

## The Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area - Draft Appraisal: Summary of Responses to Re-Consultation

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	Natural England	(i) The comments responding to the original consultation still apply.	(i) Noted	(i) 3
2	County Strategic Planning	(i) Recognises importance of areas as a wildlife corridor.	(i) Noted	(i) 3
		(ii) Locations of County Wildlife Sites, City Wildlife Sites and Local Nature Reserves have been omitted from the maps. These should be included to complement the text and demonstrate that the full extent of the designations has been considered	(ii) Alterations made to maps	(ii) 1
3	Conservators of the River Cam	(i) Suggested additional text relating to racing on the river	(i) Additions made to text	(i) 1
		(ii) Consideration of houseboats insubstantial. Can be classed as planning units. Moorings improvements should be subject to planning control. Smoke Control Area could be extended to include Riverside for benefit of local residents who currently suffer the effects of moored vessels using solid fuels and emitting smoke at street level	(ii) Noted	(ii) 2
		(iii) Concur with point that 'there are some opportunities for visual improvement'. This aspiration should be extended to the appearance of moored river craft too	(iii) Additions made to text	(iii) 1
		(iv) Agree with revised boundary pertaining to	(iv) This would need to be discussed with the	(iv) 2

		<p>river corridor. This area subject to 1922 River Cam Conservancy Act and byelaws. Area also encompasses land belonging to Conservators from former Penny Ferry to City's north-east boundary. Will Tree Work Applications be required for routine reduction work? Would like to request a waiver</p> <p>(v) Hope that riparian landowners will be encouraged to use best practice to maintain their trees</p> <p>(vi) The Appraisal make no mention of the condition of the riverbanks</p>	<p>Green Space Manager</p> <p>(v) Noted</p> <p>(vi) Alterations made to text</p>	<p>(v) 2</p> <p>(vi) 1</p>
4	Old Chesterton Residents' Association	<p>(i) The document helps to give a greater understanding of the area and reasons for designation</p> <p>(ii) Extension gives additional protection to important areas of Cambridge, in particular Stourbridge Common. Including the whole area up to the City boundary is welcomed. Surprised at inclusion of the former Penny Ferry site, but pleased its importance as a riverside amenity was recognised</p> <p>(iii) Report could have acknowledged existence of the Friends groups that are actively supporting the Open Spaces</p> <p>(iv) Appraisal notes that recent developments have become intrusive on the Open Space. It is regretted that this has not prevented a recent application in Ditton Fields from being approved</p>	<p>(i) Noted</p> <p>(ii) Noted</p> <p>(iii) Additional text added</p> <p>(iv) Noted</p>	<p>(i) 3</p> <p>(ii) 3</p> <p>(iii) 1</p> <p>(iv) 2</p>
5	Save Our green Spaces (SOS)	<p>(i) General comments submitted to first consultation should be included this time round too</p> <p>(ii) Would like to add concern over effective enforcing of TPOs. Would like to urge City</p>	<p>(i) Noted</p> <p>(ii) Noted</p>	<p>(i) 3</p> <p>(ii) 2</p>

			Council and its officers to ensure that TPOs are not removed unless absolutely needed for safety reasons			
6	Cam Valley Forum	(i)	Strongly recommend proposal to extend boundary	(i)	Noted	(i) 3
		(ii)	Despite this extension, the emphasis of the appraisal still remains dominated by considerations of townscape. There is scope for a more in depth look at characteristics of un-built areas with a view to developing constructive recommendations, with biodiversity officer, on improvements	(ii)	The biodiversity of the Open Spaces is captured in other documents	(ii) 2
7	Residents by email	(i)	Any future attempts to 'urbanise' Stourbridge Common of Haling Way – excessively widen paths, extra lighting – pressures for additional roads crossing the river from Fen Ditton would be unacceptable suggestions	(i)	Noted	(i) 2
		(ii)	The use of the Penny Ferry site should be enshrined in the document as for a public house due to its historic forbears	(ii)	Noted	(ii) 2
		(iii)	Support inclusion of the Elizabeth Way/ Newmarket Road roundabout as 'a site of opportunity perhaps'. Are s106 funds available from CRC development site to improve the appearance of Walnut Tree Avenue?	(iii)	Noted	(iii) 2
		(iv)	The suggestion to protect the trees at St Andrew the Less is excellent	(iv)	Noted	(iv) 3
		(v)	Stourbridge Common is a critical green space in the city	(v)	Noted	(v) 3
		(vi)	Any future development of the area needs to take into account the nature of the surrounding built and green environment	(vi)	Noted	(vi) 2
		(vii)	Confusing that the first few terraced houses around the junction of Stanley Road and	(vii)	There are a number of modern properties between the Riverside end of Stanley Road	(vii) 3

	Riverside are included, but not the bigger stretch towards Newmarket Road		and where the longer stretch of houses, toward Newmarket Road are which do not warrant inclusion in the Conservation Area. We generally try to avoid 'holes' in Conservation Areas.	(viii) 2
(viii)	Proposals for significant modern developments on the southern edge of Newmarket Road will be even more disproportionate to the northern edge than that which already exists	(viii)	Noted	(ix) 3
(ix)	The footbridge near to the Green Dragon and the Stanley Road/Garlic Row/Oyster Row/eastern Riverside form an especially heavily used area for non-motorised traffic. The recent development of large apartment blocks in this area have contributed to heavily increased motorised traffic which creates conflict with the industrial estate traffic	(ix)	Noted	(x) 3
(x)	Future development should reverse the trend of inconsiderate development in the Riverside area	(x)	Noted	(xi) 2
(xi)	The comment under section 8 regarding public realm is not generally true for the road along Riverside – most of which is in an appalling condition, particularly in the area fronting Stourbridge Common	(xi)	Highways are maintained by the County Council	(xii) 3
(xii)	The road fronting the modern apartments it is proposed to exclude should remain inside the Conservation Area due to the views	(xii)	Maps have been checked – this area is included	(xiii) 3
(xiii)	Why is Stourbridge House included?	(xiii)	In order to have an appropriate boundary to the Conservation Area, it is generally good practise to take the properties that front the road, and their boundaries. By including this building, any proposal for change which may come forward in the future would be subject to the more rigorous planning constraints	(xiv) 3

		(xiv) Most of the road along Riverside is disfigured by the shabby moored boats which should be removed. In addition there is no point to improving the entrance to Stourbridge Common unless the 'scruffy' vehicles are removed from this area due to their detrimental visual impact	(xiv) than if it were not in the Conservation Area Noted	
8	Meeting with Cllr Znajek	(i) Suggestion of inclusion of more properties by the Penny Ferry in Water Lane  (ii) Ensure that appropriate Chesterton Residents' Associations were notified of the re-consultation  (iii) Possible to include North East Cambridge in Conservation Area title?  (iv) Should the Penny Ferry be added to the list of Buildings of Local Interest?	(i) These properties were viewed, however there was no consistent character to the buildings making them worthy of Conservation Area status  (ii) Consultation lists checked  (iii) Proposal considered but deemed to be too complicated. The Conservation Area only extends into Chesterton by a minimal amount  (iv) This was considered previously, however due to the number of extensions and alterations that have been made to the building, there is very little of the original building left and therefore it is not deemed appropriate to try to get it added	(i) 3  (ii) 1  (iii) 3  (iv) 3
9	Meeting with Cllr Wright	(i) Asked for clarity in any additional consultations to show what is already with the Conservation Area, where the proposed extension is and the reason for the proposed extension	(i) Noted. Will be improved in subsequent Conservation Area reviews	(i) 3
10	Chair of VIE Residents' Association	(i) No additional comments	(i)Noted	(i)3
11	Cambridge	(i) Welcome the opportunity to offer further	(i) Noted	(i) 3

	Past Present Future	<p>comment. Do not feel that earlier comments have been fully integrated</p> <p>(ii) A Masterplan is required to protect the various commons covering historic and other built features as well as wildlife aspects. Each common should develop an adequate management plan</p> <p>(iii) More descriptions are needed of greened front gardens and low walls. Is there scope for more street tree planting?</p> <p>(iv) There is no reference in the document to the character of the area with regard to the issue of potential flooding</p> <p>(v) More analysis is required of missing street furniture</p> <p>(vi) Add more descriptive notes on the Chesterton side of the river, the Penny Ferry and the large meadow area</p> <p>(vii) The traditional fair on Midsummer Common should be mentioned</p> <p>(viii) The document should clearly state which of the commons are registered</p> <p>(ix) All entrances to the commons and meadows should be assessed with regard to possible improvement</p> <p>(x) There is a poor edge to the housing area where it meets Ditton Meadows which requires screening</p> <p>(xi) The reference to views from green spaces could be elaborated on</p>	<p>(ii) A management plan will be prepared for Stourbridge Common in 2012. A Masterplan is not within the remit of this document</p> <p>(iii) The text of the original draft was altered to include more description of these areas during the initial consultation. There may be more opportunities for street tree planting. This should be taken up by the Streets and Open Spaces Team</p> <p>(iv) There is a note regarding the fact that the area is in the floodplain</p> <p>(v) There may be an opportunity to undertake a comprehensive survey of public realm throughout the city</p> <p>(vi) Some additional text has been added regarding the area to the north of the river. The large meadow by Fen Road is not part of the proposed boundary</p> <p>(vii) There is reference to the fair in the document</p> <p>(viii) Text altered</p> <p>(ix) Only the entrance to Stourbridge Common from Riverside was picked up as an issue by our consultants</p> <p>(x) Noted</p> <p>(xi) The Townscape Analysis maps indicate important long and short views in the proposed Conservation Area</p>	<p>(ii) 2</p> <p>(iii) 3</p> <p>(iv) 3</p> <p>(v) 2</p> <p>(vi) 1</p> <p>(vii) 3</p> <p>(viii) 1</p> <p>(ix) 3</p> <p>(x) 3</p> <p>(xi) 3</p>
--	------------------------	---	---	---

		(xii) Are there any veteran trees along the river or elsewhere?	(xii) All TPOs and other important trees were identified by the consultants have been indicated on the Townscape Analysis maps	(xii) 3
		(xiii) Reference should also be made to the Strategic Open Space and Recreation Study which highlights the publicly accessible green spaces and private areas	(xiii) The maps indicate the City Wildlife Sites which are public open spaces	(xiii) 3
		(xiv) Under Key Characteristics add street furniture	(xiv) Please see note above regarding public realm	(xiv) 3
		(xv) Issues – proposed additional issues which would aid the generation of income to carry out environmental improvements	(xv) Noted. However this document is not the right mechanism for income generation for such projects	(xv) 3
		(xvi) Suggested additional references	(xvi) Text altered	(xvi) 1
		(xvii) Is the area by the Leper Chapel may not be part of the City Wildlife designation	(xvii) It has been confirmed that this is part of the designation	(xvii) 1
		(xviii) The meadow between Fen Road and the river should be shown as a separation between Chesterton Fen and its residential and industrial area	(xviii) This area is shown on the map as being part of the Green Belt. However, it is not within the proposed boundary, therefore not within the remit of this document	(xviii) 3
		(xix) Are the list descriptions a full copied entry from English Heritage?	(xix) They are. The website address has been added to the references	(xix) 1
		(xx) CPPF have requested previously that the Penny Ferry be added as a BLI	(xx) Noted. The consultants did not pick this up as being a potential BLI	(xx) 3
		(xxi) The inclusion of the northern embankment of the river is welcome. However the actual boundary is unclear	(xxi) The areas bounded by the blue line are the proposed inclusions. There is a black line around the area that is already within the Conservation Area	(xxi) 3
		(xxii) Add the frontages of new developments where the soft landscaping is planned	(xxii) Not within the remit of this document	(xxii) 3
		(xxiii) Comments regarding consultees	(xxiii) The draft document has been widely circulated with all statutory consultees being re-consulted	(xxiii) 3
		(xxiv) Request for a River Approaches Study	(xxiv) Noted	(xxiv) 3
12	Friends of	(i) Comments for previous consultation should	(i) Noted	(i) 3

	Stourbridge Common	(ii) be carried forward Would like to add that the document should strengthen the protection of trees and include open vistas	(ii) There is already some protection of the commons included in the document from their designation as registered commons, therefore no additional comments are deemed necessary	(ii) 2
--	--------------------	--	---	--------