

Appendix A1: Representation Response Report

Eastern Gate Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document

Public Participation Report

1. Introduction & Background

1.1.1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1. Introduction & Background				
1.1.1				
5243 - Highways Agency	Comment	Thank you for sending me a copy of the above consultation document. On this occasion the Highways Agency do not intend to submit any comments as it appears it will not have a material impact upon the strategic road network.	Comment noted.	
5411 - Drivers Jonas Deloitte	Comment	Prupim commenting on behalf of the owners of the Grafton Centre confirm that they are broadly in support of the framework but would appreciate being involved directly in any further Public and Stakeholder Consultation prior to the adoption of this framework document	No additional public consultation or stakeholder consultation will be undertaken prior to the adoption of the SPD. A mail drop to all landowners and residents was undertaken on 19th and 20th July 2010. The public consultation on the visioning document was also open for input from all interested parties between 26th July and 17th September. However the owners of the Grafton Centre will be consulted as part of any further design studies in respect to key projects and will be consulted on upcoming applications within the study area.	
5245	Support	Overall I feel the proposals are excellent. However, I do have one immediate concern: there is a risk that these proposals will be undermined should the council approve developments shortly to come before Planning Committee, in particular the residential block proposed between the consented Travelodge and Cambridge Refrigeration Technology.	Comments noted. The travelodge was approved in March 2011. The building heights for the travelodge were brought down to 4 storeys with a set back 5th storey after long negotiations. The application was approved prior to commencement on the SPD. The proposed residential block between the travelodge site is currently being reviewed. At present the height is proposed as 4 storeys with a fifth storey set back.	
5261 5262 5308 - anne ramsay 5314 - Anglia Ruskin University	Support	Support the production of the draft Eastern Gate Development Framework SPD.	Comments noted	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5276 - Anglian Water 5399 5412 5413 5414 5437 - Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA) 5456 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT) 5457 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT) 5464 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Support	Support the production of the draft Eastern Gate Development Framework SPD.	Comments Noted	
5344 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Support	<p>Cambridge Cycling Campaign welcomes and supports this supplementary planning document. This part of Cambridge is currently very car-dominated and offers a hostile environment to both cyclists and pedestrians, and we welcome the proposal to reduce this car-dominance and make the environment much more cycle- and pedestrian friendly.</p> <p>We would, however, like to make it clear that although all these changes have our support in principle, the detail of any road changes is critical and we would want to be consulted on the detail of any given change before we could give it our complete support.</p> <p>We do have some reservations and suggestions.</p>	Comments noted. Cambridge County Council Highways will undertake detailed design and traffic modelling before any key projects can be agreed. Cambridge Cycling Campaign will be consulted as part of this detailed design process.	
5493 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council strongly supports the vision of the Eastern Gate Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) encompassing "Breaking down the barriers ... reconnecting people, reconnecting place."	Comments noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>1.2.2</i>				
5315 - Anglia Ruskin University	Comment	Purpose - we note the SPD has been informed by meetings and discussion with local residents groups. Given the collaborative nature of planning, it is disappointing that such discussions have not taken place with landowners and businesses in the area regarding the preparation of the SPD.	<p>The production of the draft Eastern Gate visioning Document and draft SPD involved extensive consultation with residents, key stakeholders and landowners as highlighted in the approved Eastern Gate Visioning Document.</p> <p>On the evening of the 9th November 2009, Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT) and Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA) held a public meeting themed 'Your Community-Your Future'. The purpose of the meeting was to begin a debate about how residents see their local area developing and in doing so, improve links between residents of Riverside, Petersfield and the neighbouring area of Brunswick. To facilitate this, Officers from the Joint Urban Design Team were invited along to the evening to run an exercise aimed at getting people involved, in a 'hands-on' way, in expressing their visions for the future of the area, this formed the first steps of consultation with local residents groups.</p> <p>A mail drop to all landowners, residents and businesses was undertaken on the 19th and 20th July 2010 for approximately 2450 properties that fell within or close to the study area. The leaflet drop advertised the draft Eastern Gate Visioning Document was open for consultation for an 8-week period between 26th July and 17th September 2010. Following this, a day long staffed public exhibition too place from 2pm-9pm on 11th October 2010 at Christ Church, located close to the study area.</p>	

Appendix A1: Representation Response Report

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>1.2.4</i>				
5438 - Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA)	Support	<p>We strongly support the purpose, vision and objectives stated here.</p> <p>1.2.4 We believe Local Plan policies 3/13 (Tall Buildings and the Skyline) and 4/11 (Conservation Areas) are also particularly important for this area. Newmarket Road is a local ridgeway, with a 7m drop in land height to the river. Tall buildings therefore have an especially dominant impact on their surroundings. Newmarket Road is also embedded within a largely residential area, with Conservation Areas to north and south - not simply a highway or a commercial development zone.</p>	Comments noted	
<i>1.2.5</i>				
5439 - Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA)	Comment	<p>1.2.5 We are pleased that the SPD will be a key material consideration in determining planning applications. We hope that the principles set out here will be robustly and consistently enforced.</p>	Comments noted.	
<i>1.3.4</i>				
5247	Comment	<p>The SPD, if approved, will not have official status until sometime in the autumn, but inspectors usually rule, when matters go to appeal, that emerging policy should be taken into account. In several respects the SPD will be so much scrap paper if the residential block is approved.</p>	<p>Comments noted. For some time there has been widespread recognition for the need to improve the environment within the Eastern Gate Study Area. Over the years the area has been subject to a number of planning applications, some of which are still extant.</p> <p>It is important change within the area is appropriately planned, the SPD will provide a framework that will co-ordinate and guide future redevelopment in line with Local Plan Policies. Once approved the SPD will be a key material consideration in the determination of planning applications.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>1.4.1</i>				
5465 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	Chapter 1.4 - Vision and objectives - Greenspace notion has not sufficiently been tackled and CambridgePPF strongly objects to the notion that St Matthews's Piece should be labelled as a development site now and at any future time. The current community centre in time should be moved to a more suitable location to enable the green space to be enlarged and thus better catering a community underprovided in public open spaces. We request the change from "potential development site" is made "to green space"- (changes need to be made to Figures 2 and 30 as well as to Chapter 3.3. Open Space - 3.3.3 Block structure should have an additional bullet point - i.e. "to enhance the area of St Matthews Green Space by taking the opportunity to significantly increase the area of St Matthews Green Space"; ditto para 3.3.4 benefits of increased green space should be made. Fig 31 Remove word "potential" and replace with "essential" to increase the size of St Matthew's Piece and add within overall text that finding such as Section 106 Monies or SCIL should be collected so that in time the space can be purchased from the Landowner (Cambridgeshire County Council?). Overall the boundaries of St Matthews as "open space" or "Protected Open Space" is inconsistent - check e.g. Figures 16, 20,24,29,30, etc.	Concerns noted. However, 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. 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. In relation to the two other sites marked as open space on Figure 20, officers from the Council's Planning Policy team have confirmed that they will assess them against the criteria for assessing Protected Open Space. 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, which can then be carried forward into developing the Council's policies and priorities. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy is a key document and evidence base for the Local Plan Review. Through the Local Plan Review the Council's Planning Policies for the protection and designation of open space in Cambridge will be updated.	Boundaries of protected open space areas will be reviewed to ensure consistency between figures 16, 20, 24, 29, 30, 31 and 38.
5286 - Allia Limited 5316 - Anglia Ruskin University	Comment	We consider that the vision and objectives are somewhat confused. 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. We suggest that the vision be re-worded to "The vision for the study area is to regenerate and transform the gateway to the city centre through high quality development and to break down the barriers to movement and connectivity".	Comments noted. We propose to reword the vision to the following: " 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."	Reword the vision to the following: " 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."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5318 - Sustrans East of England	Support	<p>We support the Vision and Objectives. The 1970's Elizabeth Way viaduct and roundabout are inimical to the character and development of Cambridge as a place for people to experience and enjoy, putting roads before streetscapes, and traffic movement before people. The Eastern Gate area is a key confluence of east-west and north-south movements. These movements should be of people (walking, cycling or on public transport) not of private motor vehicles.</p> <p>Vision needs expanding to emphasise the need for "street", "people" and "conviviality" or similar. (see Manual for Streets, 1 and 2)</p> <p>The objectives should not merely "promote" but "create".</p>	<p>Support noted. The objectives contained within the SPD are high-level, it would not be appropriate to change 'promote' with 'creation' on all objectives. The Visioning however will be reword to the following:</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>	<p>Reword the Vision as "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>
<i>1.4.2</i>				
5320 - Sustrans East of England	Comment	<p>Regeneration and redevelopment of the area (if incorporated into the final SPD) will best be delivered by the creation of streets for people (see MfS 1,2) not by increasing motor traffic access.</p> <p>See our comments on the objectives in Vision 1.4.1</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	
5317 - Anglia Ruskin University	Comment	<p>Objectives - whilst we support the objectives, we consider that they are rather limited in their aspects. The objectives should include delivering regeneration and redevelopment of the underused assets of the area as a means to enhancing the entrance to the city centre.</p>	<p>Comments noted. We will add to the objectives the following:</p> <p>"Delivering regeneration and redevelopment of the underused assets of the areas as a means to enhancing the entrance to the city centre"</p>	<p>Add to the objectives the following:</p> <p>"Delivering regeneration and redevelopment of the underused assets of the areas as a means to enhancing the entrance to the city centre"</p>
<i>Bullet 2</i>				
5312	Comment	<p>This is good, but the wording is too weak. Replace "promote the creation" with "Create". Promotion is not enough. We need real improvements. Suggested rewording: "Create safer, more civilised and inclusive streets, which prioritise pedestrians and cyclists."</p>	<p>Comments noted. Agree, suggested text changes to the objectives will be made to bullet point 2, paragraph 1.4.2 to read as 'Create safer, more civilised and inclusive streets, which priorities pedestrians and cyclists'</p>	<p>Amend bullet point 2, paragraph 1.4.2 to Create safer, more civilised and inclusive streets, which priorities pedestrians and cyclists'</p>

Appendix A1: Representation Response Report

1. Introduction & Background

1.4.2, Bullet 2

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5325 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Support	<p>Cambridge Cycling Campaign welcomes and supports this supplementary planning document. This part of Cambridge is currently very car-dominated and offers a hostile environment to both cyclists and pedestrians, and we welcome the proposal to reduce this car-dominance and make the environment much more cycle- and pedestrian friendly.</p> <p>We would, however, like to make it clear that although all these changes have our support in principle, the detail of any road changes is critical and we would want to be consulted on the detail of any given change before we could give it our complete support.</p>	Comments noted. Cambridge County Council Highways will undertake detailed design and traffic modelling with the City Council before any key projects can be progressed. Cambridge Cycling Campaign will be consulted as part of this detailed design process.	
<i>Bullet 8</i>				
5287 - Allia Limited	Comment	<p>It seems to us that the whole regeneration of the Eastern Gate area will, essentially, be development led, and it seems rather strange therefore to not give greater prominence to this criterion within the overall set of objectives. A number of the other objectives flow from the redevelopment and regeneration proposals, not the other way round and it seems to us that the ordering of the objectives needs to be reconsidered.</p>	The ordering of bullet points do not necessarily reflect their relative importance. However we propose to bring forward bullet point 8 to bullet point 4.	Amend the ordering of key objectives listed in paragraph 1.4.2 switch bullet point 8 with bullet point 4
<i>Bullet 9</i>				
5288 - Allia Limited	Object	<p>Whilst it is accepted that development should add to the quality of the immediate neighbourhood, we consider it to be inappropriate for an SPD document such as this to seek to go beyond the statutory position regarding development in Conservation Areas. The statutory test is one of either preservation or enhancement, and whilst it could be concluded that a good deal of development in the area will almost certainly enhance the area, it ought to be made clear that the statutory requirement is preservation as a baseline and enhancement if at all possible.</p>	<p>The quality of the northern peripheral areas of the Mill Road and St Matthews sections of the Central Conservation Area has been eroded over the years by overly bulky, low quality developments. It is an entirely reasonable objective to expect development within the study area to enhance this section of the Conservation Area. Whilst the strict statutory test for development is to conserve or enhance the conservation area. It would be inappropriate to merely preserve the character of the aforementioned areas. However the wording of the text will be changed to:</p> <p>"Preserve or enhance the conservation area and the setting of historically significant buildings."</p>	Amend paragraph 1.4.2 Bullet point 9 to "Preserve or enhance the conservation area and the setting of historically significant buildings."

Appendix A1: Representation Response Report

1. Introduction & Background

Figure 2: Eastern Gate Study Area

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Figure 2: Eastern Gate Study Area</i>				
5415 5416	Comment	The study area could be extended to encompass East Road as far as Norfolk Street, and Newmarket Road as far as the railway bridge.	Whilst the study area has been defined by a red line, the context immediately beyond the red line has been taken into account during the assessment process. The site was not extended to Norfolk Street due to a lack of development areas being identified within this area. Likewise with respect to extending the boundary to the northeast, no development sites have been identified within this area. Naturally there are finite resources available at present in relation to undertaking such studies. It may be possible to extend the study area to include these areas at a later date as part of a separate study.	
5367 - unex holdings limited	Object	The site of the former Atrium Club, as bounded by Severn Place, Newmarket Road and East Road should be listed as an "other potential development site" on Figure 2. Redevelopment of this site would significantly improve the townscape and public realm environment of this part of the City. The proposed development would also provide much needed City Centre housing and would provide a new pedestrian/cycle route from East Road to Newmarket Road and on to the river.	Disagree. This is on the basis that Unex Holdings Limited are involved in pre-application discussions with Cambridge City Council regarding redevelopment of the Atrium Site. It would be inappropriate to set out the scale and massing of the development without further pre-application discussions with the applicant. Accordingly we consider it would be problematic to include this site on other plans at this stage. By not including the Atrium Site we are not prejudicing future development or options that may come forward on this site.	
5289 - Allia Limited	Support	On behalf of Allia, we support the identification of the former Howard Mallet Centre site at the junction of New Street/Sturton Street as a potential development site. We anticipate bringing proposals for that site forward in the not too distant future, and therefore welcome the Council's acknowledgement that there is likely to be change within the immediate area.	Comments noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
2. Context Analysis				
2.1.1				
5495 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	The County Council agrees with the assessment of the character of the Newmarket Road area set out through the chapter. Similarly the County Council generally supports the individual design criteria set out in Chapter 4, subject to detailed design and testing. Taken together, they are an accurate summary of the existing situation and a good vision for how matters might be improved.	Comments noted.	
5417	Comment	Context analysis could also cover the context of change and the key role of East Rd, Coldham's Lane, Newmarket Road and Sturton Street (for cycles in particular) as part of the broader transport network now and in the context of continued growth in and around the city - in particular focussed on the importance of these corridors for public transport and cycling movements.	Comments noted. Chapter 2 forms a full and detailed appraisal of the context surrounding the Eastern Gate Study Area.	
5500 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	The archaeological significance of the area lies in the location of Barnwell Priory (HER 04653) founded in this location in the early 11th century. The surviving buildings include the Church of St Andrew the Less and the Cellarer's Chequer, possibly originally a kitchen. The Priory precinct may have extended from Walnut Tree Lane (now Avenue) in the west to Saxon Road and Godestone Road in the east, although 19th century quarrying makes the western limit difficult to trace. Associated lay settlement is likely to have been located to the south of Newmarket Road.	Comments noted. The text in paragraph 2.1.1 will be amended.	<p>amend paragraph 2.1.2 to</p> <p>'Barnwell Priory (Historic Environment Record (HER 04653), which was originally founded in the 11th Century at Castle Hill, but later moved to its present site in 1112 has played a major role in shaping the area.</p> <p>However, there is little left now apart from the 12th century Church of St Andrew-the-Less (refer to figure 10), a building known as the Cellarer's Chequer (possibility used originally as a kitchen). The Priory Precinct may have extended from Walnut Tree Lane (now Walnut Tree Avenue) in the west to Saxon Road and Godesdone Road in the east. The 16th Century building of Abbey House now stands on what used to be Barnwell Priory.'</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5499 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	The historical context would benefit from some amendment. There is some evidence for Iron Age and Roman rural settlement in the vicinity of Newmarket Road and Fen Ditton, but no evidence to suggest that Newmarket Road dates from the Roman period. Most produce from the east (including from the Horningsea Pottery kilns) would have been brought to the Roman town by river. The present route probably dates from the medieval period, linking Cambridge with Stourbridge Common and the villages to the east.	Comments noted. The text in paragraph 2.1.2 will be amended to include details of the Iron Age and Roman rural settlements in the vicinity of Newmarket Road.	Amend paragraph 2.1.2 to 'From the Medieval period Newmarket Road has been used as a main route linking Stourbridge Common and villages to the East to the City Centre. Areas surrounding Newmarket Road date back to a much earlier Iron Age and Roman Rural Settlement where produce from the east including that from the Horningsea Pottery Kilns would have been brought into the town by river'.
5502 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	Development impacts on archaeology will of course vary depending on the location and character of development proposals. The Council would recommend that the SPD includes reference to the Historic Environment Record, managed by the County Council. The Council would also recommend that the SPD promotes early consultation with the County Council Historic Environment Team, to ensure that archaeological assessments are appropriate targeted and proportionate to the potential archaeological significance of the area.	Comments noted, reference to the Historic Environment Record will be made in section 2.1. A map of Archaeological remains surrounding the Eastern Gate Study Area will be included.	Additional text to include as new paragraph between 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 'Cambridge Historic Environment Record The Cambridge Historic Record (CHER) forms a comprehensive record of archaeological sites and finds in Cambridgeshire. Figure x shows that the Eastern Gate study area contains 6 Archeological sites. The archaeological sites within the study area range from Paleolithic finds (500,000 to 10001 BC) on Occupation Road, late prehistoric pottery fields (4000 BC to 42 AD) on New Street, to remains relating to Britannia Ironworks (19th Century to 21st Century) on the Mackays site. The Historic Environment Team at the County Council provides archaeological interpretation, and it is recommended that any development proposal be referred to the County Council's archaeologists for advice as part of the pre-application process.'
5498 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council strongly supports the inclusion of the Historic Environment in the document and as listed under Section 5, Planning Requirements.	Comments noted.	
<i>2.1.4</i>				
5501 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	The 19th century industrial heritage of the area is also of significance, as detailed in the development framework document.	Comments noted.	

Appendix A1: Representation Response Report

2. Context Analysis

2.1.7

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
2.1.7				
5418	Comment	2.1.7 COMMENT Could note the presence in the historic map of trees along much of the length of Newmarket Rd - only a handful of which now remain (immediately west of the Elizabeth Way roundabout and further east nr the junction with Stanley Road).	Comments noted. Reference to the trees on the historic map will be added to the end of 2.1.7 as follows: The 1925 OS map shows a single row of trees along Newmarket Road. These trees have been lost over substantial sections of Newmarket Road.	Reference to the trees on the historic map will be added to the end of 2.1.7 as follows: The 1925 OS map shows a single row of trees along Newmarket Road. These trees have been lost over substantial sections of Newmarket Road.
2.2.1				
5419	Comment	2.2.1 COMMENT Question what a 'weak gateway' is - and why strong gateways are required when the aim is to create a permeable, high quality, human scaled (i.e. not traffic driven) environment across the whole area - rather than defining through the introduction of 'gateways' (clutter?) areas which belong to cars (i.e. the main roads) and areas that belong to people (i.e. the residential areas)?	Comment noted. This section of the document is purely an analysis of the existing situation. The existing junction does provide a poor quality, weak entrance to the city. Strong gateways can be announced through the design and placement of buildings or changes in paving. It is not the intention for gateways to be marked by excessive clutter or extravagant over-provision of public art.	
5366 - Sustrans East of England	Comment	This section should make clear that the area is the confluence of east-west and north-south cycle desire lines. All areas of Cambridge are within cycling distance of each other. At present traffic-heavy Newmarket Road forms an obstacle to cycling from Abbey district, where the area around the Park-and-Ride is earmarked for short or medium term expansion. There is almost certainly suppressed demand for cycling from east of the railway.	Comments noted. The importance of the study area as a confluence of east west and north south cycle desire lines will be noted. The role of Newmarket Road as a physical barrier, which is deterring potential cyclists, will also be added to bullet point 4: "The nature of Newmarket Road also serves to present a barrier to cycle movement from the east, beyond the railway line discouraging many potential cyclists	Add to bullet point 4: "The nature of Newmarket Road also serves to present a barrier to cycle movement from the east, beyond the railway line discouraging many potential cyclists
5440 - Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA)	Support	We agree with the analysis at 2.2.1 that the area is dominated by vehicles, hostile for pedestrians and cyclists, and divided by the Newmarket Road 'barrier'. We strongly support the aspirations set out in 3.2.3-10.	Comments noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Figure 15</i>				
5503 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	Pages 18-19 - the maps appear to be incomplete and do not identify all locations for evening entertainment venues or open space. It would be helpful if this can be rectified.	Comments noted. Figure 16 will be reviewed to show all locations for evening activities, additional areas of Open space including Parkers Piece, Christ's Piece, Stourbridge Common and Coldham's Common will be included.	Action - review locations of additional 'Buildings with Evening Activities' and Open Spaces.
5319 - Anglia Ruskin University	Comment	Land use and activity (2.3) - Figure 15 identifies theoretical walking distances. It is unclear what this figure shows or its purpose. The distance will vary dependent upon where the site is located within the area. Locations within 400 and 800 meters of Anglia Ruskin's Young St. Site are quite different to those from West's Garage.	Comments noted. The figure will be amended to show the theoretical walking distances from the study boundary. The figure will demonstrate how local facilities marked by coloured pins are easily accessible by foot from all areas within the study area. Reference to the key will be made to clarify facilities.	Amend figure 15 to show walking catchment from the boundary edge of the Eastern Gate Study Area.
<i>Figure 16</i>				
5321 - Anglia Ruskin University 5322 - Anglia Ruskin University	Comment	Figure 16 does not accurately portray the Anglia Ruskin Young St. Site. It shows the eastern park of the site in education use, although the area shown extends beyond that of the nursery school. Part of the nursery school is shown without any notation (being white) and the frontage to Sturton St is shown as retail, when in fact it is residential use. The remainder of the site is shown as grey (denoting vacant). Whilst much of the area of the formally occupied by CRC is not currently being used, part of the site is used by Anglia Ruskin. However, in any event the site has an established use for education. We suggest the whole of the Anglia Ruskin's land ownership be identified as education.	Comments noted. The figure will be amended.	The whole of the Anglia Ruskin's land ownership will be shown as education use, the frontage to Sturton Street will be shown as residential land use.
5420	Comment	Figure 16 COMMENT - full extent of open space (i.e. POS) at St. Matthews Piece not shown	Comments noted. The plans will be amended.	Figure 16 will be amended to show the full extent of Public Open Space areas.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Figure 20</i>				
5421	Comment	<p>Figure 20 seems to confuse use, historic period of construction (of buildings) and character.</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the full extend of open space around the Citylde/Howard Mallett should be coloured green with the building itself only highlighted as 20th C building (similar to how the remnants of the Abbey are depicted on the plan) - the poor quality open highway + bulky building character of East Road is not identified separately - the 20c housing west of St. Matthews Road is not identified as a separate character area 	<p>Comments noted. 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>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>	Amend figure 20 to show townscape character areas and townscape types.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5504 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	Page 21 - the character appraisal map has some areas which haven't been shaded. It would be helpful if the reason for this is explained.	Comments noted. 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.	Action - Amend figure 20 to show townscape character areas and townscape types.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5466 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	Fig 20- all green spaces labelled as Open Spaces should all be protected (including labelled space NE of Newmarket Road). Adequate assessment should be made to enhance overall green space coverage in these neighbourhoods.	<p>Concerns noted. However, 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. 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. In relation to the two other sites marked as open space on Figure 20, officers from the Council's Planning Policy team have confirmed that they will assess them against the criteria for assessing Protected Open Space. 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, which can then be carried forward into developing the Council's policies and priorities.</p> <p>The Open Space and Recreation Strategy is a key document and evidence base for the Local Plan Review. Through the Local Plan Review the Council's Planning Policies for the protection and designation of open space in Cambridge will be updated.</p>	

Appendix A1: Representation Response Report

2. Context Analysis

Figure 24

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Figure 24</i>				
5422	Comment	<p>Figure 24 COMMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - should include existing mature trees along Newmarket Rd to the west of the roundabout - could better emphasise the structure of planting at St. Matthews Piece by showing the true scale of the 2 main lines of trees (those that run approx N-S) at their full size - highlighting their primacy over the secondary tree planting that curves along York St to the S.E and along the northern edge at New Street - should the East Road/St. Matthews Street and East Rd/Newmarket Rd junctions also be shown as busy junctions? 	Comments noted. The figure will be amended.	<p>Mature trees of townscape value will be shown to the west of Elizabeth Way roundabout on Maid's Causeway.</p> <p>The two lines of trees within St. Matthew's Piece will be shown at the correct scale.</p> <p>The East Road/St. Matthew's Street and Elizabeth Way roundabout will be shown as 'busy junctions'.</p>
5467 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	Fig 24; Fig 42 - semi-mature plane trees outside the now being converted pub (BLI) at the Elizabeth Roundabout are missing and significantly contribute to the streetscape in this harsh streetscape. Retention and enhancement of these existing trees as crucial contributors to the local streetscape.	Comments noted. The figure will be amended.	The semi-mature trees located along Occupation Road, bordering the roundabout will be shown as trees of townscape value.
5475 - Caldecotte Consultants	Comment	Noticed a factual error on the plan on Page 23 of the document that needs to be corrected. This error wrongly highlights The Seven Stars PH as a Building of Local Interest. The Seven Stars is not a Building of Local Interest. However, The Rose & Crown (now The Corner House) is a Building of Local Interest, however this is not shown on the plan.	Comments noted - The Seven Stars is not a BLI and the plan will be amended. Disagree - The Rose and Crown Pub is correctly shown as a BLI.	Remove BLI listing shown on the Seven Stars pub.
5323 - Anglia Ruskin University	Comment	Townscape analysis (2.5) - in relation to Anglia Ruskin's Young St. Site, Figure 24 appears to contain a number of errors. The BLI shown on the plan is actually the Brunswick Nursery playground; the Ragged School, which is a BLI is represented by the notation for poor quality frontage.	Comments noted. The figure will be amended.	The Building of Local Interest shown on figure 24 on the Young Street site will be shown on the Old Ragged School.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Figure 28</i>				
5468 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	Fig 28 - new hotel between Harvest Way & Newmarket Road - should be highlighted as site under current redevelopment/ with planning permission to change.	Comments noted. The figure will be amended.	The Travelodge site will be shown as 'site currently under redevelopment'.
5489 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	Comment	Figure 28 is incorrect as regards the massing of the existing buildings on Newmarket Road/Harvest Way east of Abbey Street: these buildings are two storeys high, not three.	Comments noted, figure 28: Existing Scale and Massing will be amended to show 2-2.5 storey buildings fronting Newmarket Road east of Abbey Street.	Amend figure 28 to show two storey buildings fronting Newmarket Road, east of Abbey Street.
<i>2.7.1</i>				
5327 - Savills	Comment	Opportunities and constraints (2.7) - a strength of the area is not just its access to the City Centre, but is accessibility from other locations. For example, there is a bus interchange at the Grafton Centre, which is less than 150 meters from the Young St. Site. The list of strengths should include the area's accessibility.	Comments noted.	The first bullet point will be amended to 'The area is well located for access to the City Centre and the Grafton Centre'
<i>Bullet 1</i>				
5423	Comment	2.7.2 COMMENT There are perhaps other strengths that could be noted? - proximity to river - presence of ARU? - direct ped./cycle links to station - area forms connection between retail areas at grafton centre and cambridge retail park	Comments noted. The text will be amended.	Additional strengths will be added as follows: Proximity to the river Proximity to Anglia Ruskin University Direct pedestrian and cycle links to the railway station

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Bullet 1</i>				
5424	Comment	<p>2.7.3 COMMENT</p> <p>There are perhaps other weaknesses that could be noted?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (close to town centre and town centre uses but...) arrangement of East Road with few crossing locations and a very coarse city grain (in particular because of the layout/limited access through the Grafton Centre) makes these difficult to access. - very poor quality built environment along East Road and Newmarket Rd. - very little positive enclosure or active frontage along East Road - routes between Grafton Centre and Cambridge Retail Park are illegible or unpleasant 	Comments noted. Additional weaknesses will be added.	<p>Additional weaknesses will be added as follows:</p> <p>Area suffers a lack of permeability due to large scale block development such as the Grafton Centre and industrial buildings.</p> <p>Large warehouses and industrial buildings with poor quality, blank frontages contribute little to the townscape or public realm, notably along East Street and Newmarket Road.</p> <p>Poor quality, illegible pedestrian links between Cambridge Retail Park and the Grafton Centre.</p>
<i>Figure 29</i>				
5469 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	Fig 29 - linkages are also needed between Petersfield and Kite and Brunswick and should be enhanced to avoid the main road artery of East Road.	Comments noted. The figure will be amended.	links between communities will be also shown between Petersfield, Kite and Brunswick community areas.
5290 - Allia Limited	Comment	The arrow on this Figure suggests that part of the Howard Mallet site may be sacrificed to provide additional green space. Whilst it cannot be ruled out that a solution may be found which results in an increase in open space to the south of the Howard Malett building it would be premature to presume that and accordingly the draft SPD should not, in our opinion, raise false hope in that regard.	Comments noted. The green arrow will be removed.	Remove green arrow from St Matthew's Piece pointing towards the Howard Mallet Centre

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5425	Comment	<p>Figure 29 COMMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Surely this should be called 'challenges' rather than 'opportunities' - Why the apparently arbitrary extent of the the Petersfield community - excluding houses, businesses etc. north of New Street? - Why no link between Petersfield and area west of east Road shown - key missing link - Links between communities should either be more diagrammatic - i.e. one big arrow directly connecting Petersfeild and Riverside - not apparently dodging around the warehouses on Newmarket Road - or instead perhaps highlight specific *potential *opportunities to link Petersfield to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Riverside i.e. along Sturton St. - Occupation Rd - Abbey Rd; St. Matthew's Gardens - Path to the East of Allotments - linkage to Newmarket Rd. - churchyard - Priory Rd; Harvest Way to Godesdone Rd; Coldeham's Lane - River Lane. Likewise across East Rd i.e. Staffordshire St - Severn Pl; New Street - Wellington St; Young Street - Grafton Centre - Improve eastern gateway to the city - not just a gateway - improve margin of the city centre - purple blob should extend to the roundabout - Blue dash should could also be labelled as denoting upgrade of street environment and public transport and per/cycle improvements. 	<p>Comments noted. It is normal practice to provide constraints and opportunities plan. The opportunities plan will be amended in relation to extent of Petersfield Community. Links to the Grafton Centre will be added. The remaining links shall be shown in a more diagrammatic form. 'Improve the "Eastern Gateway" to the City' area will be amended.</p>	<p>Amend the location of the Petersfield area boundary to include the houses and businesses north of New Street.</p> <p>Add links between communities and the Grafton Centre.</p> <p>Amend the extent of the Eastern Gateway to include parts of East Street and Elizabeth Way roundabout.</p>

Appendix A1: Representation Response Report

2. Context Analysis

Figure 29

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5368 - Sustrans East of England	Object	<p>Fig 29, entitled Opportunities in the draft SPD should include the cycling desire lines through the area, which meet at Elizabeth Way roundabout, and which would be greatly improved by the proposals: North along both Elizabeth Way and Abbey Road - Riverside - Chesterton, East along both Newmarket Road and Coldhams Lane, South along Occupation Road - Sturton Street - Railway Station, Southwest along East Road - Gonville Place, West along both Maids Causeway and rear of Grafton Centre.</p> <p>This is important in the implementation of Local Plan policies towards an effective cycle network, and of the national policies and guidance of LTN2/08 and MfS1,2.</p>	Comments noted. Opportunities for improving cycle desire lines will be shown on figure 29.	Add to figure 29, 'cycle desire lines to be improved', shown on the following locations: North along both Elizabeth Way and Abbey Road - Riverside - Chesterton, East along both Newmarket Road and Coldhams Lane, South along Occupation Road - Sturton Street - Railway Station, Southwest along East Road - Gonville Place, West along both Maids Causeway and rear of Grafton Centre.
5361 - unex holdings limited	Object	<p>Redevelopment of the site bounded by Severn Place, East Road and Newmarket Road should be shown on the Opportunities Plan, which is Figure 29. The opportunities include the creation of a new cycle and pedestrian routes, through an upgraded Severn Place with landscaping and tree planting, to link East Road and Newmarket Road. The proposed development provides City Centre housing and significantly improves the appearance of the area and the public realm improvement.</p>	<p>Disagree. On the basis that Unex Holdings Limited are involved in pre-application discussions with Cambridge City Council regarding redevelopment of the Atrium Site and it would be inappropriate to set out the scale and massing of the development without further pre-application discussions with the applicant.</p> <p>Accordingly, it would be problematic to include this site on other plans at this stage. By not including the Atrium Site it is not prejudicing future development or options that may come forward on this site.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3. Strategies for Change				
3.1.2				
5470 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	Chapter 3 and in particular paras 3.1.2,3.2.3, Appendix A - Air pollution - this area significantly suffers from air pollution and to date insufficient measures have been proposed to mitigate such. Enhanced design detailing to reduce air pollution must be achieved and to create strong enough guidelines to obtain adequate development in this highly polluted area etc. Transport is a key generator of local pollution and must be tackled at this stage to achieve healthier living and working environment for local people. Similarly good design detailing is crucial. CambridgePPF would like to see a more robust paragraph integrated to ensure a strong Air Quality Strategy is implemented and engenders enhanced air quality for local people in this area.	Comments noted. Guidance relating to air quality is contained within the Air Quality in Cambridge - Developers Guide and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD as noted in Appendix A of the Eastern Gate SPD. We do not think it is appropriate for the SPD to duplicate existing policy.	
<hr/>				
3.2.2				
5258	Comment	Newmarket Road is a horribly hostile street. The Dual carriageway design encourages drivers to treat it as a racetrack, sprinting from light to light. What cycle lanes there are are narrow and rough. Bus lanes are routinely ignored. Cycle and pedestrian connectivity is poor- just try getting, legally, by bike from the cycle path at the east end of Tesco (next to the war memorial) to the eastbound side of the road. Remove the central reservation, and there would be more space for cyclists and pedestrians.	Comments noted.	
<hr/>				
5256	Comment	Stronger measures need to be in place to deter cyclists from using pavements illegitimately. I am particularly concerned about the north side pavement between the new crossing and the Tesco pedestrian/cycle entrance. At the moment the only sign indicating that this is not a cycling pavement is just to the east of the crossing, where a blue sign (bike and pedestrian) has "End" beneath it. There is nothing to deter cyclists leaving Tesco at the above point from turning right and cycling along to the crossing.	Comments noted. The proposals provide for two new cycle paths. It is envisaged that this new cycle path will provide a strong incentive for cyclists to use the official on road lanes rather than the pavement. We would not wish to clutter the pavement with excessive signage.	
<hr/>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5255	Comment	The timing on pedestrian crossings is crucial. Delays for pedestrians before the traffic is halted should not be too long and adequate time must be allowed for crossing. I walk fairly vigorously, but cannot get over the new crossing opposite Abbey Way before the beeper stops. Give the absence of an obvious safe refuge in the middle, I feel this will be distressing and dangerous for children and the very elderly.	Comments noted. Crossing times are an important consideration. However it is not within the scope of this SPD to provide details in relation to crossing timings. The on-going 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 signalling.	
5257	Comment	The standard European red-circle-with-a-bike-inside sign is often misunderstood, particularly by foreign residents. I appreciate that the SPD wants as little street furniture as possible, so why not have the message "No Cycling" repeated regularly on the pavement?	Comments noted. The proposals provide for two new cycle paths. It is envisaged that this new cycle path will provide a strong incentive for cyclists to use the official on road lanes rather than the pavement. It is not the intention to clutter the pavement with excessive signage.	
5328 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Support	We particularly welcome the proposals to reduce the proportion of road space allocated to private motor vehicles in favour of cyclists, pedestrians and bus users.	Comments noted.	
3.2.3				
5441 - Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA)	Comment	3.2.3 We welcome the idea of greater visual (and actual) connections between north and south. We feel this principle must be stated more strongly in 3.4.2 and Figure 38 if it is to be enforced. Recent and current planning applications on proposal site 7.01 provide neither visual breaks or actual on-the-ground connections	Comments noted. The physical links shown on the July 2010 Draft For Consultation showed pedestrian/cycle links across the Local Plan (2006) Proposal site 7.01 linking Harvest Way to the south of Newmarket Road. These pedestrian/cycle links were removed within the Final Draft of the Visioning Document in light of the approval of the Travelodge application in March 2011. 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.	
3.2.4				
5400	Support	Strongly support. This is one of the worst junctions in the city in terms of streetscape, safety and permeability.	Comments noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5326 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Support	We particularly welcome the proposals to replace the Elizabeth Way / East Road roundabout with traffic signals, to reduce the overall size of the junction, and to replace the subways with surface crossings.	Comments noted.	
5380	Support	Strongly support the replacement of this roundabout that forms a considerable barrier, emphasizes the racetrack nature of this part of the city and is wasteful of space.	Comments noted.	

3.2.5

5311 5371 - Sustrans East of England 5381 5401	Comment	Suggest rewording the phrase "where possible" and specify on-road cycle lanes be a minimum of 2 metres wide along the length of Newmarket Road.	<p>Whilst 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:</p> <p>"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. Section 4.3.5 of the SPD states:</p> <p>"Therefore any 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 road, width and geometry of the streetscape".</p> <p>This is a robust starting point for cycle provision. Newmarket Road and East Road are highly constrained. We have allowed for a minimum 1.8m wide footpath on either side of the street, two 3m wide vehicle carriageways, two 3.1 m wide bus lanes and two 3m wide bus shelter islands in some sections. As part of the detail design we will endeavour to maximise lengths of cycle path to 2m. 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>	
---	---------	---	--	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.2.6				
5284 5402	Support	Support for the removal of metal railings and breaking down the barriers in order to improve desire lines.	Comments noted.	
5329 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Support	We particularly welcome the proposals to increase the general permeability of the area by creating additional road crossings, allowing additional movements at junctions, and removing the New Street/Harvest Way one-way systems.	Comments noted. Thank you for your support in relation to proposed alterations to the one-way system.	
3.2.7				
5248	Comment	1) Through routes between communities to north and south. Developers should be told that there needs to be a pedestrian way to the west of the Travelodge, including some greening, before any development commences.	Comments noted. The indicative pedestrian and cycle links were removed from the Movement and Circulation strategy map, in light of the approval of the Travelodge application in March 2011. 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). Visual links through the development are proposed within the Travel Lodge site and the eastern end of the residential block. This will be added to figure 31. The additional green link between the proposed residential block between Simpers Walk and St Andrew-the-less (Abbey Church) cannot be achieved on this particular alignment given the constraints of land ownership. It may however be possible to provide a visual link between the Residential Site and the Cambridge Refrigeration Technology Site.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5249	Comment	2) Even the need for visual connections will have to be abandoned - the block would have none. [response if residential block is approved]	<p>Comments noted. The indicative pedestrian and cycle links were removed from the Movement and Circulation strategy map, in light of the approval of the Travelodge application in March 2011. 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>Visual links through the development are proposed within the Travel Lodge site and the eastern end of the residential block. This will be added to figure 31. The additional green link between the proposed residential block between Simpess Walk and St Andrew-the-less (Abbey Church) cannot be achieved on this particular alignment given the constraints of land ownership. It may however be possible to provide a visual link between the Residential Site and the Cambridge Refrigeration Technology Site.</p>	
5330 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Support	<p>We particularly welcome the proposals to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase the general permeability of the area by creating additional road crossings, allowing additional movements at junctions, and removing the New Street/Harvest Way one-way systems. - allow cyclists and pedestrians to cross Newmarket Road directly from Occupation Road to Abbey Road. This will be of great benefit both to local cyclists and pedestrians but also to cyclists making longer journeys between, for example, the station to Chesterton and north-east Cambridge. 	Comments noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Figure 30</i>				
5426	Comment	<p>Figure 30 COMMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - does not show a block structure to support the principles outlined in 3.2.3 and 3.2.7 - whereas the previous visioning document did - in particular by showing how the division of the currently very large single block along the south side of newmarket road should be divided to promote connections N-S and to enable a more walkable/permeable urban grain - doesn't depict the existing mature trees on Newmarket Rd. west of the roundabout, nor the does it accurately depict the full extent and hierarchy of trees at St. Matthew's Piece. 	<p>Comments noted. 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 the south 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>Figure 31: Open Space, Land Use and Activity strategy will be amended to show the existing mature trees on Newmarket Road, west of Elizabeth Way roundabout and north of Occupation Road. Trees indicated on St. Matthews Piece will be amended to depict the two rows of trees and their hierarchy.</p>	<p>Amend figure 32 to show existing mature trees on Newmarket Road west of Elizabeth Way Roundabout, and north of Occupation Road. Amend arrangement and hierarchy of trees on St Matthews Piece.</p>
5505 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	Page 33 - Definition of 'homezone style' approach needs to be explained.	<p>Comments noted, 'homezone style' shown on pages 33 and 37 will be replaced with 'shared space'. A definition for Shared space will be given in the Glossary as:</p> <p>'Shared Space: a street or place accessible to both pedestrians and vehicles that is designed to enable pedestrians to move more freely by reducing traffic management features that tend to encourage users of vehicles to assume priority'</p>	<p>Replace 'homezone style' with 'shared space' within the key on pages 33 and 37.</p> <p>Add 'shared space' definition to the Glossary as:</p> <p>'Shared Space: a street or place accessible to both pedestrians and vehicles that is designed to enable pedestrians to move more freely by reducing traffic management features that tend to encourage users of vehicles to assume priority'</p>
5472 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	Fig 30 - Hostile junctions/ main junction - in effect these are gateways to the various communities and business/ retail areas and need to be better marked as gateways through the usage of land mark buildings. This concept is unclear and should be further integrated. Ditto Figure 31 and 38 - buildings should not just be increased in height but also have wider landmark effect and of higher than average built and landscaped quality.	<p>Comments noted. 'Landmark' buildings are illustrated within figure 38 as sites with the potential for localised increase in height. These are indicated on sites, which border key junctions and provide a 'gateway' to the city and Petersfield. Design quality is contained within the saved policies of the 2006 Cambridge Local Plan (chapter 3 - Designing Cambridge). it is inappropriate to specify where high quality development should occur, we would aspire for the highest quality of development across all of the potential development sites.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5359 - unex holdings limited	Object	Figure 30: Movement and Circulation Strategy should be amended to show the site bounded by Seven Place, East Road and Newmarket Road as a potential development site. The figure should also show, as part of the proposed redevelopment, a new pedestrian and cycle route along an upgraded (and softened with planting and street trees) Seven Place which would be opened up to link East Road to Newmarket Road and on to the river.	Disagree, given that Unex Holdings Limited are involved in pre-application discussions with Cambridge City Council regarding redevelopment of the Atrium Site and it would be inappropriate to set out the scale and massing of the development without further pre-application discussions with the applicant. Accordingly, it is considered it would be problematic to include this site on other plans at this stage. By not including the Atrium Site it is not prejudicing future development or options that may come forward on this site.	
5277	Support	The proposals set out on this plan will improve the streets and act as an example to other areas.	Comments noted.	
3.2.9				
5427	Comment	3.2.9 COMMENT Support principle - but should also mention historic street pattern between new street, east road and Fitzroy street - study boundary would be usefully extended here.	Comments noted. The area bounded by New Street, East Road and Fitzroy Street does not include potential development sites. 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 areas where the quality of the public realm has been significantly undermined by 'standard' highway solutions.	
5331 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Support	We particularly welcome the proposals to allow cyclists and pedestrians to cross Newmarket Road directly from Occupation Road to Abbey Road. This will be of great benefit both to local cyclists and pedestrians but also to cyclists making longer journeys between, for example, the station to Chesterton and north-east Cambridge.	Comments noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.2.11 5259	Object	Both these streets are narrow and frequently have cars parked on either side of the road. I would argue therefore, that it is undesirable to make this change as to drive either way down it safely would mean removing all the car parking - something I can't imagine any resident accepting, even with encouragement to use car share schemes.	Key project 5 explores ways of improving the gateways into the Petersfield ward area and ultimately offers a fresh approach to creating civilised and inclusive streets which priorities the needs of residents. In recent years the publication of 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 we feel that it is appropriate to investigate an alternative approach to highways given the existing highway arrangement. Key project 5 looks at the whole of New Street and Harvest Way to deliver a coherent arrangement not just to 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.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.3.5				
5335 - Savills 5337 - Savills	Comment	It is unclear as to why some streets require 'greening'.	<p>Trees will greatly enhance the quality of the streetscape, the purpose of greening streets is described in paragraph 3.3.4. With respect to Newmarket Road, it is stated in 3.3.5 that it is an aspiration of this strategy to extend the trees along these principal routes so as to become a tree lined approach into the city.</p> <p>The 1925 Newmarket Road OS map (figure 6, page 13) indicates a row of trees fronting the southern side of Newmarket Road. Today much of these trees have been removed through significant highway interventions. Further east of the study area, mature London Planes occupy the median strip of Newmarket Road, it is felt an opportunity exists to extend this green character westward.</p> <p>New trees proposed for New Street and Harvest Way will provide an attractive means of slowing vehicle speeds by reducing forward visibility as well as adding townscape value. Green fingers are identified on Abbey Street and Occupation Road; these streets will be planted to provide a green link between the St Matthews Place and Newmarket Road.</p>	
5374 - Sustrans East of England	Support	<p>The "greening" of routes (we would say "streets" by adding trees and other plantings can be entirely justified by reference to sources such as Manual for Streets 1 and 2.</p> <p>Greening would make the streets more attractive for non-motorised users, would enhance property values, and would tend to lower traffic speeds, further encouraging people to walk or cycle within or through the area.</p> <p>It would have the effect of uniting the study area with central Cambridge, where at present it has a distinctly inferior and separate character.</p>	Comments noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.3.6				
5309 - anne ramsay	Support	Natural England agrees with strategy 3.3 Open Space, Land use and Activity in particular section 3.3.4 Greening streets and spaces and 3.3.6 Biodiversity with the possible provision of such options as roof gardens; the inclusion of brown or green roofs; tree avenues; hedgerows and designing in bat and bird boxes, in particular for swifts.	Comments noted.	
5235 - Cambridge City Council	Support	Fully support the objective to enhance habitat and welcome the use of native species such as the proposed Field maple as street trees. We may wish to remove Cotoneaster spp. from the suggested species as this species has recently been added to schedule 9 relating to the control of invasive species.	Comments noted. Cotoneaster will be removed from the suggested species list.	Remove Cotoneaster tree species from the species list.
3.3.7				
5448 - Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA)	Comment	3.3.7-9 Given low levels of public open space within the study area, we would like to see a specific principle in the SPD that requires developers to provide adequate public and private green space within developments, rather than allowing commuted S106 payments. Space is the scarcest commodity; it needs to be actively secured.	Comments noted. Open space provision requirements for developers are provided within the adopted Open Space Strategy 2006 produced by Cambridge City Council. An updated version has been recently issued for consultation.	
5291 - Allia Limited	Comment	It is noted that the local community considers that there is a deficiency of open space within the Petersfield Ward. Whilst there may be an aspiration to increase the size of St Matthews Piece, it is important that the ultimate outcome emerges from a review of all design options for the redevelopment of the Howard Mallet Centre. It is not considered that the existing building contributes positively to the visual qualities of the area, and Allia strongly believe that there is scope to provide a building of lasting quality which will be more appropriate in its immediate site context.	Comments noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.3.8</i>				
5253	Comment	6) The SPD talks of "promoting the creation of new and existing public spaces." The chance for a small public park extension will have been forgone. The developers think they can buy their way out of this with a cash contribution, but without space being made available this looks like yet another objective to become mere wishful thinking.	Comments noted. Open space provision requirements for developers are now provided within the adopted Open Space Strategy 2006 produced by Cambridge City Council. An updated version has been recently issued for consultation.	
<i>Bullet 2</i>				
5292 - Allia Limited	Comment	Allia do not object to the suggestion that there ought to be an exploration of the opportunity to increase the size of St Matthew's Piece, but it must be made very clear that this is only appropriate in the event that the redevelopment of the Howard Mallet Centre warrants/justifies that. There is an established building footprint on the site at present, and it cannot be ruled out that this may need to be retained even following redevelopment.	Comments noted.	
5403	Support	Strongly support this. There is strong local support for the expansion of St Matthew's Piece. The reworking of this space towards a larger more coherent space has been long-argued for.	Comments noted.	
<i>3.3.11</i>				
5449 - Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA)	Comment	3.3.11 We believe the area contains a disproportionately high level of purpose-built student accommodation, especially when the new CRC/Berkeley Homes development is included. It will also soon contain the largest hotel in Cambridge, with another application in the pipeline. In our view, planning policy for sites 7.01 and 7.03 should be reviewed to prevent the area being dominated by large clunky buildings which contribute little to the community.	Comments noted. The Eastern Gate Study Area contains a mix of uses. The Brunswick Site incorporates a mixed-use scheme, the student accommodation for Anglia Ruskin University has been provided in lieu of affordable housing on the site as proposed within the Proposals Schedule for site 7.11 in the Cambridge Local Plan. Student accommodation is an excepted proposed used along with employment, business and housing as part of the Mackays Site as described within the Proposals Schedule for site 7.01. The Newmarket Road residential scheme (proposal site 7.01) and approved applications within the island site (area bounded by New Street, Occupation Road, Abby Street and Newmarket Road) propose residential uses.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.3.13				
5450 - Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA)	Support	3.3.13-14 and 3.4.13 We strongly support the view that remaining historic high street buildings should be retained. Their location close to the Elizabeth Way roundabout increases the importance of Project 1, which would allow them to be showcased and rejuvenated within an attractive, pedestrian-friendly urban space.	Comments noted.	
3.3.14				
5375 - Sustrans East of England	Object	<p>Our objection is that this strategy should be more emphatic, since the SPD area is central to the city, though excessive traffic and regrettable past planning decisions have given it an "edge of town" character. In a central area all buildings should be designed on the presumption that residents, visitors and customers will arrive and leave on foot (or bus) or by bicycle.</p> <p>Thus residential and commercial property should have cycle parking close to its entrance. Residents' cycle parking must be more convenient to use than any car parking. Low (city centre) levels of car parking should be required.</p>	<p>Objection noted, an additional paragraph will be added after 3.3.14 as follows: 'Cycle Parking 3.3.15 Cycle parking for residents should be provided in a secure, covered and lockable enclosure preferably within the footprint of the building. To promote ease of use parking should usually be at the front of the building and closer than the nearest non-disabled parking space. For larger blocks of flats cycle parking should be spread throughout the site and relate to either each block or floor of the flats depending on the size of the building. Guidance relating to cycle parking is contained within the Cambridge City Council guidance - Cycle Parking Guide For New Residential Developments, February 2010'.</p>	<p>Add additional paragraph to 3.3.14 to read as follows: ' Cycle Parking 3.3.15 Cycle parking for residents should be provided in a secure, covered and lockable enclosure preferably within the footprint of the building. To promote ease of use parking should usually be at the front of the building and closer than the nearest non-disabled parking space. For larger blocks of flats cycle parking should be spread throughout the site and relate to either each block or floor of the flats depending on the size of the building. Guidance relating to cycle parking is contained within the Cambridge City Council guidance - Cycle Parking Guide For New Residential Developments, February 2010'.</p>
5376 - Sustrans East of England	Object	Amend to read:...applicants should be expected or required to consider the following:	Objection noted. The text within paragraph 3.3.14 will be amended to 'applicants will need to consider the following'	Amend paragraph 3.3.14 to 'applicants will need to consider the following'
5451 - Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA)	Support	We welcome the emphasis on more active, pedestrian-friendly uses. The desire to create 'spill-out' activity is clearly closely linked to the aspiration at 3.2.5 to widen footpaths where possible. We hope that this broader strategic perspective can be agreed with County Highways	Comments noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Figure 31</i>				
5473 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	Fig 31 - More active ground floor spaces should also be achieved with local businesses north of Newmarket Road close to Elizabeth Roundabout (e.g. current window glazier - and those east and west of St Andrews). Retention of the shop (and improved lay-by) to west of St Andrew's should be kept to keep a continued stepping stone of large and smaller community shopping area. Historic frontage to section of road east of St Andrews should also be highlighted and retained as edge development to the Central Conservation Area and in line with the Newmarket Road Approaches Study (currently being consulted on). We object to the implied loss of these buildings/ facade areas	Comments noted. Active ground floor uses have been shown on sites which contain potential development sites, both allocated within the 2006 Cambridge Local Plan and unallocated sites, existing shops on the northern side of Newmarket Road do not contain potential development sites. The historic frontage west of St Andrews-the-less (Abbey Church) is shown on the Townscape Analysis (figure 24) as 'historic building frontage'. Parts of the historic high street have been indicated on figure 31 as this presents an opportunity to reconnect the two sides of the street through the retention of the historic street frontage, the historic retail area to the east of Abbey Church lies within the proposed central conservation area extension.	
5428	Comment	Figure 31 COMMENT - does not show a block structure to support the principles outlined in 3.3.3 - whereas the previous visioning document did - in particular by showing how the division of the currently very large single block along the south side of newmarket road should be divided to promote connections N-S and to enable a more walkable/permeable urban grain - doesn't depict the existing mature trees on Newmarket Rd. west of the roundabout, nor the does it accurately depict the full extent and hierarchy of trees at St. Matthew's Piece.	Comments noted. The physical links shown on the July 2010 Draft For Consultation showed pedestrian/cycle links across the Local Plan (2006) Proposal site 7.01 linking Harvest Way to the south of Newmarket Road. These pedestrian/cycle links were removed within the Final Draft of the Visioning Document, which was approved by the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth In February 2011. The indicative pedestrian and cycle links were removed, in light of the approval of the Travelodge application in March 2011. 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. Figure 31 will be amended to show the existing mature trees west of Elizabeth Way roundabout and alignment and hierarchy of trees on St Matthew's Piece.	Show trees west of Elizabeth Way roundabout, adjust alignment and hierarchy of trees shown on St Matthew's Piece.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5452 - Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA)	Comment	While the study area excludes the retail park to the east, we would like to see the same principles extended there in the future, if possible. Wide expanses of car park offer nothing to residents or passers-by, and create an unsafe environment after dark. If retail park owners were encouraged to introduce streetfront uses (as with the Starbucks cafe), this could revitalise the area for residents and visitors.	Comments noted. Cambridge Retail Park does not contain any potential development sites. 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 areas where the quality of the public realm has been significantly undermined by 'standard' highway solutions. It is beyond the scope of the SPD to include the Retail Park at present, opportunities may arise in the future to introduce street frontage uses.	
5283	Support	Active uses are appropriate to be encouraged along the ground floor of Newmarket road. This stretch up to the junction with Coldhams Lane needs to become more pedestrian and cycle friendly, active uses will help encourage this.	Comments noted.	
<i>3.3.15</i>				
5285	Comment	This parking strategy needs to be clearer, unless there are already clear parking guidelines for new developments included in other documents within the LDF.	Comments noted. Car parking standards are set out in 2006 Cambridge Local Plan Appendix C and relate to the maximum parking levels permitted.	
5396 - Sustrans East of England	Object	re our earlier objection: justification for making cycle parking easier of access than car parking can be found in Manual for Streets 8.2.1: "Providing enough convenient and secure cycle parking at people's homes and other locations for both residents and visitors is critical to increasing the use of cycles. In residential developments, designers should aim to make access to cycle storage at least as convenient as access to car parking." This is highlighted on p5 of the new Cambridge Cycle Parking Guide.	Comments noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5377 - Sustrans East of England	Object	We believe that this section should be entitled Car and Cycle Parking. The wording of 3.3.15 should be augmented to include cycle parking, which should not be within basement areas, unless it is manifestly easier to use (consider the journey lift/stair - parked bike/car - street and vice versa) than is the car parking. In this central area with its excellent bus connections buildings should be required to be designed around walking and cycling access.	Comments noted. The section will be renamed 'Car and Cycle Parking'. Reference will be made to maximum parking standards set out in the 2006 Local Plan Appendix C and minimum cycle parking standards set out in Appendix D.	Amend title of 3.3.15 to 'Car and cycle parking' and make reference to parking standards set out in the 2006 Local Plan Appendix C.
<hr/>				
<i>3.3.16</i>				
5254	Comment	7) The SPD believes Car Club schemes should be encouraged to reduce parking requirements. There are no spaces for Car Club parking in the residential proposals.	Comments noted. The inclusion of car club spaces is an aspiration of the SPD. The car club parking within Cambridge is primarily owned and operated by Streetcar. There is a number of existing car club spaces surrounding the Eastern Gate study area, including Norfolk Street, Sleaford Street and Adam and Eve Street Car Park all of which are within a 5-10 minute walk of the Eastern Gate study area (locations of car club spaces can be viewed on the Streetcar website - www.streetcar.co.uk) A future street car space is also proposed for Riverside. Further Car Club spaces could be provided through Section 106 agreements following approval of the Harvest Way Residential development, these could be provided on street where appropriate or within the development.	
<hr/>				
5378 - Sustrans East of England	Object	To make this paragraph effective it should state "low car ownership development will be given strong preference" or similar. Also, it being a central area, with the Council aiming to create greater integration with the city centre, low levels of car parking should be specified in the SPD, overriding the Local Plan levels.	Comments noted. The current is considered to be appropriate for this SPD.	
<hr/>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5293 - Allia Limited	Support	Allia supports the notion that uses provided within the area, via new development, should not exacerbate existing parking pressures, but equally it must be acknowledged that there are established parking standards in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, and it is considered that an appropriate cross-reference should be made to the standards within this section of the document. The matter of whether or not car clubs, etc. will be brought forward is a matter for further, detailed consideration, on a site by site basis.	Comments noted. Reference to maximum car parking standards contained with the 2006 Cambridge Local Plan will be included in paragraph 3.3.16.	Reference the 2006 Cambridge Local Plan maximum car parking standards.
<i>3.4.1</i>				
5447 - Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA)	Support	We strongly support all the proposals to improve and humanise the public realm, promote active uses, create new open spaces and increase 'greening'.	Comments noted.	
<i>3.4.2</i>				
5339 - Savills	Comment	Block Structure (3.4.2) - the SPD identifies that the block structure is intended to moderate the mass of the development. Mass can be influence by height, detailing, articulation and materials and reference to the role of block structure appears misplaced. As part of the built form strategy, recognition should be given to the need to ensure that land is used effectively.	Disagree. The block size is a major factor in massing, albeit clearly it is not the only one. The block size will have a significant influence on the footprint of the building and as a result the massing of the building	
5429	Comment	3.4.2 COMMENT Support, however suggest that the following be added: - encourage permeable finer grained block structure - provide positive enclosure to streets and open spaces - tying in with existing building lines or establishing new building lines with clearly defined fronts and backs as appropriate.	Comments noted. The following will be added to section 3.4.2. 'Encourage a permeable, finer grained block structure' The second comment regarding enclosure is addressed within Section 3.4.12, relating to defining public and private spaces.	Add 'Encourage a permeable, finer grained block structure' to section 3.4.2

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Figure 38</i>				
5433	Comment	<p>Figure 38 COMMENT/OBJECTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - doesn't depict the existing mature trees on Newmarket Rd. west of the roundabout, nor the does it accurately depict the full extent and hierarchy of trees at St. Matthew's Piece. - taller building might be just as appropriate or possibly more so on opposite corner of Newmarket Road/Coldham's Lane junction - as a terminus of a long view down Newmarket Road - what is the justification for this location? - why are buildings lines/block structure as proposed within key project 1 not included in this figure? - OBJECT TO UNJUSTIFIED INCLUSION OF MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHTS - see comments on 3.4.3 above 	<p>Comments noted. Figure 38 will be amended to show the hierarchy and arrangement of trees on St Matthew's Piece, the existing groups of mature trees will be shown to the west of Elizabeth Way roundabout.</p> <p>Maximum heights indicated have been informed by a comprehensive townscape analysis of the area and the Council's own 3D model. Heights relating to the Newmarket Road frontage have been informed by previous outline applications, approved applications and appeal decisions. This forms a robust starting point for the consideration of development proposals.</p> <p>The indicated 3-3.5 storey heights shown opposite the Coldham's Lane/Newmarket Road junction were seen to be appropriate given the site borders the riverside area of the central conservation area. Any proposals that seek to break the maximum storey heights shown will need to be tested in a robust way, and applicants will need to demonstrate through 3D computer modelling that their proposals will not unduly impact upon the surrounding context in line with saved Policy 3/4 (as required on page 40 of the draft SPD).</p> <p>The building line and block structure shown within key project 1 will be included in figure 38.</p>	<p>Amend figure 38 to show the hierarchy and arrangement of trees on St Matthew's Piece, show the existing groups of mature trees to the west of Elizabeth Way roundabout. Include the building line and block structure shown within key project 1.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5454 - Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA)	Comment	<p>We have some concerns about current proposals and their enforcement, however:</p> <p>The indicative maximum heights shown in Figure 38 are high relative to surrounding residential properties, bearing in mind that Newmarket Road is a local high point. In particular, we are concerned that 3-3.5 storeys for the West's site (corner of River Lane) and 3.5-5 storeys for most of proposal site 7.01 could prove excessively overbearing.</p> <p>We believe that these ranges should be enforced WITHIN developments, to create a gradual and varied progression to the lower Victorian buildings to the west - not treated by developers as opportunities to build to the maximum height possible across their full frontage.</p>	<p>Maximum heights indicated have been informed by a comprehensive townscape analysis of the area and have been tested through the Council's own 3D model. Heights relating to the Newmarket Road frontage have been informed by previous outline applications, approved applications and appeal decisions. This forms a robust starting point for the consideration of development proposals.</p> <p>Any proposals that seek to break this guidance will need to be tested in a robust way, and applicants will need to demonstrate through 3D computer modelling that their proposals will not unduly impact upon the surrounding context in line with saved Policy 3/4 (as required on page 40 of the draft SPD). 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.</p> <p>Section 3.4.10 highlights the importance of varying rooflines, so as not to detract from the roofscape of the conservation area and the city. Developers would be expected to produce 3D computer models to inform an appropriate massing of their development and impact on key views and vistas.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5348 - Savills	Comment	Figure 38 identifies indicative storey heights. The SA needs to appraise and explain reasonable alternative to the approach of the SPD. That does not appear to have been done. Whilst figure 38 indicates storey heights, it is unclear what assumptions are made about roofs. A flat roofed structure of 4 storeys may be lower than a pitched roofed structure of 3 storeys.	<p>Comments noted. The document will be reworded to include the following additional sections after section 3.4.3. Figure 38 will be reworded to clearly show height expressed as both shoulder height and overall height.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there will be some difference in floor to ceiling heights between buildings. However small changes are acceptable and indeed will help to provide a greater variation in roofscape.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Figure 38 expresses height as a range of figures including shoulder height and overall height 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 should be made to the</p>	Amend Figure 38 to clearly show height expressed as both shoulder height and overall height.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5490 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	Comment	<p>We are disappointed that the earlier emphasis on creating new physical links between the communities north and south of Newmarket Road appears to have been dropped. Figure 38 only suggests a new visual link between Newmarket Road and Simpers Walk. This is disappointing in the light of (a) very strong community support given for new physical links (see, for example, Figure 6 of your consultation draft dated July 2010), and (b) support given in the Suburbs and Approaches study of Newmarket Road for re-instating some of the lost historical passages - see paragraph 6.2 of the Newmarket Road study.</p> <p>Both points have bearing on Eastern Gate applications: one that has already been consented (5-storey Travelodge hotel) and one that is currently under consideration (5-storey residential development adjacent to the Travelodge hotel). Both applications, to our dismay, have been supported by the Joint Urban Design Team.</p> <p>We feel strongly that important opportunities, which would be fully in line with the JUDT's aspirations for the Eastern Gate area, have been lost or are in serious danger of being lost here - notably, the opportunity to create a new physical link between Newmarket Road and Simpers Walk (to the west of the allotments), and the opportunity to create developments whose massing is more sympathetic to the terraced housing to the north and south of Newmarket Road. An extra three storeys in comparison with the existing buildings, on a road that is already on an elevated ridge, surely goes against the JUDT's aim to reduce barriers between the communities to the north and south of Newmarket Road.</p>	<p>overall height.</p> <p>Comments noted. The physical links shown on the July 2010 Eastern Gate Visioning Document, Draft For Consultation showed pedestrian/cycle links though the Local Plan (2006) Proposal site 7.01 linking Harvest Way to the south of Newmarket Road. These pedestrian/cycle links were removed within the Final Draft of the Visioning Document, which was approved by the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth in February 2011 in light of the approval of the Travelodge application in March 2011. 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>With regards to the heights along Newmarket Road - the 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> <p>Eastern Gate Residential Site, (08/0205/FUL) 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.</p> <p>Travelodge site, 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> <p>The combined planning history, building heights model and context analysis of the area forms a robust starting point for the consideration of maximum heights of development proposals.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5282	Comment	The revised building heights along Occupation road tie in better with the former Rose & Crown.	Comments noted.	
5260	Comment	The only question I have is how the development framework fits in with the decision to grant planning permission for a multi-storey hotel and apartments between the Coldhams Lane Junction and the Elizabeth Way roundabout, as this seems to be at odds with overall strategy for the area. I'm particularly concerned about the increase in traffic, and about the canyon effect of high-rise buildings along one side of Newmarket Road creating even more of a barrier between the two communities either side of the road.	<p>The heights indicated on figure 38: Built Form, Scale and Massing Strategy have been informed by a comprehensive townscape analysis of the area and the Council's own 3D model. Heights relating to the Newmarket Road frontage have been informed by previous outline applications, approved applications (as is the case for the consented Travelodge scheme) and appeal decisions. This forms a robust starting point for the consideration of development proposals.</p> <p>Any proposals that seek to break this guidance will need to be tested in a robust way, and applicants will need to demonstrate through 3D computer modelling that their proposals will not unduly impact upon the surrounding context in line with saved Policy 3/4 (as required on page 40 of the draft SPD).</p> <p>Both the consented Travelodge scheme and proposed residential scheme have been subject to a Transport Assessment carried out as part of the planning application, which will need to show the level of impact an increase in traffic to the surrounding residential areas.</p>	
5365 - unex holdings limited	Object	Figure 38 should be amended to include the site bounded by Severn Place, East Road and Newmarket Road as a potential development site with indicative storey heights ranging from 4 to 8 storeys. The redevelopment of this site would significantly improve the appearance and townscape of this part of the City and would help to screen the bulk of the Grafton Centre car park and access ramps.	<p>Disagree, on the basis that Unex Holdings Limited are involved in pre-application discussions with Cambridge City Council regarding redevelopment of the Atrium Site and it would be inappropriate to set out the scale and massing of the development without further pre-application discussions with the applicant.</p> <p>Accordingly it would be problematic to include this site on other plans at this stage. By not including the Atrium Site it is not prejudicing future development or options that may come forward on this site.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5264	Object	I am concerned to see the document refer to 3.5 to 5 storeys as being the acceptable height along Newmarket Road. Bearing in mind the surrounding area is predominantly 2 and 3 storeys I think the most that should be recommended is 4 storeys. Developers will always push for more, e.g. the Travelodge, I therefore think we should start at a lower point.	<p>The heights indicated on figure 38: Built Form, Scale and Massing Strategy have been informed by a comprehensive townscape analysis of the area and the Council's own 3D model. Heights relating to the Newmarket Road frontage have been informed by previous outline applications, approved applications and appeal decisions. This forms a robust starting point for the consideration of development proposals.</p> <p>Any proposals that seek to break this guidance will need to be tested in a robust way, and applicants will need to demonstrate through 3D computer modelling that their proposals will not unduly impact upon the surrounding context in line with saved Policy 3/4 (as required on page 40 of the draft SPD).</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------

3.4.3

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5345 - Savills	Comment	Building heights (3.4.3 and 3.4.4) - It is not clear from the document what reasonable alternatives to the heights set out have been considered. Equally, it is clear from the sustainability appraisal (SA) that reasonable alternatives to the approach set out within the SPD have not been considered. The SA appears to take the view that what is to be appraised is whether or not to produce a document. That is not so. What must be appraised are the choices and decisions that the document makes - for example, what are the positive and negative impacts of returning New Street to two-way traffic and what alternative options have been considered. We are deeply concerned that reasonable alternative approaches do not appear to have been considered and therefore that the SPD and the SA can be said to met the requirements of the SEA Directive and is therefore vulnerable to challenge.	<p>With reference to the Sustainability Appraisal Process: Comments noted. The Sustainability Appraisal was carried out in line with the 'Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents' (November 2005), which takes into account the requirements of the SEA Directive. This involved assessing the Draft SPD objectives (paragraph 1.4.2) against the SA objectives identified in Stage A (Scoping) of the SA process, as well as assessing the Local Plan policies, to which the SPD relates.</p> <p>As explained in paragraph 5.3.2, due to the precise nature of the Eastern Gate Development Framework Site SPD and the fact that it provides guidance on adopted Local Plan policy, as such two options were considered to be appropriate through the SA assessment; to either a) proceed with the SPD or b) to not proceed with the SPD and rely on Policy alone. In conclusion of this assessment it was found that the only viable option to guide future proposals for the Eastern Gate Development Framework site is to proceed with the drafting of the SPD. The appraisal found that if the SPD were to go ahead there would potentially be no negative impacts on the SA objectives.</p> <p>The Visioning Document for the SPD was subject to public consultation and this resulted in a series of different suggestions about how the area could be improved. These ideas were used to identify five potential projects, which are set out as key projects in the SPD. These projects are in line with the objectives of the SPD, which were appraised using the SA objectives.</p> <p>Each Key Project will be amended to include a summary detailing the explicit benefits that could be achieved if the Key Project is realised. A paragraph will be added to section 1.4.2 to indicate that the objectives of the SPD have been used to inform the design principals of the Key Projects.</p> <p>With reference to heights (paragraphs 3.4.3 and 3.4.4, figure 38): The guidance relating to the appropriate form, height</p>	Amend to key projects to include a summary detailing the benefits if they key project is achieved. Additional paragraph to be added to section 1.4.2 to indicate how the objectives of the SPD inform the design proposals of the key projects.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>and grain of development as shown within the Built form, Scale and Massing Strategy directly relate to the objectives set out within Chapter 1 which are assessed as part of the SA process, and as such are not subject to individual testing through the SA.</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> <p>Eastern Gate Residential Site, (08/0205/FUL) 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.</p> <p>The Travelodge site, 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> <p>In addition, the Young Street Site (approved scheme C/04/0745) for the erection of 70 homes, including 14 houses and 56 flats/studio apartments and caf�� contained a height range from 3-7 storeys.</p> <p>The key positive vista from Elizabeth Way Bridge across the conservation area highlighted in figure 28 and paragraph 3.4.8 of the SPD was identified as a 'strategic' view in the inspectors report following the appeal of the Newmarket Road Residential application. As a result this important view has been included in the SPD and should be enhanced.</p> <p>The combined planning history, building heights model and context analysis of the area forms a robust starting point for the consideration of maximum heights of development proposals. Proposals that seek to break this guidance will need</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>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>With reference to Key project 5 (New Street): The Key projects shown in chapter 4 of the SPD represent indicative solutions for achieving the overall vision and objectives of the Eastern Gate study area, they represent just one option for redevelopment, and do not discount additional options or sites that could come forward in the future. The key projects have been developed through extensive consultation with local residents and have been appraised through sound urban design guidance and informal consultation with the County Council as Highway Authority. All key projects will require further detailed design work, traffic modelling and testing to be undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council to ensure vehicular traffic can still operate effectively and not cause problems with the wider highways network.</p> <p>2-way traffic on New Street shown in Key Project 5 has been reintroduced to help create a more legible environment for cyclists and vehicle movements, as well as helping to create a shared space approach to Harvest Way. Further testing to assess the viability of returning New Street to two-way traffic will need to be carried out to ensure no adverse effects on the wider highway network.</p> <p>Actions - Amend to key projects to include a summary detailing the benefits if they key project is achieved. Additional paragraph to be added to section 1.4.2 to indicate how the objectives of the SPD inform the design proposals of the key projects.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5430	Comment	<p>3.4.3 COMMENT/OBJECTION Appropriate height is what is important - and this needs to be carefully designed/justified in *all* cases (including the guidance given within the SPD document) - recognising that in some cases less tall buildings may be more appropriate and in others taller buildings might be more appropriate - but that this is a judgment that should be made with respect to a coordinated, designed and modelled master plan for the area given the scale of potential change represented by the multiple development sites and/or a robust means of testing proposals as they come forward.</p> <p>To this end I would question what the rationale/justification for the building heights given in the document is and on what basis these should be treated as the 'starting point' when there is no evidence of proper massing models having been produced to determine this guidance. A proper 3d spatial framework might stand but plan drawing with (apparently arbitrary) building heights ascribed is not good enough.</p> <p>I would argue that it is better not to provide maximum heights - but to insist that schemes be required to demonstrate through the planning process (D&AS) details of the urban design/massing approach - related to a wide urban context.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Maximum heights indicated have been informed by a comprehensive townscape analysis of the area and have been tested through the Council's own 3D model. Heights relating to the Newmarket Road frontage have been informed by previous outline applications, approved applications and appeal decisions. We therefore believe this forms a robust starting point for the consideration of development proposals.</p> <p>Any proposals that seek to break this guidance will need to be tested in a robust way, and applicants will need to demonstrate through 3D computer modelling that their proposals will not unduly impact upon the surrounding context in line with saved Policy 3/4 (as required on page 40 of the draft SPD). 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.</p>	

Appendix A1: Representation Response Report

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5246	Comment	The JUDT team gave what I can only describe as weak and unsatisfactory responses to the Travelodge plans (consented) and the hotel proposed for the Mackay's site (refused). They gave a nod to both, even though Travelodge will be yet another massy, uniform height building and the Mackay's site proposals crowded forward onto the pavement. The only excuse for such responses might be that the SPD was at a far earlier stage. Even so, it should have been pointed out that these buildings would breach the Eastern Gate vision.	<p>Comments noted. Maximum heights indicated have been informed by a comprehensive townscape analysis of the area and have been tested through the Council's own 3D model. Heights relating to the Newmarket Road frontage have been informed by previous outline applications (as was the case for the Travelodge Site) approved applications and appeal decisions. We therefore believe this forms a robust starting point for the consideration of development proposals.</p> <p>Any proposals that seek to break this guidance will need to be tested in a robust way, and applicants will need to demonstrate through 3D computer modelling that their proposals will not unduly impact upon the surrounding context in line with saved Policy 3/4 (as required on page 40 of the draft SPD). 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.</p>	
5294 - Allia Limited	Support	Allia welcome the fact that the draft SPD confirms that the range of storey heights recommended in Figure 38 (Page 43)forms a starting point for the consideration of scale of new development within the study area. It must not, however, be the case that the storey heights identified are viewed as a cap, and individual proposals will need to be brought forward which justify the storey heights proposed.	Comments noted. Proposals that seek to break this guidance will need to be tested in a robust way, and applicants will need to demonstrate through 3D computer modelling that their proposals will not unduly impact upon the surrounding context in line with saved Policy 3/4 (as required on page 40 of the draft SPD).	
5453 - Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA)	Support	3.4.3 and 3.4.10-11 (and Figure 38) We are strongly in favour of generating "a variety of building heights to achieve a varied skyline and roofscape." We also strongly support principles 3.4.10-11 which seek to moderate building height. High buildings combined with a busy road create a very hostile environment for pedestrians.	Comments noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.4.4				
5431	Comment	3.4.4 COMMENT Surely all proposals that come forward would need to demonstrate that they would not 'unduly impact'	Comments noted. We agree all developments need to demonstrate that they would not unduly impact the area. However we have made specific reference to taller buildings that by their scale have greater potential to adversely affect an area. Section 3.4.4 is specifically referring to buildings that exceed the parameters set out on Figure 38. However the requirement for visualisations for all proposals is stated in Section 3.4.8.	
5295 - Allia Limited	Support	Allia welcome the Council's flexibility, whereby there is an acceptance that 3D computer modelling may be utilised to test whether or not storey heights in excess of those given indicatively within the SPD can be substantiated. The Council will no doubt enter discussions in accordance with the spirit of this statement.	Comments noted.	
3.4.8				
5296 - Allia Limited	Object	Allia would challenge the Council's identification of the vista from Elizabeth Way as shown on Fig.35 as being a "key positive vista". Whilst it is undoubtedly the case that there is a pleasing view over the roofscape of the Riverside area, this is a view taken from a man-made and elevated and therefore artificial vantage point route, and in our view should not be used in an inappropriate way to stifle design solutions that may involve the erection of taller buildings.	Disagree. It is acknowledged that the view is taken from a bridge which is a man made structure. However this should not negate the importance of this view. Castle mound is a man made structure but is one of the most important views in the city. Views from the Elizabeth Way Bridge were an important consideration in the refusal of the appeal on 9-15 Harvest Way.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.4.10</i>				
5455 - Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA)	Comment	The aim stated at 3.4.10, to "avoid long unvaried rooflines of large new buildings forming dominant and intrusive horizontal bands on the skyline" is considered especially important by residents. However, this principle was not applied for the recent Travelodge consent, which permits a very long, monolithic 5 storey building. We hope it will be applied more robustly in future for other applications, such as the adjacent residential block.	Comments noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5432	Comment	<p>3.4.10 COMMENT</p> <p>What if proposed buildings don't have 'shoulder heights, eaves or ridge lines' - this does seem to pre-suppose certain building typologies/styles...</p>	<p>Comments noted. The document will be reworded to include the following additional sections after section 3.4.3. Figure 38 will be reworded to clearly show height expressed as both shoulder height and overall height.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there will be some difference in floor to ceiling heights between buildings. However small changes are acceptable and indeed will help to provide a greater variation in roofscape.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Figure 38 expresses height as a range of figures including shoulder height and overall height 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 should be made to the</p>	Amend Figure 38 to clearly show height expressed as both shoulder height and overall height.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5250	Comment	3) The SPD talks of the need to "avoid long unvaried rooflines of large new buildings forming dominant and intrusive horizontal bands on the skyline." This is precisely what we would have [with the development of the residential block]: an unbroken line of identical height from Coldham's Lane to Cambridge Refrigeration Technology.	overall height. Comments noted. The revised residential block is currently under review. The proposals include breaking up the 5th floor to provide a varied roofline.	
5297 - Allia Limited	Support	Allia support the Council's proposal to design roofscapes which are interesting, and to have varying storey heights within individual schemes. It is accepted that this will enliven the roofscape on individual development sites, and will reduce uniformity and blandness.	Comments noted.	
<i>3.4.12</i>				
5299 - Allia Limited	Support	Allia support the Council's intention to ensure that gaps in street frontages are repaired wherever possible. There is a rather unfortunate and visually discordant gap in the case of the Howard Mallet Centre when viewed from New Street, and Allia would intend to recreate a strong building line on the site frontage as part of redevelopment proposals for this site.	Comments noted.	
<i>Bullet 1</i>				
5251	Comment	4) The SPD would like to see "residential units with individual front doors served directly from the street." Whilst this is not practical for a residential block, they could have produced plans for a building with multiple entrances [residential block]	Comments noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>3.4.17</i>				
5300 - Allia Limited	Comment	It is not clear why specific development principles are contained within the document for the Howard Mallet Centre site, when they do not appear in relation to other key sites, e.g. Mackays, the ARU site on Young Street, Wests Garage, etc. We are curious as to why the Howard Mallet Centre has received "special attention" and if principles are to be laid down in this way, either the same ought to apply for other sites elsewhere, or the specific principles included should not be incorporated at all. Notwithstanding that, we make comments on some of the principles identified.	Comments noted. Consultation on the draft Eastern Gate Visioning Document revealed a strong desire from local residents and some Residents Associations for the Howard Mallett Centre to be demolished and to increase the size of St Matthew's Piece. It was felt important to establish a key development principals should the site come forward for redevelopment.	
5462 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	Comment	While we welcome the new sections concerning the Howard Mallett Centre (3.4.17 and 3.4.18), local residents are strongly opposed to the notion that 2 - 2.5-storey buildings might be put up along the New Street frontage of this site (see second bullet point in section 3.4.18 and Figure 38). Residents feel strongly that St Matthew's Piece and the protected open space to the east of the Howard Mallet Centre should remain visible from New Street and not be blocked from sight by any new buildings. Visual links to this scarce piece of green space in the area are vital.	Paragraphs 3.4.17 and 3.4.18 note the sensitivity of St Matthew's Piece and the level of care that would be needed to develop the Howard Mallett Centre in an appropriate way. With regards to the connections from New Street and St Matthew's Piece, the indicative building frontage shown on figure 38 will be adjusted to represent the extent of protected open space on St Matthew's Piece. Accordingly future proposals will help to amend the New Street Frontage, whilst ensuring the delivery of the final bullet point - 'potential to enhance and increase the size of St Matthew's Piece - through the promotion of a reduced building footprint in comparison to the existing Howard Mallett Centre, and the contribution of S106 monies to enhance the existing open space'.	Adjust the indicative building frontage on the Howard Mallett Centre within figure 38 to represent the extent of protected open space on St Matthew's Piece.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3.4.18				
5263	Comment	Reference is made to the Howard Mallett. I would like to see a much more positive proposal to return the Howard Mallett Site to much needed open space.	<p>Concerns noted. However, 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. 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, which can then be carried forward into developing the Council's policies and priorities.</p> <p>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. It was felt important however 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, and the contribution of S106 monies to enhance the existing open space.</p> <p>The Open Space and Recreation Strategy is a key document and evidence base for the Local Plan Review. Through the Local Plan Review the Council's Planning Policies for the protection and designation of open space in Cambridge will be updated.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5434	Comment	3.4.18 COMMENT - Question what the adaptive re-use of the current building offerS in terms of the desire to see the restoration of St. Matthew's Piece? - SUPPORT the reintroduction of a building frontage on New Street - Additionally it should be noted that the protection of trees and the primary spatial arrangement of the Piece as defined by two lines of trees is of critical importance	Comments noted. At present no detailed proposals have been submitted for the redevelopment of the Howard Mallet Centre, it may be appropriate to explore the potential for adaptive reuse of the site if this comes forward. Support noted for the reintroduction of a building frontage on New Street. St Matthew's Piece is an open space area protected by Cambridge Local Plan Policy 4/2. Trees shown within the strategy maps will be adjusted to show their correct spatial arrangement on each strategy map.	Amend figures 30, 31 and 38 to show the full extent of Public Open Space on St Matthew's Piece and the correct alignment of trees.
<i>Bullet 1</i>				
5302 - Allia Limited	Object	Allia do not envisage the "adaptive reuse of the building". The building is aesthetically poor, internally awkward, and represents an inefficient structure on the site. Allia can confirm that its redevelopment proposals for the site will include the demolition of the existing building and the provision of a new, purpose-built facility for the eventual use.	Comments noted.	
<i>Bullet 2</i>				
5303 - Allia Limited	Support	Allia support the objective of mending the street frontage by the promotion of a new building frontage, forward of the existing building. However, this objective must obviously be integrated "in the round" but the general principle is supported.	Comments noted.	
<i>Bullet 3</i>				
5304 - Allia Limited	Comment	Allia accept and understand the wish to secure active frontages wherever possible, but it must be acknowledged that, for some uses, this is easier than for others, e.g. retail space. Equally it is not always possible to have active frontages on all sides of a building, and the Council will need to negotiate on this point with a degree of flexibility.	Comments noted.	

Appendix A1: Representation Response Report

3. Strategies for Change

3.4.18, Bullet 4

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Bullet 4</i>				
5305 - Allia Limited	Comment	Allia acknowledge that St Matthew's Piece is a locally important resource, and that development must present an appropriate backdrop to the Piece. However, the use of the term "minimising the impact" is perhaps rather vague, and lacks specificity.	Comments noted. Reference to the 'Howard Mallett Centre - Development Principles' was added to the Built Form Scale and Massing Strategy following extensive consultation on the Eastern Gate Visioning Document. Bullet point 4 'Minimising the impact on St Matthew's Piece' was considered important in order to consider the impact of development on the Piece and arrangement of mature trees to the rear of the site.	
<i>Bullet 5</i>				
5310 - Allia Limited	Comment	Whilst Allia acknowledge that there is some public clamour to consider increasing the size of St Matthew's Piece, it would be premature to presume this will be possible. Allia is a charitable organisation which has been set up for the benefit of the community. Allia is legally required to use its resources in the furthering of its aims. If the building footprint on the Howard Mallet site is to reduce this is likely to mean that a building of greater mass and height than that which exists presently (this point is almost certain in any event) will be needed.	Comments noted. It has been assumed that a taller building than the existing 1 storey building would be proposed. This is shown on Figure 38 Built form, Scale and Massing Strategy, which identifies a maximum 2-2.5 storey building would be appropriate.	
<i>3.5.1</i>				
5506 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	Page 46 - Public Art. It is suggested that consideration should be given to retaining the public art that currently exists in the underpasses beneath Elizabeth Way Roundabout. The draft SPD does not mention this.	Comments noted. The mosaic murals located on pedestrian and cycle underpasses of Elizabeth Way Roundabout will be included within section 3.5 suggesting where possible to retain and relocate the existing mosaic mural beneath the Elizabeth Way Roundabout.	Add additional paragraph noting the existing mosaic murals.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
4. Key Projects				
4.1.1				
5458 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	Comment	We fully support Key projects 1 - 4, but we have serious reservations about one important aspect of key project 5, namely the proposal to reintroduce two-traffic along New Street and Harvest Way. We believe this would a grave mistake	Key project 5 explores ways of ways of making a street, which prioritises the needs of residents. In recent years the publication of Manual For Streets 1 and 2, the Cambridgeshire Design Guide along with numerous High Street redevelopments including Brighton, 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 we feel that it is appropriate to investigate an alternative approach to highways given the existing highway arrangement. Key project 5 looks at the whole of New Street and Harvest Way to deliver a coherent arrangement not just a reinstatement of two-way traffic. The project will include a comprehensive review with Cambridgeshire County Council as Highways Authority to examine the feasibility of the proposals. The concerns of local residents are taken very seriously however we would not wish to discount these proposals at this relatively early stage.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5350 - Savills	Comment	There is no information within the SA that indicates what alternative approaches have been considered, nor as to the social, economic and environmental benefits of the projects. Not only does this cast doubt as to whether the SPD meets with the legal requirements, but it also makes it difficult to meaningfully comment on the projects.	<p>Comments noted. The Sustainability Appraisal was carried out in line with the 'Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents' (November 2005), which takes into account the requirements of the SEA Directive. This involved assessing the Draft SPD objectives (paragraph 1.4.2) against the SA objectives identified in Stage A (Scoping) of the SA process, as well as assessing the Local Plan policies, to which the SPD relates. The Key Projects illustrate a possible way in which the objectives and vision within the SPD can be delivered, they represent indicative solutions to making better use of space, improve the balance between traffic and townscape and create streets and spaces that are more civilised and inclusive.</p> <p>As explained in paragraph 5.3.2, the Eastern Gate Development Framework SPD provides guidance on adopted Local Plan policy, two options were considered to be appropriate for the SA; to either a) proceed with the SPD or b) to not proceed with the SPD and rely on Policy alone. In conclusion of this assessment it was found that the only viable option to guide future proposals for the Eastern Gate Development Framework site is to proceed with the drafting of the SPD. The appraisal found that if the SPD were to go ahead there would potentially be no negative impacts on the SA objectives.</p> <p>The Visioning Document for the SPD was subject to public consultation and this resulted in a series of different suggestions about how the area could be improved. These ideas were used to identify five potential projects, which are set out as key projects in the SPD. These projects are in line with the objectives of the SPD, which were appraised using the SA objectives.</p> <p>The Key Projects represent just one solution for the redevelopment of the key public realm and infrastructure projects shown in figure 41, each has been developed and appraised through extensive consultation with local residents, (see Summary of Public Meeting 9th November 2009 and approved Eastern Gate Visioning Document, February 2011) and have been appraised through sound urban design guidance and informal consultation with the</p>	Amend to key projects to include a summary detailing the benefits if they key project is achieved. Additional paragraph to be added to section 1.4.2 to indicate how the objectives of the SPD inform the design proposals of the key projects.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			County Council as Highway Authority. All key projects are illustrative and will require further detailed design work, traffic modelling and testing to be undertaken in partnership with Cambridgeshire County Council.	
			The Key projects shown in chapter 4 of the SPD represent indicative solutions for achieving the overall vision and objectives of the Eastern Gate study area, they represent just one option for redevelopment, and do not discount additional options or sites that could come forward in the future.	
5349 - Savills	Comment	Key project (section 4) - the University welcomes the intentions behind these key projects to improve the gateway to the city centre. We have not reviewed the plans to assess whether they are technically deliverable, but welcome measures to improve accessibility to the city centre and across the city by public transport, cyclist and pedestrians. We consider that the projects needs to be thoroughly tested and appraised.	Comments noted. Before junction layouts proposed within key projects can be agreed, further detailed design work, cost analysis and traffic modelling of the area will be carried out in collaboration with Cambridgeshire County Council.	
<i>4.1.3</i>				
5390 - Sustrans East of England	Support	<p>Sustrans' "DIY Streets" project has engaged with local communities on a relatively small scale to redesign residential areas, especially those which are rat-runs for motor traffic. The result has been streets in which people of all ages feel safe, walking, cycling and playing.</p> <p>We enthusiastically support the key projects of this Draft SPD, which will have a similar effect on the study. Although Cambridge already has the highest levels of cycling in the UK, it could double these levels, to match levels commonly seen in Europe.</p> <p>Improving cycling conditions in the SPD area would do much to make this happen.</p>	Comments noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
4.1.6 5354	Support	<p>I strongly support the main thrust of all key projects.</p> <p>I think cycle lane widths should be a minimum of 2.0 metres throughout. 1.5m should be reserved for exceptional sections, and the width reduction should be explicitly justified at each exception.</p>	<p>Whilst 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:</p> <p>"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 acceptable on roads with a 30 mph limit". Section 4.3.5 of the SPD states:</p> <p>"Therefore any 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, road width and geometry of the streetscape".</p> <p>As part of the detail design for all key projects we will endeavour to maximise widths of cycle lanes to 2m where possible, however 1.5m is a robust starting point for cycle provision, given the design speed of 20mph along Newmarket Road. Before layouts can be agreed, further detailed design and traffic modelling of the area will need to be carried out through extensive consultation between the City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council as Highways Authority.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Figure 41</i>				
5496 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	It is appreciated that the proposals are illustrative, but they do raise issues of transport capacity for cars, buses, pedestrians and cyclists that will need to be studied in some detail. In this context, the County Council will seek to work with the City Council to identify the resources to take forward this work. It is important to ensure that the junctions of Newmarket Road with East Road and Coldhams Lane are not constrained to too great an extent for the surrounding network to cope with, as they are critical for the operation of the transport network of the city. In this context, it is likely that some of the aspirations shown for sustainable transport modes may not be achievable without compromises in other areas such as available land or building lines on the Newmarket Road frontage. However, provided an open minded approach is maintained, it should be possible to achieve many of the benefits that are sought that are in line with current national and local transport policy, and that the document clearly expresses.	Comments noted.	
5494 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Projects 1 to 5 - pages 50 - 67 - The County Council supports the principal of improving the Elizabeth Way Roundabout junction and surrounding area for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users and breaking down the existing barriers. However before a junction and area layout can be agreed, detailed design and traffic modelling of the area needs to be carried out to ensure that the vehicular traffic can still operate as efficiently as possible and not cause problems within the surrounding areas. This is a key arterial route and particular care should be taken to ensure there is no detriment to traffic flow as this could have a knock on effect for bus reliability and traffic in other areas of Cambridge.	Comments noted.	

Appendix A1: Representation Response Report

4. Key Projects

4.2.1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>4.2.1</i>				
5382	Comment	Support proposal. I would like to see cyclists allowed to turn left on all corners of this junction without having to wait at the traffic signals. There seems to be space for routes to avoid the signals.	Comments noted. The key projects illustrated in chapter 4 of the SPD are illustrative proposals for achieving the overall vision for the area and represent just one solution for the redevelopment of the key public realm and infrastructure projects shown in figure 41. The key projects will need to be developed further, subject to consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council as Highways authority to inform detailed design work, traffic modelling and testing. More detail would need to be obtained to demonstrate the feasibility of allowing cycles to by pass the traffic signals.	
5385	Comment	The abuse of the bus lanes on Newmarket and Hills Road is endemic and there is abuse of the wide cycle lanes on Gilbert Road to jump queues. What enforcement measures are proposed, given that the police do not seem interested in this?	Comments noted, it is beyond the scope of the SPD to enforce cycle lanes. Key projects shown in chapter 4 of the SPD each seek to balance the needs of road users in order to promote the creation of safer, more civilised and inclusive streets, which priorities pedestrians and cyclists.	
5332 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Support	We particularly welcome the proposals to replace the Elizabeth Way / East Road roundabout with traffic signals, to reduce the overall size of the junction, and to replace the subways with surface crossings.	Comments noted.	
5442 - Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA)	Support	3.2.4, 3.2.9 and Project 1 (4.2) We would be delighted to see Elizabeth Way roundabout removed, historic northsouth links restored and the space used to create safer routes for cyclists and pedestrians. The subway is confusing and hostile for both groups, particularly at night, and it is very difficult for cyclists to enter Newmarket Road from Abbey Road.	Comments noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5393 - Sustrans East of England	Support	<p>This roundabout is a failed futuristic project, entirely unrelated to its surroundings. Its effect in boosting traffic levels is a blight on the city, and it forms a major obstacle to pedestrian and cycle access on several important desire lines.</p> <p>It is good to see that the draft SPD acknowledges this and proposes a convincing solution. The creation of extra public or development space is a further bonus.</p> <p>Its replacement as proposed cannot come soon enough.</p>	Comments noted.	
<i>Figure 43</i>				
5444 - Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA)	Comment	<p>The pedestrian experience will only be 'comfortable' if crossing times are sufficient.</p> <p>Timings on the recently-improved Abbey Street crossing are far too short.</p>	Comments noted. Crossing times are an important consideration. However it is beyond the scope of this SPD to provide details in relation to crossing timings. The on-going design of the key projects will require extensive consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council as Local Highways Authority. Traffic modelling will be undertaken to assess a variety of options in relation to signalling and timings.	
5383	Comment	<p>There are no cycle lanes on Newmarket Road to the west of the junction, why is this?</p>	Comments noted. Cycle lanes west of Elizabeth Way Roundabout on Newmarket Road will be added to figure 43.	Add cycle lanes west of Elizabeth Way Roundabout to figure 43.
5384	Comment	<p>Why is there no pedestrian crossing from East Road to Elizabeth Way bridge on the east side of the junction? In practice people will not walk to the Occupation Road crossing</p>	Comments noted. There was a strong desire to reinstate the historic link between the river and the railway station during initial public consultation for the Eastern Gate Visioning Document. The possibility of providing an additional crossing closer to the junction will be examined as part of options testing at the detailed design stage.	

Appendix A1: Representation Response Report

4. Key Projects

Figure 43

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5443 - Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA)	Comment	4.2.3 and Figure 43 Speed reduction measures must be explicitly required for Project 1. Proposals to remove pedestrian guardrails, improve the environment for cyclists and create new active public open spaces will only succeed if vehicles are required to slow down significantly.	Comments noted. Speed reduction measures have been introduced through the use of tighter road geometry, junction radii and reduced lane widths. 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 road, width and geometry of the streetscape".	
5404	Support	Strongly support. The opportunity to part-fund this by extending the terrace to the north-east of the junction should definitely be considered.	Comments noted.	
<i>4.2.3</i>				
5278	Support	These design criteria have been well considered to create a new junction that will better serve all forms of transport.	Comments noted.	
<i>Bullet 3</i>				
5405	Support	Strongly support. Pedestrians are treated as the lowest-of-the-low in this whole area.	Comments noted.	

Appendix A1: Representation Response Report

4. Key Projects

4.2.3, Bullet 4

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Bullet 4</i>				
5507 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	Page 50 - The Eastern Gate area is already going through numerous changes. It is suggested that a paragraph is included in the Supplementary Planning Document to note that the SPD needs to be adaptable to local changes. For example, the Rose and Crown Pub is mentioned on page 50 and it is suggested that a 'spill out' space could be created outside of the pub. It is understood that the Rose and Crown building is no longer a pub and therefore the opportunity for a 'spill out' space may need reviewing.	<p>Comments noted, at the time of producing the Eastern Gate Visioning Document and SPD the 'Rose and Crown' was a Public House. In December 2010 an application was approved for the change of use from a Public House to a 6-bed flat (1st and 2nd floors), 1-bed flat (ground floor) and Letting Agent and basement office. The 'spill out space' (bullet point 5, paragraph 4.2.3, and showing as note 3 on page 52) will be removed in light of the change of use application.</p> <p>The key projects illustrated in chapter 4 of the SPD are illustrative proposals for achieving the overall vision for the area and represent just one solution for the redevelopment of the key public realm and infrastructure projects shown in figure 41. The key projects will need to be developed further, subject to consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council as Highways authority to inform detailed design work, traffic modelling and testing.</p>	Remove 'Spill out space' from paragraph 4.2.3 (bullet point 5) and note 3 on page 52.
<i>Bullet 7</i>				
5333 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Support	We particularly welcome the proposals to allow cyclists and pedestrians to cross Newmarket Road directly from Occupation Road to Abbey Road. This will be of great benefit both to local cyclists and pedestrians but also to cyclists making longer journeys between, for example, the station to Chesterton and north-east Cambridge.	Comments noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>4.3.1</i>				
5445 - Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA)	Support	3.2.5. and Project 2 (4.3) We strongly support proposals to reduce the dominance of vehicle through-traffic over other, more community-centred uses. We also support proposals to create wider cycle lanes and pedestrian footpaths. We do not object to central bus lanes; they are widely used in Europe and can improve safety and visibility for cyclists and pedestrians. However, careful introduction and signage will be needed if implemented here, since they are unfamiliar to British road users.	Comments noted. The design of the central bus lanes will be carefully considered as part of any on-going design studies with Cambridgeshire County Council as Local Highways Authority.	
<i>4.3.6</i>				
5334 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Comment	We note with interest the proposal to introduce a pair of bus lanes along the middle of Newmarket Road, with a single lane for other traffic on each side, plus cycle lanes. This is an innovative idea but it is difficult for us to assess the impact on cyclists without seeing a more detailed design which takes account of the limited space available. Until then we cannot give this scheme our full support.	Comments noted. The design of the bus lane will be carefully considered as part of any on-going design studies with Cambridgeshire County Council as Local Highways Authority.	
<i>Figure 50 to 53</i>				
5387	Comment	Traffic turning from Newmarket Road east-bound to Coldhams Lane is controlled separately from that continuing on Newmarket Road at present. I can't see how that is possible with the new layout, which could lead to long queues and encourage abuse of cycle and bus lanes.	Comments noted. Figure 50 and 57 will be amended to show a right turn lane from Newmarket Road to Coldham's Lane. All key projects will require further detailed design and traffic modelling with Cambridgeshire County Council as Local Highways Authority.	Amend figure 50 and 57 to include a right turn lane from Newmarket Road to Coldham's Lane.

Appendix A1: Representation Response Report

4. Key Projects

Figure 50 to 53

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5406	Comment	<p>Not convinced there is space for a bi-directional bus lane and 3m-wide islands to access the buses.</p> <p>A tidal flow bus lane, which creates the opportunity for wider cycle lanes and wider pavements, should be considered.</p> <p>The only point of a bus lane is really to ensure that it can beat the traffic, but this only ever applies in one direction at any time of day, so tidal flow could work well.</p>	Comments noted. Other options will be tested as part of any on-going detailed design work and traffic modelling with Cambridgeshire County Council as Local Highways Authority.	
5435	Comment	<p>p57 (figure - not numbered) COMMENT Why no trees shown on the plan - when it is highlighted previously as an objective/strategy - and the symbol is included in the key?</p>	Comments noted. Areas for 'Opportunities for street trees' are indicated on figure 50 surrounding Elizabeth Way roundabout. Figure 50 is intended to show the key design criteria for the arrangement of Newmarket Road, whilst it is an aspiration of the SPD for the 'greening' of Newmarket Road, trees have been removed to avoid confusion and improve the clarity of the drawing.	
5474 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	<p>Fig 50 - should illustrated the extension of the plane tree avenue (trees at similar distances as already planted section along the retail areas to east) along Newmarket Road from the east to Elizabeth Roundabout to further enforce the need to adequately integrate new development. This to both sides of the road to ensure quality development and signature tree-line avenue along Newmarket Road.</p>	Figure 50 is intended to primarily show the key design criteria for the arrangement of the carriageway, whilst it is an aspiration of the SPD for the 'greening' of Newmarket Road, trees have been removed from figure 50 to avoid confusion and improve the clarity of the drawing.	
5313	Object	<p>I think it would be better to have the bus lanes in the normal position outside the main traffic lanes.</p> <p>OK to keep the idea of bus stop islands but instead place these bus stop islands between the bus lane and the cycle lane.</p> <p>I think this alternative would be better for cyclists by providing protection from the main traffic lane.</p>	Comments noted. Our preference at presence is for a central bus lane. However other options will be tested as part of any on-going design work with Cambridgeshire County Council as Local Highways Authority.	

Appendix A1: Representation Response Report

4. Key Projects

Figure 50 to 53

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5362 5386	Object	Cycle lanes should be shown at 2 metres wide for all on road section of Newmarket Road.	<p>Whilst 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:</p> <p>"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 acceptable on roads with a 30 mph limit". Section 4.3.5 of the SPD states:</p> <p>"Therefore any 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, road width and geometry of the streetscape".</p> <p>As part of the detail design for all key projects we will endeavour to maximise widths of cycle lanes to 2m where possible, however 1.5m is a robust starting point for cycle provision, given the design speed of 20mph along Newmarket Road. Before layouts can be agreed, further detailed design and traffic modelling of the area will need to be carried out through extensive consultation between the City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council as Highways Authority.</p>	
5391 - Sustrans East of England	Support	<p>We strongly support the wording of 4.3, as demonstrating a realistic approach to delivering major benefits: at present Newmarket Road's lack of any safe and continuous cycle route is suppressing cycle use in Abbey ward, for which it is an essential route to the city centre, and (via Green Dragon Bridge) to north Cambridge.</p> <p>With the future development of Cambridge East demand along this important desire line will increase very substantially. It is essential that Newmarket Road is "tamed" for people as soon as possible, and ahead of any significant growth in Cambridge East. Better cycle access means less motor traffic.</p>	Comments noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>4.4.3</i>				
5392 - Sustrans East of England	Support	Sustrans supports the design proposals as likely to encourage both walking and cycling. We note that they are designed to be "of a piece" with Projects 1 and 2, and would welcome the holistic redesign of the entire street between Newmarket Road's railway bridge and Gonville Place's junction with Hills Road.	Comments noted. The wider areas of Newmarket Road to the railway bridge and the Gonville Place junction with Hills Road are not included within the Eastern Gate study area, as they contain no potential development sites, both allocated in the 2006 Cambridge Local Plan and unallocated. There maybe opportunities in the future to address the standard highway arrangement of these routes surrounding the study area	
<i>4.4.4</i>				
5389	Comment	The bus lanes are in the centre on Newmarket Road and at the edges on East Road. Could this cause confusion for road users? I would favour a more consistent approach.	Comments noted. Bus lane proposals are indicative at this stage. Alternative configurations will be thoroughly tested with Cambridgeshire County Council Highways as part of the on going design review and traffic modelling process.	
5279	Support	These design criteria have been well considered to create a new junction that will better serve all forms of transport, especially cyclists.	Comments noted.	

Appendix A1: Representation Response Report

4. Key Projects

4.4.4, Bullet 3

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Bullet 3</i>				
5336 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign 5340 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign 5356 5360 5372 5373 5388 5397 5409	Object	Cycle lanes should be shown at 2 metres wide for all on road section of Newmarket Road.	<p>Comments noted. Whilst 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:</p> <p>"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 acceptable on roads with a 30 mph limit". Section 4.3.5 of the SPD states:</p> <p>"Therefore any 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, road width and geometry of the streetscape".</p> <p>As part of the detail design for all key projects we will endeavour to maximise widths of cycle lanes to 2m where possible, however 1.5m is a robust starting point for cycle provision, given the design speed of 20mph along Newmarket Road. Before layouts can be agreed, further detailed design and traffic modelling of the area will need to be carried out through extensive consultation between the City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council as Local Highways Authority.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Figure 55</i>				
5463 - Her Majesty's Courts & Tribunals	Comment	<p>The nature of Her Majesty's Courts & Tribunals Services (HMCTS) business is highly sensitive in terms of highways issues. It appears from the proposed illustrative proposal (Figure 55) that traffic coming from the city centre will no longer be able to turn right into St Matthew's Street. This route is regularly used by visitors to the court and prison transport and HMCTS's main concern is that this could cause a backlog and restriction to traffic entering or leaving the Court.</p> <p>This could have implications on the flow of operational / custody vehicles to and from the Courts. Any increase in road activity in the area may impinge on the safety and swift access required for exit to and from the Courts, thereby undermining HMCTS's ability to operate the Court building in support of the Country's legal system.</p> <p>We would ask that the Council take into consideration our comments when approving proposals for the remodelling of St Matthew's Street Junction so as to ensure the Court has the full and unfettered access and egress it requires at all times.</p>	Comments noted. Figure 55 will be amended to show a right turn lane from Newmarket Road to allow vehicle access to St Matthew's Street. All key projects will require further detailed design and traffic modelling with Cambridgeshire County Council as Local Highways Authority.	Amend figure 55 to show right turn lane from Newmarket Road to St Matthew's Street.
5343 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Comment	<p>* It was not clear to us whether the changes proposed at the East Road / St Matthew's Street junction would allow traffic leaving the Grafton Centre Car Park to proceed towards St Matthew's Street or turn right into East Road, neither of which is possible at the moment. We would welcome these movements being allowed because they would benefit cyclists using the signposted cycle route around the northern edge of the Grafton Centre, which allows cyclists to avoid the existing 10-4 cycle ban in Fitzroy and Burleigh Street.</p>	Comments noted. Subject to approval and further detailed design review from Cambridgeshire County Council Highways, vehicles and cyclists exiting the Grafton Centre will be able to turn right onto East Road and St Matthews Street. All key projects will be subject to further detailed design and traffic modelling.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>4.4.5</i>				
5446 - Riverside Area Residents Association (RARA)	Comment	<p>3.2.7 and Project 4 (4.4 and Figure 5.7) We welcome the proposal to remodel this junction, which is extraordinarily hostile for pedestrians and cyclists. This project needs immediate attention, since junction improvement forms part of the S106 agreement for the recently-consented Travelodge. We hope the JUDT will be working closely with County Highways, Travelodge and the owners of the Intercell House site.</p> <p>The River Lane/Newmarket Road/Coldham's lane 'dogleg' junction is the only exit from the Riverside area for cars and cycles heading south or west. It makes no provision for cyclists or pedestrians. We welcome the proposals to improve the junction for these groups, but would like to point out the importance of ensuring it functions adequately for residents entering or leaving the Riverside area by car.</p> <p>We cannot tell from Fig 5.7 where bus lanes would be located on Coldham's Lane, which is a particularly problematic road, being narrower than Newmarket Road but with equal or greater volumes of traffic.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Figure 57 has been developed so as to retain existing vehicle movements from the west turning right onto River Lane, and movements turning right from River Lane onto Newmarket Road. Figure 57 will be amended to show a right turn lane from Newmarket Road to Coldham's Lane.</p> <p>At present we do not propose to include bus lanes within key project 4. Coldham's Lane is highly constrained and it was found to be too narrow to include additional bus lanes in each direction. All key projects are indicative and will require further work including detailed design and traffic modelling to be carried out by Cambridgeshire County Council as Local Highways Authority.</p>	Indicate the river lane junction arrangements more clearly, amend the Newmarket Road/Coldham's Lane Junction to provide a right turn lane into Coldham's Lane.

Appendix A1: Representation Response Report

4. Key Projects

4.4.5, Bullet 3

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Bullet 3</i>				
5341 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign 5342 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign 5357 5358 5363 5364 5369 5370 5379 5398 5410	Object	A 2m cycle lane should be the minimum width of on-road cycle lane along Newmarket Road.	Comments noted. Whilst 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 acceptable on roads with a 30 mph limit'. Section 4.3.5 of the SPD states: 'Therefore any 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, road width and geometry of the streetscape'. As part of the detail design for all key projects we will endeavour to maximise widths of cycle lanes to 2m where possible, however 1.5m is a robust starting point for cycle provision, given the design speed of 20mph along Newmarket Road. Before layouts can be agreed, further detailed design and traffic modelling of the area will need to be carried out through extensive consultation between the City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council as Local Highways Authority.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>4.5.1</i>				
5460 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	Comment	Traffic in New Street and Harvest Way is in any case expected to increase vastly once the consented Eastern Gate Travelodge Hotel is built, which has its vehicle entrance and drop-off point in Harvest Way. The hotel alone is expected to generate an extra 1000+ vehicle movements per 24 hours. Further development (some of it proposed in pending planning applications) will add even more traffic.	<p>Comments noted. The Travelodge application was subject to a full Transport Assessment and Hotel Transport Management Plan as part of the planning application. We note the County Council (as Highways Authority) raised no objections to the development on transport related grounds, it was viewed that the predicted 3% increase in traffic levels was not material, when viewed against the day-to-day and season-to-season variation in traffic flows that already occurs on the highway network. Page 48 of the approved Travelodge Transport Assessment reveals the Travelodge will add a further 27 trips in the AM peak and 38 additional trips to PM peak to the local road network. The County Council did not consider that the predicted increase in traffic flows on Newmarket Road and Coldham's Lane was a sufficient reason to oppose the planning application.</p> <p>The residential development located to west of the Travelodge will be subject to a similar Transport Assessment, which will need to show the level of impact an increase in traffic will have to the surrounding residential areas.</p>	
5459 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	Comment	Many local residents remember frequent tailbacks in New Street before the one-way system was introduced, because drivers routinely used New Street as a short-cut between East Road and Coldham's Lane. In fact, some residents remember witnessing physical fights between drivers travelling in opposite directions when there was not enough room for both to pass (because of parked cars).	<p>Comments noted. Key project 5 explores ways of improving the gateways into the Petersfield ward area and ultimately offers a fresh approach to creating civilised and inclusive streets which priorities the needs of residents. In recent years the publication of 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 we feel that it is appropriate to investigate an alternative approach to highways given the existing highway arrangement. Key project 5 looks at the whole of New Street and Harvest Way to deliver a coherent arrangement not just to 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>	

Appendix A1: Representation Response Report

4. Key Projects

4.5.1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5252	Comment	5) The excellent ideas for New Street and Harvest Way will prove impractical if, in addition to the considerable extra traffic to be generated by the Travelodge, yet further increases result from the proposed residential block - as they will, whatever statistical legerdemain the developers' traffic consultants come up with.	<p>Comments noted. The Travelodge application was subject to a full Transport Assessment and Hotel Transport Management Plan as part of the planning application. We note the County Council (as Highways Authority) raised no objections to the development on transport related grounds, it was viewed that the predicted 3% increase in traffic levels was not material, particularly when viewed against the day-to-day and season-to-season variation in traffic flows that already occurs on the highway network. The County Council did not consider that the predicted increase in traffic flows on Newmarket Road and Coldham's Lane was a sufficient reason to oppose the planning application.</p> <p>The residential development located to west of the Travelodge will be subject to a similar Transport Assessment, which will need to show the level of impact an increase in traffic will have to the surrounding residential areas.</p>	
5280	Support	<p>As residents and regular users of these roads we are keen to see these proposals taken forward. It will also be good to take this opportunity to be part of a pilot project demonstrating fresh approaches to street design.</p> <p>Careful thought will have to be put into how to prevent parking while still reducing road markings and signs.</p> <p>Harvest Way and New Street need 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>	Comments noted. Harvest Way and New Street has been designed so as to achieve a target speed of below 20mph. Fundamental to this is reducing carriageway widths. The visual width of the carriageway will be reduced further through the use of a double kerb detail and street trees.	
<hr/>				
<i>Figure 58</i>				
5436	Comment	<p>Figure 58 COMMENT</p> <p>Why doesn't this show the tighter road geometry as proposed in key project 3 at the junction of New Street and St. Matthew's Street</p>	Comments noted. Figure 58 (key project 5) will be updated to show the tighter road geometry at the junction of New Street and St Matthews Street as shown in key project 3.	Update figure 58 to show tighter radii to the New Street/St Matthews junction - as per figure 55.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>4.5.7</i>				
5461 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	Comment	<p>Home-zoning measures, as proposed in key project 5, may help slow down traffic, but would not be effective in reducing congestion and tailbacks.</p> <p>We have discussed this matter with Patrick Lanyon of SRL Consultants, who was responsible for in-depth traffic assessments of the area in relation to two major planning applications at Eastern Gate (including the Travelodge Hotel). His judgement is that reintroducing two-way traffic on New Street and Harvest Way would be foolish and would harm the amenity of local residents.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Key project 5 explores ways of improving the gateways into the Petersfield ward area and ultimately offers a fresh approach to creating civilised and inclusive streets which priorities the needs of residents. In recent years the publication of 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 we feel that it is appropriate to investigate an alternative approach to highways given the existing highway arrangement. Key project 5 looks at the whole of New Street and Harvest Way to deliver a coherent arrangement not just to 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>	
5265	Object	<p>Returning Harvest Way and New Street to two-way traffic will, I think, be a backward step and the idea should be abandoned:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It will create a rat run from Coldham's Lane to East Road 2. There will be a loss of car parking which is going to be critical with the building of the Travelodge and proposals for residents' parking in other areas of the City. 	<p>Comments noted. Key project 5 explores ways of improving the gateways into the Petersfield ward area and ultimately offers a fresh approach to creating civilised and inclusive streets which priorities the needs of residents. In recent years the publication of 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 we feel that it is appropriate to investigate an alternative approach to highways given the existing highway arrangement. Key project 5 looks at the whole of New Street and Harvest Way to deliver a coherent arrangement not just to 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 including any reduction in on street parking.</p>	

Appendix A1: Representation Response Report

4. Key Projects

Figures 59 to 63

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Figures 59 to 63</i>				
5407	Support	I support the reduction of the very car-dominated landscape here.	Comments noted.	
<i>4.6.1</i>				
5351 - Savills	Comment	Implementation and deliverability - the SPD sets out a number of aspirational projects, which the council consider, are desirable to implement. It is unclear how any of the projects can be said to pass the tests of the CIL Regulation 122. The projects have not been tested through a Development Plan Document and it is unclear therefore how they are necessary or directly-related to any of the development sites within the area. We do not consider the projects are capable of funding through S106.	Concerns noted. However, projects do not need to be tested through the development of a Development Plan Document in order to allow the Council to spend S106 monies on projects. The Council's adopted Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document provides guidance on contributions towards transport infrastructure and public realm improvements on a site specific basis. If the Council fully justifies the collection of monies for a particular planning application in line with both the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document and the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended), it could be possible to spend S106 monies on one or more of the projects as appropriate. We do however recognise the difficulty with pooling S106 monies from 2014 onwards.	
5353 - Savills	Comment	In conclusion, whilst we support many of the aspirations within the SPD, we consider that elements of the SPD need reconsideration in order to ensure they meet the legal requirements in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal process and CIL Regulations	Concerns noted. However, it is not considered that the SPD requires further amendment to meet the requirements of the Community Infrastructure Regulations.	
5352 - Savills	Comment	Looking to the future, the projects should be brought forward and subject to proper scrutiny and testing through the development plan process and can then be funded through the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)	Concerns noted. A range of infrastructure projects will provide a base for testing the viability of charging the Community Infrastructure Levy, which will in turn lead to the development of a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule. However, once the charging schedule is adopted, further infrastructure projects are likely to come forward with detailed costings and will need to be prioritised by the Council.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
4.6.6				
5394 - Sustrans East of England	Support	<p>We recognise that the redesign of this major area of street infrastructure cannot be carried out without study of its effect on the rest of the Cambridge network.</p> <p>We urge County and City Councils, in their CATS study, to have confidence that in the Cambridge context it is realistic to expect that re-engineering the network, better to accommodate pedestrian and cycle traffic, will bring about a corresponding reduction in motor vehicle traffic.</p> <p>Cambridge has the potential to be the first UK city to match continental cycling levels, where 40% modal share is not uncommon.</p> <p>We would be glad to participate in CATS.</p>	Comments noted. The participation of Sustrans would be welcomed.	

Implementation Table - Key Projects - jpg

5395 - Sustrans East of England	Comment	<p>The comprehensive 'Place and Movement' design strategy referred to in Project 2 in fact must apply to all four projects, whose full benefits will only be realised when all have been delivered.</p> <p>We feel that every means possible should be used to advance 1 and 2, which are the keys to delivering higher levels of walking, cycling and public transport use.</p> <p>Developers and the public will have greater confidence in the benefits of the Development Framework if its street content can be delivered ahead of rebuilding works. This may result in the rebuilding proposals being of better quality.</p>	Comments noted. The 'Place and Movement' design strategy noted is intended as a summary description for Key Project 2. All key projects will seek to greatly improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists. Before the layout of key projects can be progressed further, detailed design work including traffic modelling by County Council as Local Highways Authority in partnership with the City Council is required.	
5281	Support	This timetable is realistic but challenging and takes into account the priorities for the area well.	Comments noted.	
4.6.8				
5408	Comment	Extension of the Abbey Road terrace, using freed-up land, could provide some of the funds for this scheme.	Comments noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5497 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	Page 70 - Pooling of S106 contributions will be severely limited from 2014. The option to pool funds is mentioned under 'Planning Obligations Contributions'. Care needs to be taken if considering pooling and the SPD should note that this will not be possible from 2014.	Comments noted.	
<hr/>				
<i>4.6.11</i>				
5355	Comment	Please include Cambridge Cycle Campaign as one of the partners.	Comments noted. Cambridge Cycling Campaign is one of a number of key stakeholders to be consulted as part of successful implementation of the Key Projects; The SPD will be amended to include other Key Stakeholders.	Add 'other Key Stakeholders' to paragraph 4.6.11.
<hr/>				

5. Planning Requirements

5.0.1

5244 - Environment Agency	Comment	I can confirm that the agency would be unlikely to have any objection, in principle, to the development provided that the issues highlighted under your sub heading 5. Planning Requirements are satisfactorily addressed in line with contemporary guidance. The issues of particular interest to the Agency are highlighted below: Environmental Statement; Floodrisk Assessment; Foul water Drainage & Utilities Assessment; Land Contamination Assessment; Sustainable Drainage Strategy & Management Plan; and Sustainability Statement.	Comments noted.
---------------------------	---------	---	-----------------

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Appendices</i>				
<i>Appendix D: Image Credits</i>				
5471 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	Add to glossary: air pollution,	Comment noted. Air pollution will be added to the glossary, and defined as 'The condition in which air is contaminated by foreign substances of the substances themselves. Air pollution consists of gaseous, liquid, or solid substances that when present in sufficient concentration, for a sufficient time, and under certain conditions, tend to interfere with human comfort, health or welfare, and cause environmental damage. Air pollution causes acid rain, ozone depletion, photochemical smog, and other such phenomena'.	Add 'Air pollution' to the Glossary. Defined as 'The condition in which air is contaminated by foreign substances of the substances themselves. Air pollution consists of gaseous, liquid, or solid substances that when present in sufficient concentration, for a sufficient time, and under certain conditions, tend to interfere with human comfort, health or welfare, and cause environmental damage. Air pollution causes acid rain, ozone depletion, photochemical smog, and other such phenomena'.