

## New Town & Glisson Road Conservation Area - Draft Appraisal: Summary of Responses

1 = action taken

2 = not within the remit of this document

3 = no action taken

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

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Action
1	English Heritage East of England Region	(i) This is an interesting conservation area, including a number of contemporary buildings of note	(i) Noted	(i) 3
		(ii) A comment should be added regarding the Shackleton Library which is currently outside the boundaries of the conservation area. It might be viewed as making a positive contribution to the character of the area	(ii) Alterations made to text	(ii) 1
		(iii) St Mary's School extension is also seen to be of its time and by well regarded local architects	(iii) Alterations made to text	(iii) 1
		(iv) Should the good modern buildings unidentified within Union Road, King George IV Street and Bentinck Street be identified on Townscape Analysis map?	(iv) The consultants have identified Buildings Important to the Character on the map within this part of the conservation area and these have not been picked up	(iv) 3
		(v) Add name of architects for Parkside Swimming Pool	(v) Text added	(v) 1
		(vi) Should the TPO'd trees behind the almshouses on St Paul's Road be picked up as an important contribution to the character of the conservation area?	(vi) A recent application, which was withdrawn, did not pick up the trees as being important to the area	(vi) 3
		(vii) Highsett – record that phase III received a RIBA Award and that phases II and II should be picked up as Buildings Important to the Character	(vii) Text and map altered	(vii) 1
		(viii) Station Road – add comments about the loss of Wilton Terrace being part of the CB1 Masterplan and about the silo and Mill. The 'Three Deities' are only partially marked as Buildings Important to the	(viii) Text and map altered	(viii) 1

		(ix) Character The new Botanic House should be added to the document due to its impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. The Flying Pig and Osborne Arms should be added as Buildings Important to the Character	(ix) Text and map altered	(ix) 1
		(x) Nos 127 and 127A are still shown on the map as BLIs	(x) Map altered	(x) 1
		(xi) The Townscape Analysis Map should also record important open spaces	(xi) Where they do not detract from the analysis as already shown, these will be added	(xi) 1
		(xii) The proposed boundary changes have been justified	(xii) Noted	(xii) 3
2	Natural England	(i) No response received		
3	Cambridgeshire County Council – Strategic Planning	(i) Recognition of importance of Coe Fen, Sheep’s Green and New Bit as a green wedge is supported as is the University Botanic Garden as a wildlife corridor	(i) Noted	(i) 3
		(ii) The appraisal should also recognise the presence of County and City Wildlife Sites	(ii) Text altered	(ii) 1
4	Cambridgeshire County Council – Highways	(i) No response received		
5	Environment Agency	(i) No response received		
6	Save Our Green Spaces	(i) The appraisal concentrates on the architectural and urban landscape, but this area includes very important green spaces which not only need preserving but enhancing too	(i) Noted. This information has been added to the text	(i) 1
		(ii) There is concern that development is being prioritised over the green environment. This has resulted in some unnecessary tree felling	(ii) Noted	(ii) 2
		(iii) The whole station area should have trees and green spaces included as a matter of urgency. The money set aside by developers for environmental improvements should be used to ameliorate the damage that comes about as a	(iii) Noted	(iii) 2

		result of the developments		
7	2 emails	<p>(i) Glisson Road Warehouse/Dance Studio should be added as a Building of Local Interest if it is not one already</p> <p>(ii) A reference has been given to the origins of St Paul's Church, the Vicarage and the Almshouses and also for the post-enclosure development</p> <p>(iii) The content of the draft appraisal is supported. Particularly agree with the problem of signs and shopfronts</p> <p>(iv) The loss of the trees for the CB1 development is unacceptable. Trees are important to the well-being of residents both physically and psychologically. The City Council should be more protective of existing trees</p> <p>(v) Under Issues and Recommendations the appraisal says that the height and bulk of buildings in the station area and around the edges of the Botanic Garden has an adverse effect on the character of the area, so why is the CB1 development allowing taller and bulkier buildings in the station area?</p>	<p>(i) Noted. This suggestion will be followed up</p> <p>(ii) Noted</p> <p>(iii) Noted</p> <p>(iv) The Masterplan for the CB1 area has been agreed. The comment relating to the protection of trees is noted</p> <p>(v) The CB1 Masterplan has been agreed. Each application is judged against the Masterplan and on its own merits</p>	<p>(i) 2</p> <p>(ii) 3</p> <p>(iii) 3</p> <p>(iv) 3</p> <p>(v) 3</p>
8	1 letter	<p>(i) The appraisal is too late. (The respondent has made a similar comment to that above regarding height and bulk.) Surely the Cambridge Planning Committee is at fault for allowing this to happen. What about Botanic House and the building of vast numbers of flats near the Rail Station?</p>	<p>(i) Comments noted. The CB1 Masterplan has been agreed. Each application is judged against the Masterplan and on its own merits</p>	<p>(i) 3</p>
9	9 comments forms	<p>(i) The draft appraisal is very interesting and makes some sensible recommendations.</p> <p>(ii) The houses at 8-12 Brookside are not double-fronted. Nos. 18/19 are two separate houses with one entrance on Brookside and the other Pemberton Terrace</p> <p>(iii) The history of the area is interesting and</p>	<p>(i) Noted</p> <p>(ii) Alterations made to text</p> <p>(iii) Noted</p>	<p>(i) 1</p> <p>(ii) 1</p> <p>(iii) 3</p>

		<p>represents the rich architectural heritage of the area.</p> <p>(iv) Why have the Coronation Street flats, a council car park and the chemistry laboratory been included? Why are these and Botanic house considered an enhancement to the area?</p>	<p>(iv) The previous boundary left 'holes' where the modern developments were. The current appraisal of the area attests that they are of a suitable scale and design as to be worthy of inclusion. Botanic House was approved by the Planning Committee as being a suitable building for this location</p>	<p>(iv) 3</p>
		<p>(v) The most important issue is how current council policy enforces the conservation areas. Should the area be extended, can there be clear guidance produced by the council about how the conservation area will be enforced?</p>	<p>(v) There is clear national guidance relating to the designation and extension of conservation areas and how planning proposals within those areas should be dealt with. There is also a local policy regarding development within conservation areas</p>	<p>(v) 3</p>
		<p>(vi) The appraisal needs an Executive Summary</p>	<p>(vi) The Introduction and the Summary of Special Interest both give overviews of the area the document covers and its general character</p>	<p>(vi) 3</p>
		<p>(vii) The document should address the allocation of Open Space especially in the new build areas</p>	<p>(vii) The CB1 Masterplan has been agreed. Open Space will be addressed through these planning applications</p>	<p>(vii) 2</p>
		<p>(viii) Sorry that the Triangle and new CB1 area will be excluded</p>	<p>(viii) This is the boundary as suggested by the consultants</p>	<p>(viii) 3</p>
		<p>(ix) Sorry that the time [of the exhibition] was only 6-8.30pm. Very difficult for anyone with young children. Injects an age bias</p>	<p>(ix) The local residents' associations were contacted before the consultation began asking for suggestions for when and where an exhibition should be held in order that it could attract the greatest number of people. The Centre at St Paul's venue one evening during</p>	<p>(ix) 3</p>

		<p>(x) Would have liked a clear 'before' map</p> <p>(xi) Obviously a lot of work went into the appraisal</p> <p>(xii) The area proposed to be excluded should remain within the boundary</p> <p>(xiii) The designation of a conservation area should carry more weight in planning issues than it seems to at present</p> <p>(xiv) Preservation of Foster's Mill and the granary (now Roomz) should be more strongly encouraged</p> <p>(xv) The proliferation of garish signs should be addressed</p> <p>(xvi) The Triangle development area should be included to ensure that any new buildings in the future fit in with the rest of the conservation area. Also the green space needs to be protected</p> <p>(xvii) Some mention should be made of the effect of traffic on the area and the need to restrain development that causes it to be increased</p> <p>(xviii) It is understood from the consultation at St Paul's Church that the same consultants carried out this survey as were working for the Triangle developers. If so this is wrong. This consultation should have been totally independent and I fear for the full objectivity of the survey especially in the wording about keeping in the Triangle/CB1 area</p> <p>(xix) The conservation area should also encompass most if not all of Accordia. Given that Highsett is regarded as an important architectural landmark, the Accordia site is a 21<sup>st</sup> century equivalent, evidenced by the Stirling Prize.</p>	<p>the week appeared to be the best option</p> <p>(x) Noted</p> <p>(xi) Noted</p> <p>(xii) This is the boundary as suggested by the consultants</p> <p>(xiii) There are local and national policies regarding development within conservation areas</p> <p>(xiv) Noted</p> <p>(xv) Noted</p> <p>(xvi) This is the boundary as suggested by the consultants</p> <p>(xvii) Noted</p> <p>(xviii) When Beacon Planning were appointed to carry out this appraisal they specifically pointed out that the people dealing with the CB1 site would not be involved with the work for the appraisal to ensure there was no conflict of interest</p> <p>(xix) Accordia was not picked up by the consultants as being an area that should be included. There will be opportunities in the future to assess whether the development should be designated as a conservation area</p>	<p>(x) 3</p> <p>(xi) 3</p> <p>(xii) 3</p> <p>(xiii) 3</p> <p>(xiv) 3</p> <p>(xv) 2</p> <p>(xvi) 3</p> <p>(xvii) 2</p> <p>(xviii) 3</p> <p>(xix) 3</p>
11	Cambridge Past, Present & Future	<p>(i) Additional text regarding the War Memorial</p> <p>(ii) The Green Belt extends into the City Centre</p>	<p>(i) Alterations made to the text</p> <p>(ii) Alterations made to the text</p>	<p>(i) 1</p> <p>(ii) 1</p>

(a late consultation response)	(iii)	Different railings located within the conservation area and their colours have been changed over their history. A full study should be undertaken to determine their original colours and adequacy	(iii)	This work could be undertaken as part of a city wide assessment of the public realm	(iii)	2
	(iv)	There are no descriptions of lighting and an overall street lighting strategy should be pulled together. CPPF considers that any type of lighting across the commons would be inappropriate	(iv)	See comment above	(iv)	2
	(v)	Clearer guidelines are required on street clutter and street furniture design. There is a lack of street furniture in the area. Seats are essential to ensure the needs of less able to be able to enjoy the city. The city-wide plan and management of street furniture should be revised and the various departments at the City and County Councils should be co-ordinated to ensure appropriateness	(v)	See comments above	(v)	2
	(vi)	Additional information supplied regarding Hobson's Conduit and the Conduit Head	(vi)	Alterations made to text	(vi)	1
	(vii)	A description and management plan are needed for the commons covering the historic environment and ecology/wildlife management, archaeology etc. Coe Fen and Sheep's Green Conservation Plan 2001 should be reviewed	(vii)	Noted, however these proposals are not within the remit of this document	(vii)	2
	(viii)	Hodson's Summerhouse, Coe Fen, needs to be added to the table of BLIs	(viii)	Alterations made to text and map	(viii)	1
	(ix)	The Local Nature Reserves should be mentioned	(ix)	Alterations made to text	(ix)	1
	(x)	Additional text suggested regarding trees in Station Road, Brooklands Avenue and the conservation area as a whole	(x)	Alterations made to text	(x)	1
	(xi)	Comments regarding landscape and lack of open space. The importance of the new Station Square should be highlighted	(xi)	Comments noted. The CB1 Masterplan has been agreed. Each application is judged against the Masterplan and on its own merits	(xi)	3
	(xii)	Mentioned should be made of the feature brick façade on Kett House	(xii)	Alterations made to text	(xii)	1
	(xiii)	Under Issues and Recommendations – welcomes inclusion of Article 4 matters, questions the colour	(xiii)	These points are noted and referenced under other comments	(xiii)	3

		of the railings, needs to be improvements to street furniture, concern regarding height and bulk of buildings having an adverse impact on the area	above	
	(xiv)	The inclusion of areas currently outside of the conservation area are welcomed, however strongly object to the exclusion of the green space and new apartment blocks which are part of the CB1 development. This area should remain in the conservation area.	(xiv)	This is the boundary as suggested by the consultants (xiv) 3
	(xv)	Descriptions of Listed Buildings – are these the originals or a summary?	(xv)	These are the full descriptions as given in the 'greenbacks' (xv) 3
	(xvi)	Proposed additions to Townscape map	(xvi)	Alterations made to map (xvi) 1
	(xvii)	Historic maps could be added to show changes over time	(xvii)	These may be added before publication should the document be approved (xvii) 3