SPD. There is a strong desire amongst residents to relocate the building and return the space entirely to Protected Open Space.</p> <p>B. <u>Protected Open Spaces</u> Representations from Cambridge Past Present and Future (CPPF) also noted all green spaces labelled as open space should be labelled as Protected Open Space.</p> <p>Representations from Riverside Residents Association (RARA) suggested a specific principal should be introduced</p>

	<p>in the SPD that requires developers to provide adequate public and private green space within developments, rather than allowing commuted S106 payments.</p>
--	---

	<p>By way of background_paragraphs 3.4.17 and 3.4.18 (Howard Mallet Centre Development Principles) were added to the SPD following consultation and approval of the draft Eastern Gate Visioning Document. It was felt important to establish key development principles should the site come forward for redevelopment.</p>
--	--

<p>Draft response and consequential changes to the SPD</p>	<p>A. <u>Identification of the former Howard Mallet Centre as a proposed redevelopment site</u> The Howard Mallett Centre is currently in private ownership and could only be returned to Public Open Space if it was purchased by an interested party or by the City Council. The cost of acquisition and demolition is currently unknown. Towards the end of the process of preparing the Eastern Gate Visioning Document, Officers felt it was important to establish key development principles should the site come forward for redevelopment. The draft SPD (Paragraph 3.4.18) notes the potential to increase the size of St Matthew's Piece through the promotion of a reduced building footprint in comparison to the existing Howard Mallett Centre building, and also notes the potential for a contribution of S106 monies to enhance the existing open space.</p> <p>B. <u>Protected Open Spaces</u> It is not the role of the Eastern Gate Development Framework SPD to designate Protected Open Spaces. This work is carried out as part of the development of the Open Space and Recreation Strategy, the draft of which has recently been issued for consultation and will feed into the Local Plan Review. New Street Allotments, Midsummer Common and St Matthew's Piece are already designated as Protected Open Space on the Cambridge Proposals Map (February 2008) and the draft Open Space and Recreation Strategy proposes that they will continue to be designated as Protected Open Space.</p> <p>Assessment of these sites will not enhance green space coverage for the local area in its own right, but indications of quantitative and/or qualitative deficits can be made through the Open Space and Recreation Strategy. Solutions to address shortcomings can then be carried forward into developing the Council's policies and priorities.</p> <p>Boundaries of Protected Open Space areas will be amended to ensure consistency between figures 16, 20, 24, 29, 30, 31 and 38.</p>
<p>KEY ISSUE 9 - Visual and Physical links through development sites</p>	
<p>Concerns 5441 (Para 3.2.3), 5426 (Figure 30) 5428</p>	<p>A number of representations were received from local residents, Riverside Area Residents Association and Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT) in relation to the erosion of physical links in the general area and across new development sites within Newmarket Road.</p>

(Figure 31)	<p>Representations from PACT noted the aspiration of the physical link from Simperts Walk (to the west of the allotments) to Newmarket Road were in danger of being lost.</p> <p>Residents considered figure 30 did not show a block structure that supported the principles outlined in paragraphs 3.2.3 and 3.2.7 in order to promote north-south connections, enabling a permeable urban grain.</p> <p>By way of background, following consultation on the Eastern Gate Visioning Document the 'indicative pedestrian cycle links' on the Movement and Circulation Strategy map was removed in light of the recent approval of the Travelodge application, strategy maps relating to Open Space (figure 31) and Built Form (figure 38).</p>
Draft response and consequential changes to the SPD	<p>The physical links shown on the July 2010 Draft Eastern Gate Visioning Document for Consultation indicated a pedestrian/cycle links through Local Plan (2006) Proposal Site 7.01, linking Harvest Way and the south side of Newmarket Road. These were later removed from the Final Draft of the Eastern Gate Visioning Document, which was approved in February 2011 in light of the recent Travelodge application. The strategy maps relating to open space (figure 31) and built form, scale and massing (figure 38) have been amended to encourage the exploration of new visual links.</p> <p>The 'opportunities for visual links' indicated on the key for figure 31 is missing. The figure will be amended to show the additional visual link between the Travelodge and Residential schemes.</p>

3.13 A number of changes to the SPD arose from the consultation. Resulting changes to the SPD are set out in Appendices C1. New text is highlighted in yellow print, changes to maps and plans have been highlighted within a yellow box.

3.14 In accordance with European regulations, a Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report was prepared in relation to the SPD. This assessment appraises the potential effects of the SPD, both alone and in combination with other plans, on a number of internationally designated sites of conservation importance. No negative impacts are envisaged as a result of changes to the SPD.

Next Steps

- 3.15 Following approval for adoption, final versions of the SPD and SA will be formatted and made available on the Council's website.
- 3.16 At the time of adoption, the Council must publish on its website the statement set out in Appendices A and B (representations received and how they have been addressed in the SPD and SA), and the Adoption Statement set out in Appendix F1

4. Implications

Financial Implications

- 4.1 Funding of future infrastructure projects is set out in further detail in Chapter 4 of the draft SPD. Funding of individual projects will depend on the project, relevance to development sites and project lead. In the case of any projects taking place within the public highway, the lead authority will be the County Council given that it is the Highways Authority. It is likely that several funding sources will be necessary from several different parties in order to realise the complete "Vision" for the area. Given the scale and complexity of the issues addressed in the SPD, such a Vision will likely take a number of years to realise.

Staffing Implications

- 4.2 There are no significant direct staffing or procurement issues arising from this report. Staffing resources are already committed through the budget and service plan process.

Equal Opportunities Implications

- 4.3 A stage 1 Equalities Impact Assessment has been prepared in relation to the draft SPD. No negative impacts on equalities were identified as a result of the assessment. No further work will be required.

Environmental Implications

- 4.4 The improvement of the Eastern Gate area as set out in the draft SPD, has the potential to considerably improve the environmental quality of the area.
- 4.5 A Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has been carried out as an integral part of the SPD.

- 4.6 A climate change rating indicated a medium positive impact (+M) could be achieved for the Eastern Gate Area. The opportunity for the SPD to reduce carbon emissions includes improving the pedestrian and cycling environment, thereby enhancing the practicality and attractiveness of sustainable modes of transport and increasing the opportunities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Carbon savings can be achieved from the development of new buildings to high sustainability standards. The reduction in car parking and improvements to the pedestrian and cycling environment within the study area should also help to reduce emissions from transport.

Consultation

- 4.7 In accordance with the process for preparing an SPD, consultation was carried out for a 6-week period between June and July 2011. This consultation was in line with the standards set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended). This consultation was also consistent with the Council's Code of Best Practice.

Community Safety

- 4.8 The improvement of the Eastern Gate area as set out in the draft SPD has the potential to significantly improve the quality, attractiveness and safety of the public realm in the area.

5. Background papers

- 5.1 The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:
- Approved Eastern Gate Visioning Document, February 2011.
 - Eastern Gate Development Framework SPD Draft for Consultation March 2011.
 - Eastern Gate Development Framework SPD Sustainability Appraisal.
 - Draft Eastern Gate Development Framework Equalities Impact Assessment.
 - Cambridge Local Plan, July 2006.

- Statement of Community Involvement – A Consultation Strategy for Planning in Cambridge, adopted September 2007.

6. Appendices

Appendix A1: Summary of representations to the SPD and Officer Assessment (Regulation 18 (4) (b) Statement)

Appendix B1: Summary of representations on the Sustainability Appraisal and Officer Assessment (Regulation 18 (4) (b) Statement)

Appendix C1: Revised Eastern Gate Development Framework SPD with track changes

Appendix D1: Sustainability Appraisal

Appendix E1: Statement of Consultation (including SA statement)

Appendix F1: Adoption statement (Regulation 16 (2) and 19 Statement)

7. Inspection of papers

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Author's Name: Matthew Paul
Author's Phone Number: 01223 457391
Author's Email: Matthew.paul@cambridge.gov.uk