

# Grafton Area of Major Change SPD 2017

## Summary of Representations & Council's Response

---

### 1. Introduction

#### Paragraph 1.1.1

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32010</b> Mx Valerie Cornish [7099]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The Grafton Centre development in the 1980s meant the loss of much of the traditional character of the area. This is an opportunity to improve the area. To retain and restore individual local characteristics and make improvements to encourage and enhance the experience for residents, visitors and workers. What would be very detrimental would be the kind of development we have seen at the railway station. Local character and variety with very good new imaginative architectural design would welcome.

---

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. New development will need to take account of the local character of the area and used to inform appropriate future development proposals.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

---

#### Paragraph 1.1.3

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32117</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

At least one key stakeholder, Camcycle, was not invited to the workshop. The consultation with the Cycling Stakeholders Group also took place after the opening of this SPD consultation, too late to have any effect. That group found various problems with the proposals which could have been resolved prior to issuing the SPD for consultation.

---

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. A separate meeting took place 22 January 2018 between the Grafton Area SPD promoters and the Cambridge Cycling Campaign to discuss the contents of the SPD and any relevant concerns that it raised.**

**The proposed changes to the SPD following earlier discussions with the Highway's Authority in December 2017 were outlined to help address the Cycling Campaign's concerns raised.**

**The concerns raised by the Cycling Campaign have been duly noted and will be taken into consideration in future planning proposals related to the Grafton Area.**

**It should be noted that a number of changes have been made in response to concerns raised during the consultation by the Cycling Campaign. These are listed under the respective section for each representation where changes have been made.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

---

## Paragraph 1.2.4

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31945</b> Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Ms Stacey Weiser) [1801]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

It is important to note that the Draft SPD cannot be adopted until the Local Plan examination has completed. As a result, no formal applications should be accepted until both the Local Plan and the SPD have been formally adopted. Applications have been submitted prematurely for other sites and this results in confusion, poor design details and lack of clarity of vision.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. It is not possible to prevent the submission of planning applications for the site. However, once the SPD has been approved for adoption it will become a material consideration for any relevant planning application.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

## Paragraph Figure 3 Cambridge City Council policies map for the Local Plan 2014

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31917</b> Jonathan Hefford [7077]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

SPD BOUNDARY Extend to include Byron House, Marino House, the Severn Place Scheme (I assume this includes the redevelopment of the old fitness centre building) and Sun Street car park. They are very much tied up with access issues and a general sorting out at this messy end of The Grafton Centre.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. The additional boundary area suggested includes a range of development styles and uses accessed via Newmarket Road. Their inclusion is not considered necessary to implement the changes proposed in the Grafton SPD. However, any future Grafton related planning application close to anyone of these sites will normally need to take account of their context and may encourage opportunities to improve these sites in the future.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

## Paragraph 1.4.2

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32201</b> Cambridgeshire County Council - Transport Assessment Team (Mr David Allatt) [7162]	Object	Not Specified	None

### *Summary:*

(1) This statement implies that current short stay cycle parking levels will remain as existing and additional cycle parking will be provided through an additional managed facility. It is important that sufficient short term cycle parking is provided close to each retail facility.  
How will this be achieved by removal of the current, convenient on-street cycle parking just outside the shops and reintroduction of conflict with motor vehicles on Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street?

(2) Improve the public realm along Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street, by removing unnecessary signage and street furniture, and using a simple and durable palette of materials;  
How will this be achieved if more traffic regulation and enforcement would be required?  
How will this be maintained in the long term, given current financial constraints?

### *Response*

(1) **Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of cycle parking provision to ensure enough provision is provided, and it the right locations. We will ensure cycle parking locations are convenient whilst not detracting from the streetscape, where this can be avoided. It is noted that the existing cycle parking stands outside shops are convenient yet often full.**  
(2) **It is noted that public realm improvements will need to conform to the County's requirements on design and materials.**

### *Action*

(1) **Add the following sentence to paragraph 4.2.30: "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area.**  
(2) **No change to the SPD.**

## Paragraph 1.4.3

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31865</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Object	Not Specified	None

### *Summary:*

1.4.3 topographical area - should read northern end of East Road

### *Response*

**Comments duly noted. Spelling mistake will be corrected.**

### *Action*

**Spelling mistake, change norther to northern**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32046</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Support, but there has been a \*complete failure\* to implement anything in the Eastern Gate proposals, due to the lack of a costed study setting out actual change. There has been large amounts of development going on, and yet all that potential S106 money is being lost. For instance, the Severn Place development was allowed not to have to improve the appallingly bad crossing facilities over East Road, because there is no plan in place.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. The intention of the Grafton SPD is to ensure new development within the area contributes to improvements to the public realm and the means of access to/from and through the site.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31918</b> Jonathan Hefford [7077]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

EASTERN GATEWAY. A lot of work went into this so yes, let's keep sight of it.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

## 2. Site and Context

### Paragraph Figure 6 Vehicle access

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32047</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

"Vehicle" should read "Motor vehicle". Cycle movements are not shown, but these are legally classed as vehicles.

*Response*

Comments duly noted.

*Action*

Amend Figure 6 from "Vehicle" to read "Motor vehicle".

### Paragraph 2.2.2

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31866</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

2.2.2 the last sentence needs re-wording -we think you mean the routes have been severed.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Last sentence will be re-worded

*Action*

Re-word last sentence

### Paragraph 2.2.3

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32150</b> Marion Bailey [7084]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Access to Adam and Eve car park is poor. Visibility to traffic approaching from Paradise Street is poor. The rear of East Road premises which back onto car park should not be considered as 'frontage'.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. There are no plans to treat the rear of East Road premises which back onto car park as an active 'frontage' i.e. as a shop front. They may however be treated as the rear entrance to the units facing onto East Road.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

## Paragraph 2.2.4

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32204</b> Cambridgeshire County Council - Transport Assessment Team (Mr David Allatt) [7162]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The area is also subject to a Residents' Parking Scheme. Residents of any subsequent development would not be eligible for Residents' Permits.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. These details will be addressed during the Development Management process for any planning application that alters the existing land uses. It should be noted that new development proposals will need to comply with the Local Plan, in particular any proposal will need to respond to its local context. It is unlikely that it would be viable to move the car park underground and covered with a green space. New developments in the Grafton Area should also include measures to reduce congestion in and around the site. New residential units will also need to ensure that vehicular movements are kept to a minimum. These could also be designed to be car-free developments. Given the site's central location, a car-free housing development could be a realistic option subject to approval by the County Highways Dept.

*Action*

Amend paragraph 4.2.25 to reflect site's intention to maximise opportunities for residential developments either car-free or with minimal car parking.

## Paragraph 2.2.5

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32048</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Cycling should be permitted in this area. Cyclists should not be diverted to indirect surrounding routes. Claims that the current situation is dangerous to pedestrians are not backed by evidence. It works fine in the central pedestrian zone.

The relevant official government guidance, Manual For Streets 2 states:

"2.3.12 Advice on this issue is set out in TAL 9/93 'Cycling in Pedestrian Areas'. This emphasises that, on the basis of research, there are no real factors to justify excluding cyclists from pedestrianised areas and that cycling can be widely permitted without detriment to pedestrians. [Quote continues - see Full Text version]"

*Response*

Comments duly noted.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32011</b> Mx Valerie Cornish [7099]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Cycle routes must avoid pedestrian areas. The current situation is dangerous to pedestrians. great risks to children, the elderly and disabled as well as ordinary pedestrians.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. The principle of exploring cycle routes and pedestrian connectivity through Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street as well as other entrances to the Grafton Centre is supported by both the Local and County Councils. Consideration will be needed to ensure cycle speeds remain low where cycling is allowed to prevent conflicts with pedestrian and associated safety implications.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

## Paragraph Figure 7 Cycle access and public transport

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31868</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

2.2.9/figure 7 the cycle lane on Newmarket Rd west of the junction with James Street does not appear to be shown on figure 7.

**Response**

Comments duly noted. Cycle route to be added to Figure 7.

**Action**

Amend Figure 7: Add cycle route on Newmarket Road west of the junction with James Street.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32051</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

The map is inaccurate - the red tarmaced cycle route through the delivery area is not shown.

<http://www.openstreetmap.org/way/147495402#map=18/52.20651/0.13339&layers=N>

**Response**

Comments duly noted. Cycle route to be added to Figure 7.

**Action**

Amend Figure 7: Add cycle route through delivery area.

Figure 7 Cycle access and public transport

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31993</b> Mr John Coyle [7098]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

This area should be cycle free.  
Cyclist should be diverted to the other side streets.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32049</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Cycling should be permitted, not diverted to indirect surrounding routes.

See the relevant official government guidance, Manual For Streets 2 section 2.3.12.

Cycling in the pedestrian zone in central Cambridge works fine. Predictions in 2005 of major problems simply haven't arisen, and there is no significant collision record.

Banning cycling just penalises people who cycle sensibly - those riding carelessly are the type of people that would do so anyway despite any signs.

The current cycling ban particular affects children going from school at 3-4pm, who have to take more dangerous routes as a result.

Weekdays have few pedestrians anyway.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted.**

*Action*

**No changes to the SPD.**

**Paragraph 2.2.7**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31867</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

2.2.7 Not all Park and Ride services serve the Grafton Centre (eg Trumpington Park and Ride and Babraham Road Park and Ride do not go to the Grafton but terminate elsewhere). Therefore there is no P and R service from the south or south west of the city to the Grafton. This deficiency should be acknowledged in the SPD and may need to be addressed to provide greater accessibility to the Centre.

There should also be mention of local bus services that serve the Centre.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted.**

*Action*

**Amend paragraph 2.2.7 to reflect more accurate service connections.**



## Paragraph 2.2.8

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32205</b> Cambridgeshire County Council - Transport Assessment Team (Mr David Allatt) [7162]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Relocating the bus stops from the current bus interchange to East Road would potentially dis-benefit public transport users travelling to/from the Grafton Area as they will need to cross East Road rather than being dropped at the entrance to the Grafton Centre.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes at the site would need to be complemented with commensurate access improvements. These changes would need to be consistent and completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular the City Access team.**

*Action*

**Add sentence which confirms a commitment to engage with key stakeholders, the public transport operators and the County Transport Teams regarding changes to East Road.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31994</b> Mr John Coyle [7098]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Buses should not be using East Road. It is time that New Square was built as a bus terminal. It can have two storey waiting rooms office around the periphery to hide the buses from the Nimby's who live there. Buses will then use Emmanuel Road in both directions improving journey times as it is Private vehicle free. This terminal will give a link between the Town and Fitzroy Street.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be consistent with wider Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) proposals and County Transport Teams engaged on the detail. The Greater Cambridge Partnership's Access Study will also be a key influence on the future of a new bus terminal. There will be a need to agree any changes with the public transport operators, County Transport Team and GCP's Access Team.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

## Paragraph 2.2.9

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32148</b> Marion Bailey [7084]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Yes cycling occurs 10-4 but is a hazard for the infirm and families. An alternative cycle route should be provided for non-shoppers (I think most of the cyclists are not shopping!)

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. Both the Local and County Council support the approach of a shared user movement corridor between pedestrians and cyclists along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32109</b> Mr Paul Davis [7104]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

You have completely neglected to mention or plan for the cycle way that leads from Fair St. to East Road. It is well used (although often blocked by delivery lorries etc). The junction at East road (where the cycle lane leads) is a disaster for cyclists and you seem to have not noticed this at all It is not marked on any of your maps!!! What happened. It 's a clear public right of way and useful!

Please get back to me as soon as you add proposals for this useful cycle lane to your plan!!

**Response**

Comments duly noted. The cycle route from Fair Street to East Road will be added.

**Action**

Amend Figure 7: Add cycle route from Fair Street to East Road in Figure 7.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31869</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

2.2.9/figure 7 the cycle lane on Newmarket Rd west of the junction with James Street does not appear to be shown on figure 7.

**Response**

Comments duly noted. Cycleway to be added to Figure 7.

**Action**

Add cycle route on Newmarket Road west of the junction with James Street to Figure 7.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32121</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Camcycle support the principle of finding a way to create a safe and inclusive cycle route on Fitzroy and Burleigh Streets.

The existing cycle lanes on East and Newmarket Roads are very poor quality and must be improved as well.

We will seek protected cycleways on East and Newmarket Roads.

Regarding cycling in pedestrianised areas, Manual for Streets 2 guidance states that, on the basis of research, there are no real factors to justify excluding cyclists from pedestrianised areas and that cycling can be widely permitted without detriment to pedestrians

**Response**

Comments duly noted. Both the Local and County Council support the approach of a shared user movement corridor between pedestrians and cyclists along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32052</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Strongly support. There needs to be a route through the area, as proposed.

The existing cycle lanes on East Road are well below government guidance standards and need to be upgraded. The SPD fails to note this.

**Response**

**Comments duly noted. Both the Local and County Council support the approach of a shared user movement corridor between pedestrians and cyclists along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32056</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Informative:

This section omits to note that there is supposedly an alternative route round the Grafton Centre to the north, but it is highly inadequate, extremely difficult to follow, and means tackling lorries and reversing vehicles, dropped glass, barriers of various kinds, etc. In other words it really is not a cycle route and should not be signed as such. Hence need for alternative through the main streets.

**Response**

**Comments duly noted. Both the Local and County Council support the approach of a shared user movement corridor between pedestrians and cyclists along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32020</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

It is very desirable to have a safe cycle route on Fitzroy and Burleigh Streets. I would like to point out that the existing cycle lanes on East Road and Newmarket Road are very poor quality and must be improved as well. There should be protected cycleways on East Road and Newmarket Road.

**Response**

**Comments duly noted. Both the Local and County Council support the approach of a shared user movement corridor between pedestrians and cyclists along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31870</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

We welcome the desire to improve cycle routes through the area as connectivity is currently poor.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Both the Local and County Council support the approach of a shared user movement corridor between pedestrians and cyclists along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31929</b> Matthew Danish [7080]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I support the principle of finding a way to have a safe cycle route on Fitzroy and Burleigh Streets. However it should be mentioned that the existing cycle lanes on East Road and Newmarket Road are very poor quality and must be improved as well. I would like to see protected cycleways on East Road and Newmarket Road.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Both the Local and County Council support the approach of a shared user movement corridor between pedestrians and cyclists along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32012</b> Mx Valerie Cornish [7099]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Recommend a separate cycle route to cross the Centre. Ban all cycling on the pedestrian areas. The current situation is dangerous.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Both the Local and County Council support the approach of a shared user movement corridor between pedestrians and cyclists along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

## Paragraph 2.2.10

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
--------------------------	---------------	-------------------	------------------------

<b>32202</b> Cambridgeshire County Council - Transport Assessment Team (Mr David Allatt) [7162]	Object	Not Specified	None
--	--------	---------------	------

*Summary:*

Cycle parking provision should be compared to anticipated demand to identify whether what is proposed is sufficient.

For the statement about the cycle parking review, this statement should include the stated intention that this must be as, or more, convenient to use than that which currently exists.

The SPD should make allowances for short stay cycle parking close to retail entrances and in order to facilitate current levels and proposed demand.

In summary for walking and cycling,

- CCC supports the principle of exploring cycle routes and pedestrian connectivity through Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street, as well as other entrances to the Grafton Centre. Careful consideration of cycle parking will be needed to ensure enough provision is provided, whilst ensuring location of parking is convenient, but does not detract from the streetscape.

- It is important to establish the hierarchy of routes for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. The removal of cycling restrictions should be carefully considered in conjunction with appropriate provision of cycle lane infrastructure and how this hierarchy can work in harmony with pedestrian routes, especially cross-cutting from opposite sides of the streets. Consideration should also be given to ensuring cycle speeds remain low where cycling is allowed to prevent conflicts between pedestrian users and associated safety implications.

- CCC supports the need for wayfinding, both in the short term and as the development progresses to ensure smooth and confident movements across and around the Grafton Centre area, supported by positive streetscaping and accessible routes for both the mobile and mobility impaired.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of cycle parking provision to ensure enough provision is provided, and in the right locations. We will ensure cycle parking locations are convenient whilst not detracting from the streetscape, where this can be avoided. It is noted that the existing cycle parking stands outside shops are convenient yet often full.**

*Action*

**Add the following sentence to paragraph 4.2.30: "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area."**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
--------------------------	---------------	-------------------	------------------------

<b>32110</b> Mr Paul Davis [7104]	Object	Not Specified	None
-----------------------------------	--------	---------------	------

*Summary:*

The cycle lane that leads from Fair St to East road - (via Fitzroy LANE (not Street! is marked as a service area - they do not have planning permission to use this as a service area for the whole length as there are restrictions in their original planning application. (At the moment it is often blocked by service vehicles!!)

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. This issue is an enforcement matter and has been forwarded onto the City Council's Enforcement Team to investigate.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32122</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Cycle parking is very heavily used and needs to be increased in number while keeping it in convenient locations. There should be cycle parking available for people using tricycles and cargo-cycles, as well as prioritised spaces for adapted-cycles that are used by persons with disabilities.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of cycle parking provision to ensure enough provision is provided, and in the right locations. We will ensure cycle parking locations are convenient whilst not detracting from the streetscape, where this can be avoided. It is noted that the existing cycle parking stands outside shops are convenient yet often full.**

*Action*

**Add the following sentence to paragraph 4.2.30: "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area."**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32053</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The existing cycle parking is very heavily used and in general more is needed.

However, some of it is a bit obstructive to pedestrians. There are more sidestreet locations like City Road and Eden Street where some could be moved to.

Support having a review, with the strong proviso that the current level should be increased and that any new locations must be convenient.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of cycle parking provision to ensure enough provision is provided, and in the right locations. We will ensure cycle parking locations are convenient whilst not detracting from the streetscape, where this can be avoided. It is noted that the existing cycle parking stands outside shops are convenient yet often full.**

*Action*

**Add the following sentence to paragraph 4.2.30: "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area."**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32021</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The current cycle parking is very heavily used and needs to be increased in number while keeping it in convenient locations. Normally if I visit the Grafton Centre in the middle of the day I am unable to find a sheffield stand and just have to use a lamppost, or my kick stand. Even in the evening, it's normally impossible to park outside Little Waitrose.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of cycle parking provision to ensure enough provision is provided, and in the right locations. We will ensure cycle parking locations are convenient whilst not detracting from the streetscape, where this can be avoided. It is noted that the existing cycle parking stands outside shops are convenient yet often full.

*Action*

Add the following sentence to paragraph 4.2.30: "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area."

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31871</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

2.2.10 We welcome the intention to undertake a review of cycle parking in the area to ascertain the usage, standard and location of provision.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of cycle parking provision to ensure enough provision is provided, and in the right locations. We will ensure cycle parking locations are convenient whilst not detracting from the streetscape, where this can be avoided. It is noted that the existing cycle parking stands outside shops are convenient yet often full.

*Action*

Add the following sentence to paragraph 4.2.30: "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area."

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31928</b> Matthew Danish [7080]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Cycle parking is very heavily used and needs to be increased in number while keeping it in convenient locations.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of cycle parking provision to ensure enough provision is provided, and in the right locations. We will ensure cycle parking locations are convenient whilst not detracting from the streetscape, where this can be avoided. It is noted that the existing cycle parking stands outside shops are convenient yet often full.

*Action*

Add the following sentence to paragraph 4.2.30: "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area."

## Paragraph Figure 8 Service access

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31977</b> Mrs Valarie Mahy [7093]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

- Access to Paradise Street should only be used for residential uses and not for either deliveries accessing shops along Fitzroy Street/Burleigh Street or for construction purposes.  
 - Current and future servicing of any new or existing retail uses should avoid residential streets, e.g. Paradise Street. The streets are often blocked by retail service vehicles and construction vehicles having to turnaround to leave the area. These activities block access for local people and create a considerable amount of noise throughout both the day and night.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Concerns regarding current retail servicing access is noted. Figure 8 identifies current servicing routes. Any proposed changes to retail provision must provide a revised servicing strategy to avoid residential streets, where possible.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

## Paragraph 2.2.12

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32054</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

"vehicular" -> "motor vehicular".

Same change to improve accuracy needed throughout the document.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted.**

*Action*

**Amend "Vehicle" to read "Motor vehicle" throughout the document.**

## Paragraph 2.2.15

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32146</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

We are concerned that some of the service areas labeled 'redundant' are in fact necessary because Burleigh Street is not wide enough to take over that functionality safely.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. As part of any re-configuration of uses, satisfactory servicing of new and existing uses will need to be agreed. In some cases, improved surface access avoiding Burleigh Street or underground servicing may remove the need for existing service areas.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**



<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32022</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

All service areas should be kept. Lorries and vans need to be kept away from Burleigh St and away from pedestrians and cyclists.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. As part of any re-configuration of uses, satisfactory servicing of new and existing uses will need to be agreed. In some cases, improved surface access avoiding Burleigh Street or underground servicing may remove the need for existing service areas.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

## Paragraph 2.2.16

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32203</b> Cambridgeshire County Council - Transport Assessment Team (Mr David Allatt) [7162]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Any changes to servicing operations will need to be evidenced and ensure that they are futureproofed, thus at this stage the County Council recommend that the service areas be retained.

*Response*

New development will need to take account of adequate servicing provision to ensure access is satisfactorily designed for both new and existing deliveries. These movements should avoid residential streets. This is necessary to prevent existing conflict between the services of existing retail units via residential streets. The servicing strategy should be developed with the County Highways Dept. and other Transport Teams where appropriate.

*Action*

Amend 1st sentence of 4.2.18 to read "Proposals involving servicing (and those including taxi access) will be subject to a clear servicing strategy and assessment." Add sentence at end of paragraph "Taxi movements will not be allowed on Fitzroy/Burleigh and the expectation is that taxi arrangements will be proposed in that context."

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32149</b> Marion Bailey [7084]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Access to Adam and Eve car park is poor. Visibility to traffic approaching from Paradise Street is poor. The rear of East Road premises which back onto car park should not be considered as 'frontage'.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. There are no plans to treat the rear of East Road premises which back onto car park as an active 'frontage' i.e. as a shop front. They may however be treated as the rear entrance to the units facing onto East Road.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

## Paragraph 2.3.2

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32147</b> Marion Bailey [7084]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The scale of Grafton has increased. This does not give license to increase other buildings in the low rise area!

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of all the existing buildings in the local vicinity.**

*Action*

**No changes to the SPD.**

---

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31872</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

2.3.2 including nineteenth century terraced housing and some twentieth century housing.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. Suggested amendments will be made.**

*Action*

**Paragraph 2.3.2 to be amended to read 'The area immediately surrounding the SPD area is generally low rise residential development including many nineteenth terraced housing and some twentieth century housing.'**

## Paragraph 2.3.3

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32104</b> Corsten Douglas [7102]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The Draft SPD itself highlights that there is less need for physical shops due to "75%" of shoppers shopping online. Why, therefore, is this area being re-developed to include a larger than ever amount of shops, including shop fronts spilling onto the street?

The Grafton Centre has frequently housed vacant shop units in the last 5 years. An apparent misconception is that this is caused by the Grafton's former, grotty image - but it is more likely caused by high rates and a lack of physical demand for goods. Simply giving the area a facelift is not going to make businesses suddenly profitable.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. The need for additional retail is based upon the Council's evidence base, in particular the updated 'Retail and Leisure Study' completed in 2013. The Grafton Area SPD is a long-term project to attract investment in the area to ensure it meets the needs of a modern retail centre not just for shoppers but also retail operators. There are genuine concerns about the centre's appeal when the shops are closed.**

*Action*

**No changes to the SPD.**

### Paragraph 2.3.5

**Representation(s)**

**Nature Appearance Soundness Tests**

<b>32055</b>	Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
--------------	------------------------------	---------------	----------------------	-------------

*Summary:*

Completely inappropriate to mention specific retailers in a public policy document of this nature.

The last thing Cambridge needs is yet another Tesco (would be the 16th) - encouraging that kind of clone town development is not welcome. Whilst I realise the SPD is not making a specific proposal of that nature, the welcoming of national clone chains should not even be hinted at.

**Response**

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Paragraph 2.3.5 cites three different examples of the types of smaller format stores that could be included. It is not the intention to create a 'clone' town centre however it is important to include small convenience shops that give people a local supermarket option. This is especially important for those who have limited mobility who may otherwise have to travel to the Beehive Centre for this type of shopping.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**

### Paragraph 2.3.17

**Representation(s)**

**Nature Appearance Soundness Tests**

<b>32173</b>	Universities Superannuation Scheme Limited (USS) Aberdeen Asset Management on behalf of Barclays Nominees (Aberdeen) [7115]	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
--------------	---	---------------	----------------------	-------------

**Agent: Deloitte LLP (Mr John Adams) [7114]**

*Summary:*

We welcome the SPD's recognition of the changing face of retail and the wider major trends, there are further challenges facing retail (The Role of The High Street Deloitte LLP, 2015):

- Oversupply - rapid expansion by retailers has led to the duplication of brands in many town centres;
- Affordability - increase in staff costs, rent costs and business rate changes;
- The configuration of retail space has not always managed to keep pace;
- Changed behaviours - consumers are seeking an integrated shopping experience; and
- Digital Acceleration - growth of omni-channel retailing and the growth of artificial intelligence.

**Response**

**Comments duly noted.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD**

### Paragraph 2.1.18

**Representation(s)**

**Nature Appearance Soundness Tests**

<b>32013</b>	Mx Valerie Cornish [7099]	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
--------------	---------------------------	----------------	----------------------	-------------

*Summary:*

The amount of inactive or service areas fronting the streets can be greatly improved. The current situation makes the whole area look run down and unattractive. The redesigns need to be imaginative and of high quality. Buildings like the Tram Depot show how sympathetic this can be and it enhances the history, character and scale of the area.

**Response**

Comments duly noted.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

### Paragraph 2.1.20

**Representation(s)**

**Nature Appearance Soundness Tests**

<b>31873</b>	Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
--------------	---	---------------	----------------------	-------------

*Summary:*

2.3.20 Paradise Street also suffers from a gap in activity along its length. Are there opportunities to activate this frontage?

**Response**

Comments duly noted. The inactive gap on Paradise Street is due, in part, to the location of surface level car parking associated with surrounding existing development and the ability to develop these areas is dependent on the consolidation of land. While the SPD boundary cannot be adjusted as it needs to conform with the Local Plan policy boundary, the SPD should recognise the development potential of this land.

**Action**

Add new paragraph 4.3.22 titled: Adjacent opportunity sites. Add the following sentence to read: Any development on the site which shares a boundary with the vacant gap along Paradise Street (currently used as the servicing area for some retail units along Burleigh Street) should ideally allow for residential use on this servicing area which could include 3-4 storey heights, subject to suitable design.

## Paragraph 2.4.1

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

32014 Mx Valerie Cornish [7099]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

The recent development trend in the city has been to build ever higher buildings. To continue this in the Grafton Centre area is particularly detrimental to the largely Victorian residential surrounding area. Whereas it is clear why developers are eager to 'over develop' expensive, city centre sites, the consequences on adjacent areas is very damaging.

The recent tower on the Fire Station site has shocked us all, and destroyed the relationship with nearby Georgian buildings. More of this is most unwelcome.

### Response

Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of all the existing buildings in the local vicinity. Figure 38 establishes the maximum heights for new development in the various opportunity areas which is based on an understanding of the existing scale and massing. Further assessment of scale/height of new proposals will be made as future development proposals come forward.

### Action

No change to the SPD.

## Paragraph 2.4.3

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31874 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

2.4.3 grade II listed

### Response

Comments duly noted. Suggested amendments will be made.

### Action

Insert "grade II" before the word listed.

## Paragraph Figure 14 The Grafton Area before the shopping centre was built. Middle: Eden Chapel which is retained on the edge of the Grafton Centre.

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

32057 Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]

Support

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Informative:

This section fails to credit the (excellent) photos.

### Response

Comments duly noted. Suggested amendments will be applied.

### Action

Add image credits to Figure 14.

## Paragraph 2.4.7

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31987 Donald Fung [7089]	Object	Not Specified	None

#### Summary:

The properties on Maids Causeway are made up of listed buildings which National Heritage consider to be buildings of historic value/beauty, any development on the car park would significantly impact on these listed buildings as the setting will be ruined by surrounding buildings of beauty by modern monstrosities.

### Response

Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of the existing built heritage such as the existing residential buildings on Maids Causeway and Salmon Lane.

### Action

No change to the SPD.

## Paragraph 2.4.9

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31875 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Object	Not Specified	None

#### Summary:

2.4.9 bullet point 2 needs re-wording. As it currently is drafted it suggests you are protecting houses from enhancements. Please re-order, placing the protection houses clause last to read: 'Enhance surrounding residential streets: care of trees, enhancements to the public realm and protecting houses from inappropriate development'

### Response

Comments duly noted. Re-word bullet point 2 to read: 'Enhance surrounding residential streets: care of trees, enhancements to the public realm and protecting houses from inappropriate development'

### Action

Re-word bullet point 2 to read: 'Enhance surrounding residential streets: care of trees, enhancements to the public realm and protecting houses from inappropriate development'.

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31976 Mrs Valarie Mahy [7093]	Object	Not Specified	None

#### Summary:

Please remove the bollards along City Rd to allow service vehicles access to the shops along Fitzroy Street/Burleigh Street to avoid them having to use Paradise Street and other local roads.

### Response

Comments and concerns duly noted. As part of any re-configuration of uses, satisfactory servicing of new and existing uses will need to be agreed. In some cases, improved surface access avoiding Burleigh Street or underground servicing may remove the need for existing service areas. New development will need to take account of adequate servicing provision to ensure access is satisfactorily designed for both new and existing deliveries. These movements should avoid residential streets including Paradise Street. This is necessary to prevent existing conflict between the services of existing retail units via residential streets. The servicing strategy should be developed with the County Highways Dept. and other Transport Teams where appropriate. Part of this representation is an enforcement matter and has been forwarded onto the Council's Enforcement Team to investigate.

### Action

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32023</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

The works of the early 1980s were an act of sheer vandalism. The remaining late Georgian and Victorian areas need preservation and enhancement. More trees are desperately needed. However, the through cycle route along City Road, which is currently obstructed by car parking and a badly placed tree, needs work to keep the tree but keep the cycle route open.

**Response**

Comments duly noted. Section 4 of the SPD identifies frameworks for informing new development in the area including the movement and access network. The intention is to significantly improve the quality of cycle infrastructure within the SPD area.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32151</b> Marion Bailey [7084]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Agree with designation on historical buildings. They are delightfully 'small scale'. What are these improvements to green and hard areas in John / City / Paradise?

**Response**

Comments duly noted. The improvements to green and hard areas in John Street, City Road and Paradise Street form part of a set of recommendations made by the Kite Conservation Area Appraisal. John Street, City Road and Paradise Street are all currently outside the SPD boundary and their implementation is a separate process to the SPD. However, if/when these recommendations are implemented, they will help improve the public realm of the surrounding public spaces around the Grafton Area.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

**Paragraph 2.4.12**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32186</b> Sheila Lawlor [7109]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

As you will know Salmon Lane is part of the Kite Conservation Area. It provides the setting for the rear terrace and gardens developed through 1820/30s. The houses, mostly are grade II listed and have small scale outbuildings to the rear, mostly dating from the period of the houses. The look and feel of Salmon Lane is by and large harmonious, small scale, with brick walls, small rear buildings, over which gardens and greenery lead the eye to the rear terraces of the houses, with wooden sash windows yellow brick walls and slate roofs.

**Response**

Comments duly noted. These details will be addressed during the Development Management process for any planning application that alters the existing land uses. It should be noted that new development proposals will need to comply with the Local Plan, in particular any proposal will need to respond to its local context and will therefore need to take account of the existing built form/heritage such as the finer grain buildings on Salmon Lane.

**Action**

Final sentence of paragraph 4.3.16 to be re-worded to read 'Housing adjacent to Salmon Lane will be domestic in scale to respond to the finer grain of the lane.'

## Paragraph 2.4.14

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32024</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

There should also be a historical display within as Laurie McConnell is a lost gem.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. This could be incorporated as part of any proposal to re-use the building and associated public art strategy.

*Action*

No changes to the SPD.

## Paragraph 2.4.15

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31876</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

2.4.15 Need to mention the grade II\* Arts Theatre Workshop and Store on Newmarket Road. It would be helpful to mention that the remainder of the listed buildings in the area are all grade II listed.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Suggested amendments will be made.

*Action*

Add reference to the grade II\* Buddhist Centre (former Arts Theatre Workshop and Store) at 36 Newmarket Road and the remainder of the listed buildings in the area are all grade II listed.

## Paragraph 2.4.16

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31877</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

2.4.16 Please insert non-designated before heritage assets.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Suggested amendments will be applied.

*Action*

Insert 'non-designated' before heritage assets in paragraph 2.4.16.



## Paragraph Figure 15 Heritage context

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31878</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

2.4.18/Figure 15. This figure helpfully shows a number of landmarks. We would suggest that Eden Hall (the old Eden Chapel) number 17 Fitzroy Street are also landmark buildings and should be shown on figure 15.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Suggested amendments will be applied.

*Action*

Addition to Figure 15: Add Landmark Buildings 'star' to Eden Hall (the old Eden Chapel) No. 17 Fitzroy Street.

## Paragraph 2.4.18

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31879</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

2.4.18/Figure 15. This figure helpfully shows a number of landmarks. We would suggest that Eden Hall (the old Eden Chapel) number 17 Fitzroy Street are also landmark buildings and should be shown on figure 15.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Suggested amendments will be applied.

*Action*

Add Landmark Buildings 'star' to Eden Hall (the old Eden Chapel) No. 17 Fitzroy Street in figure 15.

## Paragraph 2.4.19

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32025</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

No more damage should be done to this historic area of "town" Cambridge. "Gown" is always protected; we need to do more to protect the "town" side of this city.

*Response*

Comments duly noted.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32152</b> Marion Bailey [7084]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Agreed

*Response*

Comments duly noted.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

**Paragraph 2.4.20**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32026</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

What can be done with the hideous aspect of East Road? The old BHS is an eyesore, as is the Vue Cinema.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. The various framework diagrams in Section 4 identify opportunity sites along the East Road frontage including appropriate heights and land uses. These have the intention of creating a framework for appropriate new development to improve the relationship of the Grafton Centre to East Road.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

**Paragraph 2.5.1**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31880</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

2.5.1 There may be opportunities for greater connectivity and permeability.

*Response*

Comments duly noted.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

### Paragraph 2.5.3

**Representation(s)**

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**32027 Heather Coleman [1863] Object Not Specified None**

*Summary:*

The cycle parking is rather useful inasmuch as it allows those who wish to spend money in the businesses around to access those businesses. If there was no cycle parking, many fewer people would bother going to the Grafton Centre and the streets around. If I couldn't park there, I'd never go there!

**Response**

**Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of cycle parking provision to ensure enough provision is provided, and it the right locations. We will ensure cycle parking locations are convenient whilst not detracting from the streetscape, where this can be avoided. It is noted that the existing cycle parking stands outside shops are convenient yet often full.**

**Action**

**Add the following sentence to paragraph 4.2.30: "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area."**

**Representation(s)**

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**31881 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828] Object Not Specified None**

*Summary:*

Please refer to Historic England's publication, Streets for All and our advice for highways engineers and designers.

**Response**

**Please refer to Historic England's publication, Streets for All and our advice for highways engineers and designers.**

**Action**

**Add reference to Historic England's publication, Streets for All and our advice for highways engineers and designers in paragraph 2.5.3.**

**Representation(s)**

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**32153 Marion Bailey [7084] Object Not Specified None**

*Summary:*

Charlie's Coffee Company overfills its space - delightful as it service is. A cart; The tables / chairs exceed allowance. Difficult corner with Paradise Street. Large seating area outside Valeries restricts pedestrians.

**Response**

**Comments duly noted.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**

## Paragraph 2.5.4

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
32028 Heather Coleman [1863]	Object	Not Specified	None

#### Summary:

The cycle parking is rather useful inasmuch as it allows those who wish to spend money in the businesses around to access those businesses. If there was no cycle parking, many fewer people would bother going to the Grafton Centre and the streets around. If I couldn't park there, I'd never go there!

### Response

Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of cycle parking provision to ensure enough provision is provided, and it the right locations. We will ensure cycle parking locations are convenient whilst not detracting from the streetscape, where this can be avoided. It is noted that the existing cycle parking stands outside shops are convenient yet often full.

### Action

Add the following sentence to Paragraph 4.2.30: "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area."

## Paragraph 2.5.5

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31882 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Object	Not Specified	None

#### Summary:

The SPD should highlight the importance of retaining or restoring historic shopfront features. This is both in terms of the positive contribution historic shopfronts make to the character of an area, but also the economic benefit of providing traditional and bespoke shopping units to shopowners.

### Response

Comments duly noted. Suggested amendments will be applied.

### Action

Fourth sentence of Paragraph 2.5.5 to be amended to read 'Opportunities to retain and restore historic shop fronts should be taken in recognition of the positive contribution they make to the character of the area. Along with sensitive infill development this will raise the quality and continuity of the shopping streets particularly if focused on areas where the built fabric is of a lower or neutral quality.'

## Paragraph 2.5.6

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31883 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Object	Not Specified	None

#### Summary:

2.5.6 We suggest an additional bullet point to include Donkey Common.

### Response

Comments duly noted. Suggested amendments will be applied.

### Action

Add additional bullet point to Paragraph 2.5.6 to include Donkey Common.

## Paragraph 2.5.7

### Representation(s)

32154 Marion Bailey [7084]

*Nature*    *Appearance*    *Soundness Tests*

Object    Not Specified    None

#### Summary:

Opportunities for green space (not just hard landscaping).

### Response

Comments duly noted. Given the built nature of the site, it is considered more appropriate to improve the quality of the existing paved areas rather than the adjoining green spaces.

### Action

No change to the SPD.

### Representation(s)

31884 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

*Nature*    *Appearance*    *Soundness Tests*

Support    Not Specified    None

#### Summary:

2.5.7 We welcome paragraph 2.5.7.

### Response

Comments duly noted.

### Action

No change to the SPD.

## Paragraph 2.5.8

### Representation(s)

31995 Mr John Coyle [7098]

*Nature*    *Appearance*    *Soundness Tests*

Object    Not Specified    None

#### Summary:

Trees have a major adverse effect on roads and streets. There are plenty of Parks planted with them. Dransn get blocked ,leaves are slipepery, roots damaged surfaces. Tree pits are dangerous to partially sighted and the blind. The streets here do not need them.

### Response

Comments and concerns duly noted. Poor species selection and poorly detailed tree pits and paving/surfacing can result in the issues identified. However appropriately sized and located street trees also play a vital role in improving the environmental quality of an area. Section 4 of the SPD identifies, at a high level, the improvements to be made in landscape, environment and public realm. However it is beyond the scope of the SPD to specify these details but they will be considered as improvements to the various streets and spaces are developed.

### Action

Paragraph 4.5.12 should be expanded to recognise the importance of appropriate species selection, tree pit details etc.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31885</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

2.5.8 We welcome paragraph 2.5.8.

*Response*

Comments duly noted.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32015</b> Mx Valerie Cornish [7099]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

We support any additional green planting in the Grafton Centre itself. Although there are green areas nearby, which are greatly valued, East Road, Fitzroy St., and Burleigh St are very bleak. Some trees that were originally planted have been removed. Green planting softens hard street scapes and enhances the experience and behaviour of users.

*Response*

Comments duly noted.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

**Paragraph 2.5.9**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31886</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

2.5.9 Consideration should be given to appropriate new planting.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. An additional reference to "appropriate new planting" will be added.

*Action*

Add reference in Paragraph 2.5.9 to "appropriate new planting".

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31950</b> Mrs Hannah Lea [7083]	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

**Summary:**

A palm court style area within the Grafton centre that provides seating and social space to accommodate surrounding food outlets, cinema/theatre customers etc could be an effective way of helping to mitigate the absence of greenery in the immediate outside area.

**Response**

**Comments duly noted.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**

**Paragraph 2.6.1**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31938</b> Jonathan Hefford [7077]	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

**Summary:**

CONSULTATION PROCESS. Until by chance I came across an article in a newspaper I do not regularly read, I had no knowledge of this Masterplan. I have spoken to a few neighbours and they were similarly unaware. We are in regular receipt of letterbox drops about fun-run road closures, Guy Fawkes Night arrangements bin collections and so forth which are short term inconveniences, but nothing that I know of about the Masterplan which will have enduring effects to the neighbourhood.

There was massive public involvement in the plans leading up to construction of the Grafton Centre. This Masterplan is of course a lot less dramatic, but it extensively covers much that was discussed originally or has emerged since. By not involving Kite residents fully, you are missing out on local knowledge, and storing up trouble as aspects of the Masterplan are rolled out.

A mail drop to Kite residents should be made alerting them to the Masterplan. Opportunities should be made to engage with them. This will mean putting back the closing date for comments, but in the long run it will be time saved.

**Response**

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Representatives from the 'Kite' Residents Association were consulted when the public consultation began and will continue to be consulted on future planning applications.**

**Action**

**No change to SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32050</b> Frances Dewhurst [7090]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

These are my comments on the exhibition shown today at the Grafton, but first of all I think you must consider extending the consultation period. I was only notified of this by a leaflet through the door last week, and it is only by chance I was free to go today. There must be many others in the area who will have missed this. Why did you not leaflet us at the beginning of the consultation period in September?

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. In preparing the draft SPD, a stakeholder and residents workshop took place on 17 March 2017, and the comments provided at this workshop helped shape the document prior to a second stakeholder and residents workshop that was held on 21 April 2017. Comments from both workshops have been instrumental in the development of the SPD. An event record for these workshops has been produced and is available on the Council's website (<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/grafon-aomc-spd>).**

**As part of the actual public consultation notification process, the following local notifications were made/sent out notifying people about the consultation:**

- **FECRA and individual local residents' associations were contacted directly by e-mail when the consultation started.**
- **A public notice also went in the Cambridge Evening News in the same week that the consultation started.**
- **Posters were displayed at the following locations: Adam & Eve St Car Park; Kelsey Kerridge; Queen Anne; New Square; inside and outside the Grafton Centre; Madingley Rd P&R; Central Library Customer Service Centre - Mandela House.**
- **Two public exhibitions were held in the Grafton Centre**  
**Saturday, 30 September 2017 from 11am to 3pm; and**  
**Wednesday, 1 November 2017 from 2pm to 8pm.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**





<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32101</b> Corsten Douglas [7102]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

- There has not been a satisfactory period of consultation on the matter.
- As residents of Christchurch Street, we were informed of this matter on the 1st of November 2017, by a hand posted leaflet through the door.
- There has been a lack of timely information about when meetings about these matters would occur. For example, we received a leaflet after most of the consultation period had passed, leaving us very little time to draft a response.
- The reports on the proposed works around the Grafton Centre are convoluted and weasel worded. Exotic flavour language is used instead of saying what is meant, and the grammar is at times poor.
- There is no clear outline of what exactly is proposed in Plain English.
- We are essentially uninformed by your current means.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. In preparing the draft SPD, a stakeholder and residents workshop took place on 17 March 2017, and the comments provided at this workshop helped shape the document prior to a second stakeholder and residents workshop that was held on 21 April 2017. Comments from both workshops have been instrumental in the development of the SPD. An event record for these workshops has been produced and is available on the Council's website (<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/grafon-aomc-spd>).**

**As part of the actual public consultation notification process, the following local notifications were made/sent out notifying people about the consultation:**

- FECRA and individual local residents' associations were contacted directly by e-mail when the consultation started.
- A public notice also went in the Cambridge Evening News in the same week that the consultation started.
- Posters were displayed at the following locations: Adam & Eve St Car Park; Kelsey Kerridge; Queen Anne; New Square; inside and outside the Grafton Centre; Madingley Rd P&R; Central Library Customer Service Centre - Mandela House.
- Two public exhibitions were held in the Grafton Centre Saturday, 30 September 2017 from 11am to 3pm; and Wednesday, 1 November 2017 from 2pm to 8pm.

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32118</b> Dr Angus Gowland [7106]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

My family and I have been residents in 5 Fitzroy Lane, which is one of the leasehold properties within the area of proposed major change, since the year 2000. I have never once been directly contacted by the developers or the council about a proposal which - to judge from the illustrative plans - involves destroying my family home and replacing it with a different building.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Figure 39 is purely indicative and does not reflect any final proposed solution for No.5 Fitzroy Street. Any proposals for re-development would need to take account of the existing use and other considerations such as architectural aesthetic merit which enhance the area's appeal.**

*Action*

**No changes to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31939</b> Mr Peter Wakefield [4087]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

I live on St Matthews Street.

I am sorry that I missed the workshops held earlier about the Grafton proposals. North Petersfield is integral to the Grafton area so it is a pity that residents missed the opportunity to take part.

**Response**

Comments duly noted. Any future consultations will include representatives from North Petersfield.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32171</b> Universities Superannuation Scheme Limited (USS) Aberdeen Asset Management on behalf of Barclays Nominees (Aberdeen) [7115]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Agent: Deloitte LLP (Mr John Adams) [7114]**

**Summary:**

USS have expressed their desire to join the debate on the future of the City and requested to be involved in the Masterplan discussions regarding the balance between the Grafton Centre in particular and the Historic Core.

The City Centre's retail offer needs to be looked at in whole to understand how it functions and the impact of change.

Furthermore, USS offered to collaborate on a wider Masterplan for the City Centre, albeit no response has been received from Cambridge City Council to date.

Our Clients re-iterate that they would like to engage further and look forward to future dialogue with Cambridge City Council to help achieve the same goal.

**Response**

Comments duly noted. The need for additional retail is based upon the Council's evidence base, in particular the updated 'Retail and Leisure Study' completed in 2013. The Grafton Area's city centre role is not expected to change other than making better use of the existing site by introducing additional town centre use to improve the area's appeal and attractiveness for day-to-day usage. While there are currently no plans to develop a wider Masterplan for the City Centre, the Council is in the process of commissioning an Open Spaces and Movement Strategy SPD which will be looking at some of these strategic connectivity and place making issues. The Council will ensure that USS is consulted on this in due course.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

## Paragraph 2.6.2

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
32061 Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Object	Not Specified	None

### *Summary:*

Cycle stakeholders failed to be invited. Had they been so, the following additional point would have been made:

- Strong need for a proper, safe cycle route through the area.

### *Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. The principle of exploring cycle routes and pedestrian connectivity through Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street as well as other entrances to the Grafton Centre is supported by both the Local and County Councils. Consideration will be needed to ensure cycle speeds remain low where cycling is allowed to prevent conflicts with pedestrian and associated safety implications.

### *Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
32155 Marion Bailey [7084]	Object	Not Specified	None

### *Summary:*

New student accommodation open between Newmarket / East / New Street. Create housing for workers!

### *Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. A range of new uses have been proposed for this area including student accommodation. However, despite the recent proposals for student accommodation along Newmarket Rd, there remains significant need for additional student accommodation. Any planning application for student accommodation will need to ensure it will have a positive impact on the Grafton Centre area. It is anticipated that new housing will be delivered as well.

### *Action*

No change to the SPD.

## Paragraph Access and movement

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
31864 Catherine Olver [7073]	Support	Not Specified	None

### *Summary:*

I live on Paradise Street so I am woken up every weekday morning by the awful noise of the lorries delivering to Primark. It is difficult to rent out the spare bedroom because of this problem. It would be much better if the deliveries didn't start till after 8am (at the moment it's usually around 7.30am). It could also be significantly improved by making the surface of the ground smoother so there isn't such a DEAFENING rattle of metal trolleys.

### *Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. This representation is an enforcement matter and has been forwarded onto the City Council's Enforcement Team to investigate.

### *Action*

No changes to the SPD.

## Paragraph Character and heritage

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31951** Mrs Hannah Lea [7083]

**Support**

**Not Specified**

**None**

#### Summary:

A Palm court style social venue within the Grafton Centre that serves food and drink and caters for theatre (could be included on site) and cinema goes along with a Hack space, Escape rooms etc would create a multi age leisure destination where the focus is on culture and social interaction rather than music and alcohol. By extending the footfall into the evening, the cafe/bars/restaurants should be more viable and sustainable.

### Response

**Comments duly noted.**

### Action

**No change to the SPD.**

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31954** Cambridge City Council (Cllr Oscar Gillespie) [7092]

**Support**

**Not Specified**

**None**

#### Summary:

Cambridge needs more independent shops, and I'm pleased this is recognised in the SPD. For all the benefits of chain stores, they can lead to clone towns and also tend to draw money out of the city. Although planning can't require independent stores, providing smaller retail spaces is a step in the right direction.

It's also worth bearing in mind that the city centre is being used less for low-end shopping, due to the more expensive stores being opened there. I think the city centre SPD will support this. It's worth considering adding market stalls here near the cheaper stores.

### Response

**Comments duly noted.**

### Action

**No change to the SPD.**

## Paragraph Access and servicing

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32063</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Changes need to be sensitive to existing streets to avoid rat-runs being created. Dutch cities have plenty of examples of how cycling can work alongside pedestrian use.

*Response*

The County Highways Dept is not supportive of introducing vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. The reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street will be removed. The SPD needs to articulate the arrangement for taxis mindful that the area's currently closed to vehicles will remain as such. This could be part of a servicing strategy for the Grafton Area.

*Action*

- (1) Amend paragraphs 4.2.10, 4.4.24, 4.4.28 8th bulletpoint and 4.5.4 - remove reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street.
- (2) Amend 1st sentence of 4.2.18 to read "Proposals involving servicing (and those including taxi access) will be subject to a clear servicing strategy and assessment." Add sentence at end of paragraph "Taxi movements will not be allowed on Fitzroy/Burleigh and the expectation is that taxi arrangements will be proposed in that context."

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31955</b> Cambridge City Council (Cllr Oscar Gillespie) [7092]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Very very important that it is sensitive to existing streets, and doesn't become a rat run for any vehicles. It's not just taxis who do this now. There are also a lot of delivery vehicles which get lost here, and vehicles going on strange adventures.

It's worth looking at Dutch cities like Leiden to consider how cycling can sit comfortably alongside pedestrian use. Colour coding the route so that it visually represents a potential hazard can help.

*Response*

The County Highways Dept is not supportive of introducing vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. The reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street will be removed. The SPD needs to articulate the arrangement for taxis mindful that the area's currently closed to vehicles will remain as such. This could be part of a servicing strategy for the Grafton Area.

*Action*

- (1) Amend paragraphs 4.2.10, 4.4.24, 4.4.28 8th bulletpoint and 4.5.4 - remove reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street.
- (2) Amend 1st sentence of 4.2.18 to read "Proposals involving servicing (and those including taxi access) will be subject to a clear servicing strategy and assessment." Add sentence at end of paragraph "Taxi movements will not be allowed on Fitzroy/Burleigh and the expectation is that taxi arrangements will be proposed in that context."

## Paragraph Sustainability

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31956 Cambridge City Council (Cllr Oscar Gillespie) [7092]	Support	Not Specified	None

#### Summary:

It's good that sustainability has been considered - don't just think about mitigation but bear in mind Cambridge's ambition to become zero carbon by 2050 if not before.

Is there scope for PV? Can this be linked with electric charging points?

Is there scope for collecting rain water and using it for washing/plants (rather than tap water)

Is there space for cycle couriers with trailers to park and make deliveries?

### Response

Comments duly noted.

### Action

No change to the SPD.

## Paragraph Figure 30 Summary of the existing experience of the Grafton Area

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
31957 Cambridge City Council (Cllr Oscar Gillespie) [7092]	Object	Not Specified	None

#### Summary:

The northern side of the Grafton Centre isn't just for servicing, there are a number of homes there. I consider this worth acknowledging in the summary, to ensure that residents are not overlooked while building works take place.

### Response

Comments and concerns duly noted. Suggested amendments will be applied.

### Action

Add 'Homes' bubble to Figure 30 to reflect the residential use of this area.

## Paragraph 2.7.2

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
32156 Marion Bailey [7084]	Object	Not Specified	None

#### Summary:

Area let down by poor quality shops. Charity, betting, cheap food. Why not encourage controls / craft ("Auk" went to central area!) instead of just "artisan food".

### Response

Comments duly noted. It is beyond the remit of planning to require specific shops to open in Grafton, rather it is anticipated that a re-invigorated Graft Area will offer and attract an attractive range of retailer.

### Action

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31958</b> Bev Nicolson [7088]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Second point. As this document has been written so that members of the public can have their say on the council's vision for this area, use of planning jargon is unhelpful.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. A number of changes have been made to the document to reduce the use of technical works and facilitate better understanding of the document's intentions.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31887</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

2.7.2 Historic England agrees with the issues set out in this paragraph.

**Response**

Comments duly noted.

**Action**

No change in the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31952</b> Mrs Hannah Lea [7083]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Quite agree. With intelligent and sensitive redesigning the Grafton centre could become a hub accessed by stylishly designed and enhanced streets with a diverse retail community.

**Response**

Comments duly noted.

**Action**

No change to SPD.

### Paragraph 2.7.3

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31888</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

2.7.3 The opportunities should also refer to the opportunities presented by the historic environment including 17 Fitzroy Street and its setting, CA, other listed buildings and locally listed buildings, historic street patterns, historic shopfronts

*Response*

**Comment duly noted. A reference to the opportunities offered by the area's historic environment should be included.**

*Action*

**Add bullet point to Paragraph 2.7.6 to read 'Improve the historic environment including the setting of designated and non-designated heritage assets'.**

### Paragraph 2.7.4

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32206</b> Cambridgeshire County Council - Transport Assessment Team (Mr David Allatt) [7162]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The County Council recognises that the developer identifies this as a potential opportunity to change the form of East Road, however this requires further consideration with both CCC and Greater Cambridge Partnership following the outcomes of the access study.

In summary for connectivity with East Road and Newmarket Road,

- CCC supports the need to work in close partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular the City Access team. The connectivity of the site with East Road should be improved and support a holistic approach to a new bus interchange and improved pedestrian experience between this and the Grafton Centre site.

- The potential to reduce the width of East Road carriageway would support this aim, however the wider impact of these changes would need to be further investigated through a traffic assessment and working closely with the GCP.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be consistent with wider Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) proposals and County Transport Teams engaged on the detail.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**



## Paragraph 2.7.5

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32207</b> Cambridgeshire County Council - Transport Assessment Team (Mr David Allatt) [7162]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

For the the statement about reviewing the car parking requirement and redeveloping the Grafton West Car Park, surely the redevelopment should be a provisional aspiration if demonstrated to be appropriate?

*Response*

Comments duly noted. This proposals will be subject to much further detailed analysis and will only be proposed where it is considered to be appropriate.

*Action*

Clarify that it is conditional on the car parking evidence supporting its re-development.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32119</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

This paragraph should include: "Improving cycling and walking access through the area."

*Response*

Comment duly noted. Add wording "Improving cycling and walking access through the area."

*Action*

Add wording "Improving cycling and walking access through the area." to Paragraph 2.7.5.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32065</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Fails to note:

- Improving cycle routes in the area, which are currently poor.

*Response*

Comment duly noted. Add wording "Improving cycling and walking access through the area."

*Action*

Add wording "Improving cycling and walking access through the area." to Paragraph 2.7.5.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31978</b> Mrs Valarie Mahy [7093]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

- Remove the bollards along City Rd to allow service vehicles access to the shops along Fitzroy Street/Burleigh Street to avoid them having to use Paradise Street and other local roads.
- Access to Paradise Street should only be used for residential uses and not for either deliveries accessing shops along Fitzroy Street/Burleigh Street or for construction purposes.
- Current and future servicing of any new or existing retail uses should avoid residential streets, e.g. Paradise Street. The streets are often blocked by retail service vehicles and construction vehicles having to turnaround to leave the area. These activities block access for local people and create a considerable amount of noise throughout both the day and night.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. As part of any re-configuration of uses, satisfactory servicing of new and existing uses will need to be agreed. In some cases, improved surface access avoiding Burleigh Street or underground servicing may remove the need for existing service areas. Paradise Street should not be used for servicing any shops.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32058</b> Frances Dewhurst [7090]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Improving the area around the Grafton particularly the service areas we have to walk through for various activities would be a good,

*Response*

**Comments duly noted.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

### 3. Key Objectives

#### Paragraph 3.1 Vision

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32141</b> Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mrs Debbie Baker) [5616]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The Ministry of Defence (MOD) has not been consulted on the above consultation. This office received notification through the tool Devplan.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. The MoD was erroneously omitted from the original consultation notification process at the start of the public consultation. The Council apologises for this error.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31947</b> Ms Anna Lowe [7074]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Cambridge has been 'renovated' enough. I was born here and fed up with all the changes. Roads are gridlocked and now disabled people are being charged for parking! There used to be concessions for parking at Cherry Hinton Rd cinema. Now that it has been sold to a private landlord disabled have to pay full price. Who was it sold to? Most disabled cannot afford it and this city is being developed for the wealthier population.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. The freehold site of the current IMAX cinema, off Cherry Hinton Rd is owned by the City Council however the site is leased out to the cinema operator under a 50 year lease agreement. Currently, any parking charges for disabled people should be no more than what is charged for non-disabled parking. Free parking for disabled users is not a requirement unless it is provided for non-disabled users. Both Grafton car parks currently offer up to 3 hours of free parking for disabled users. While there is no commitment from the car park operator to maintain this allowance, the City Council will request that due consideration is given for convenient disabled parking which is discounted if not provided free of charge as part of any scheme involving new car parking arrangements.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31937</b> Jonathan Hefford [7077]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

PRIVATE v PUBLIC I fear that much that is good within the Masterplan has been devised in the Public Sector and will be down to that Sector to deliver, but we know that this is a severely cut back . I fear that what we will get is a cherry picked Developer led scheme for shareholders, not Cambridge citizens

**Response**

Comment and concerns duly noted. The masterplan SPD has been prepared by both the landowner and the Local Council. New proposals will need to have regard to the SPD, once adopted. Proposals that do not comply with the SPD will not normally be approved. This means, proposals will not normally be granted planning permission unless they make a positive contribution to the area. It is in the interests of both the Local Council and the landowner that comprehensive rather than just cherry picked proposals are brought forward in order to deliver the benefits described in the SPD.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31983</b> Donald Fung [7089]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Such development will cause a great deal of disturbance to residents of Maids Causeway and surrounding roads as the building works will be extensive.

**Response**

Comments duly noted. Any inconvenience caused by construction activities will be kept to a minimum. The hours of permitted construction will be restricted with the applicable planning permission.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32066</b> Frances Dewhurst [7090]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

The picture of Fitzroy St showed a bland and anonymous shopping area. It could be anywhere. Where is the veg stall and the hot dog stall? The veg stall plays an important part in our community as people stop there and chat. They also take veg shopping to elderly people in the area. You don't get that at Waitrose. We need more of the idiosyncratic and particular, not less.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. Figure 39 is purely indicative and does not reflect any final proposed solution for Fitzroy Street's surface treatments. Section 4.5.3 explains how future use of Fitzroy Street should accommodate other functions such as al-fresco eating and occasional market stalls.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32107</b> Mr. John Lee [7100]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I have a number of concerns about the proposed development, but these could be addressed in ways explained in this response. I believe that this could be a wonderful opportunity for the proposed development to reflect the Regency legacy of many of the properties in the immediate area, many of which are Grade 2 listed.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of the existing built heritage in the area.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32102</b> Corsten Douglas [7102]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

When it comes to the disruption caused by work and the trustworthiness of partners, there is much cause for concern. The replacement of the Grafton Centre roof has caused severe disruption to local residents lives and negatively affected their health. The roof replacement is relatively minor compared to the master plan proposal, which will presumably involve significant construction work. It is therefore vital that the mental health and wellbeing of residents is considered, whereby the working hours set out in the planning permission document are strictly adhered to. It would seem that disruption was underestimated, understated to local residents before work began, and that partners have acted in bad faith.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. Any inconvenience caused by construction activities will be kept to a minimum. The hours of permitted construction will be restricted with the applicable planning permission.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32185</b> Sheila Lawlor [7109]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I am writing to you about the outline consultation papers for the Grafton Centre plan and outline proposals for development. My general concern arising from the outline is about size, height, mass and scale. In particular I would like to focus on the implications of the outline envisaged for the Grafton Centre Car park which is by Salmon Lane.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of the existing built heritage such as the residential buildings on Salmon Lane. Paragraph 4.4.24 makes reference to key interventions including 'mews style homes providing frontage to Salmon Lane at an appropriate scale'.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32115</b> Mrs J. A. Surry [7094]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

While in principal I agree with improving the area I am concerned we will lose the pedestrian precinct which we currently have. Cyclists already do not conform to the time restrictions but any car/lorry/taxi access to the area is worrying. This would add to environmental concerns - quality of air. I feel strongly that taxi access is not necessary and wish to have my concerns on the record.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. The principle of exploring cycle routes and pedestrian connectivity through Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street as well as other entrances to the Grafton Centre is supported by both the Local and County Councils. Consideration will be needed to ensure cycle speeds remain low where cycling is allowed to prevent conflicts with pedestrian and associated safety implications. Furthermore, the County Highways Dept is not supportive of introducing vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. The reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street will be removed.

**Action**

Amend paragraphs 4.2.10, 4.4.24, 4.4.28 8th bulletpoint and 4.5.4 - remove reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31944</b> Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Ms Stacey Weiser) [1801]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

The Draft offers a thorough review of the challenges and opportunities of the area and overall the proposals will make a positive impact to the conservation area and provide public benefit. It is obvious that this part of the city has been neglected and ignored and a comprehensive plan to bring it back to life is very welcome. Several of the key areas for improvements include the current Park and Ride bus drop off and pick up area, the service areas and delivery areas, the public realm (including signage, street furniture and trees) and interconnectivity between spaces. It also looks to promote more evening activities, however, we question if this may result in competition for the proposed evening economy in the Market Square in the longer term. The Draft includes the creation of a proper visual frontage or entrance to the site, which is also welcome. The Master Plan document appears to address most issues CambridgePPF would wish to see and is relatively all inclusive.

**Response**

Comments duly noted.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31946</b> Roger Chatterton [7082]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Wish to be updated on the progress of this document.

**Response**

Comments duly noted. Having responded to the public consultation, the representor will be notified about the document's progress.

**Action**

No change to SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31948</b> Cambridge Buddhist Centre (Dh. Tejasiddhi) [7086]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

We are a large community/congregation within the new Grafton development area and we have recently become aware of proposed developments in an 'Opportunity Area Boundary', within which we find ourselves.

We ask that we be kept up to date with any applications for planning permission or any proposed works that may affect us. We are particularly interested in any plans for better pedestrian access to Newmarket Road, as well as being interested in any increase in noise levels that may impinge on our activities.

**Response**

**Comments duly noted. Having responded to the public consultation, the representor will be notified about the document's progress.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32172</b> Universities Superannuation Scheme Limited (USS) Aberdeen Asset Management on behalf of Barclays Nominees (Aberdeen) [7115]	Support	Not Specified	None

**32172** Universities Superannuation Scheme Limited (USS) Aberdeen Asset Management on behalf of Barclays Nominees (Aberdeen) [7115]

**Agent: Deloitte LLP (Mr John Adams) [7114]**

**Summary:**

In summary, our Clients support the mixed use approach to the redevelopment of the Grafton Area, particularly the introduction of additional residential and student accommodation.

However, clarification is sought of the retail evidence base and the impact and integration of the Grafton Area with the wider city centre.

**Response**

**Comments duly noted. The need for additional retail is based upon the Council's evidence base, in particular the updated 'Retail and Leisure Study' completed in 2013. The Grafton Area's city centre role is not expected to change other than making better use of the existing site by introducing additional town centre use to improve the area's appeal and attractiveness for day-to-day usage.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32166</b> Prof. Rob Miller [7116]	Support	Not Specified	None

**32166** Prof. Rob Miller [7116]

**Summary:**

Salmon Lane forms part of the Kite Conservation Area. The houses (mostly Grade II listed buildings) and the coach houses were built in the 1820s. The present development offers an opportunity to enhance Salmon Lane.

If the new housing on the Grafton side of Salmon Lane were of a similar height, density and historic period as the coach houses on the Maids Causeway side of Salmon Lane then I think that this development offers an excellent opportunity to restore Salmon Lane as a Regency mews. This would continue the excellent recent work by the Council in the Kite area in redeveloping the University Arms Hotel.

**Response**

**Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of the existing built heritage such as the residential buildings on Salmon Lane. Paragraph 4.4.24 makes reference to key interventions including 'mews style homes providing frontage to Salmon Lane at an appropriate scale'.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**

## Paragraph 3.2.1

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31889</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Section 3.2 The objectives should reference the need to consider opportunities presented by the historic environment.

*Response*

Comment duly noted. A reference to the opportunities offered by the area's historic environment should be included.

*Action*

Add sentence to paragraph 3.2.5: Reword to read 'Proposals for the Area of Major Change should seek to create a positive and attractive environment to support the vitality and viability of the area for retail and associated activity. Crucial to this objective is to understand and positively integrate the historic environment into proposals.'

## Paragraph 3.2.2

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31924</b> Jonathan Hefford [7077]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

OPENING UP ROUTES. A lot of thought went into separating residential areas, both visually and physically, from retail backsides. Particularly since many houses have no front gardens, turning streets into quieter cut-de-sacs was one of the few benefits of jamming the Grafton Centre into the area. Please note though that several streets are used unofficially to gain access to the rear of retail premises. Sat Navs have increased this.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. As part of any re-configuration of uses, satisfactory servicing of new and existing uses will need to be agreed. In some cases, improved surface access avoiding Burleigh Street or underground servicing may remove the need for existing service areas. Residential streets should not be used for servicing any shops.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31912</b> Mr Malcom Underwood [3555]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

As a resident of Sturton Street - welcome certain elements of the proposed plan: better organized pedestrian/cycle access, and restoration of certain of the pre-Grafton routes nearby.

*Response*

Comments duly noted.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.



<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31890</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

3.2.2 We welcome the objective to seek better connections

*Response*

Comments duly noted.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32059</b> Frances Dewhurst [7090]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Because the Grafton is shut at night, or almost shut apart from access to the cinema, it acts as a barrier. It is especially annoying if you forget and try to get in or out by one of the locked doors and then have to walk quite a long way round at night through the depressing service area to get home. Some thought given to enabling a better through route would be good.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. Section 4.2 and Figures 32 & 33 outline opportunities to improve the Grafton Area's connections and through routes with adjoining buildings. Section 4.3 outlines opportunities to improve the range of uses in the Grafton Area including additional leisure uses which should improve the area's night time appeal for local people. Proposals for new retail development will also be integrated with wider strategies for the enhancement of the public realm. Any improvements to the area's movement, access and public realm will be developed with the County Highways Dept. and other Transport Teams where appropriate.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

**Paragraph 3.2.3**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32123</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

We support the desire to create a more permeable and legible network for walking and cycling.

*Response*

Comments duly noted.

*Action*

No changes to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32069</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Strongly support - there is a need for better cycle access in this area.

*Response*

Comments duly noted.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31959</b> Bev Nicolson [7088]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The area should be primarily for pedestrians and those on bikes. We need far fewer cars.

*Response*

Comments duly noted.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

### Paragraph 3.2.4

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31996</b> Mr John Coyle [7098]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership are not competent to comment on this proposal. They are clearly led by the Cycling Lobby. Pedestrians first should be the priority. Private policing is a must to rid the City of this huge lawless highway user.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. The Greater Cambridge Partnership is committed to improving movement and access for all types of carriageway users.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32070</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

There are many schemes where the Greater Cambridge Partnership are failing to cater for cycling properly, and there have been active campaigns by cyclists against various GCP proposals. Greater Cambridge Partnership remains far too focussed on catering for motor traffic rather than seeking major change.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Projects administered by Greater Cambridge Partnership are beyond the remit of this consultation document.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

**Paragraph 3.2.7**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32157</b> Marion Bailey [7084]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Area not suitable for hotel.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. The hotel use is compatible with the site's city centre location. The site has good access to local bus services and will help improve the area's vibrancy. It will also create an important local source of employment.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31960</b> Bev Nicolson [7088]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I would argue for future proofing not just in terms of building use, but in transport terms too. We must be aiming for far fewer cars and delivery lorries and therefore lower pollution levels.

*Response*

Comments duly and concerns duly noted. Any new development proposals will need to carefully consider their impact on the environment and take advantage of opportunities to reduce all forms of pollution.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32175</b> Universities Superannuation Scheme Limited (USS) Aberdeen Asset Management on behalf of Barclays Nominees (Aberdeen) [7115]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Agent: Deloitte LLP (Mr John Adams) [7114]**

**Summary:**

Wider consideration needs to be given as to how the Masterplan will impact the City Centre. For example, increases in retail, leisure and residential floorspace will have an impact on demand for transport. This is not addressed within the Masterplan. Additional benefits can be realised by also looking at the wider context and this should be recognised within the SPD e.g. improving links between Grafton and the Historic Core.

We also remain very concerned that the planned investment in extending the capacity of park and ride and improving its efficiency is brought forward as quickly as possible.

In this regard, we continue to re-iterate that we would like to collaborate with Cambridge City Council on a spatial / economic / transport Masterplan for the City Centre.

**Response**

Comments duly noted. The Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) is currently developing a range of projects which should improve access to and from the City Centre. Any proposed improvements to the Grafton Area will need to be supported with improved accessibility and this will be completed with the input of the County Highways Dept. and the GCP in order to ensure there is an integrated approach to transport improvements including the Park & Ride services. There are currently no plans to develop a wider Masterplan for the City Centre.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32177</b> Margaret Tait [7113]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

How about having a concert Hall, which could be. used for all types of musical events, and could be used by the local schools for musical productions etc. a good way of encouraging children from less privileged backgrounds.

**Response**

Comments duly noted. No final decision has been taken regarding the mix of leisure use that could be introduced.

**Action**

No changes to the SPD.

## Paragraph 3.2.8

### *Representation(s)*

**31919** Jonathan Hefford [7077]

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**Support Not Specified None**

#### *Summary:*

FLEXIBILITY. The retail component of the Masterplan clings to the idea of the infinite carrying capacity of natural systems (or does it have another planet tucked away somewhere?), endless cheap imported products and cheap labour. None of this will endure. Neither should we assume that future generations will consider that Cambridge is of a character such it that should continue to host a large sub regional vending machine : so what we lay out and build should be capable of significant adaptation.

### *Response*

**Comments duly noted. The Grafton SPD's second objective "A balanced and successful destination" supports future-proofing to ensure that the area is able to adapt according to changing retail and leisure habits.**

### *Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

## Paragraph 3.2.9

### *Representation(s)*

**31913** Mr Malcom Underwood [3555]

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**Object Not Specified None**

#### *Summary:*

As a resident of Sturton Street - deeply suspicious of 'selective redevelopment' of retail.  
 - Many shops cater for people with lower incomes - 'redevelopment' would involve a hike on rents and push such concerns out.  
 - The present Burleigh Street and Fitzroy Street are not marginalised: they merely provide affordable choices in an increasingly polarized economic situation.

### *Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted.**

### *Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31979</b> Mrs Valarie Mahy [7093]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

- Remove the bollards along City Rd to allow service vehicles access to the shops along Fitzroy Street/Burleigh Street to avoid them having to use Paradise Street and other local roads.
- Access to Paradise Street should only be used for residential uses and not for either deliveries accessing shops along Fitzroy Street/Burleigh Street or for construction purposes.
- Current and future servicing of any new or existing retail uses should avoid residential streets, e.g. Paradise Street. The streets are often blocked by retail service vehicles and construction vehicles having to turnaround to leave the area. These activities block access for local people and create a considerable amount of noise throughout both the day and night.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. As part of any re-configuration of uses, satisfactory servicing of new and existing uses will need to be agreed. In some cases, improved surface access avoiding Burleigh Street or underground servicing may remove the need for existing service areas. Paradise Streets should not be used for servicing any shops.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32105</b> Corsten Douglas [7102]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

This raises the further question - why do we need to invest this money in this area? Public safety and willingness to invest in the area could be helped by just investing more into police patrols. Efforts could be made to prevent the exploitation of beggars and drug dealing in the back alleys.

**Response**

Comments duly noted. The need for additional retail is based upon the Council's evidence base, in particular the updated 'Retail and Leisure Study' completed in 2013. The Grafton Area SPD is a long-term project to attract investment in the area to ensure it meets the needs of a modern retail centre not just for shoppers but also retail operators. There are genuine concerns about the centre's appeal when the shops are closed.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

## 4. Strategies For Change

### Paragraph 4.2.1

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32208</b> Cambridgeshire County Council - Transport Assessment Team (Mr David Allatt) [7162]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The County Council are not supportive of the reinstatement of Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street for motorised vehicular traffic due to safety implications for vulnerable road users.

*Response*

The County Highways Dept is not supportive of introducing vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. The reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street will be removed.

*Action*

Amend paragraphs 4.2.10, 4.4.24, 4.4.28 8th bullet point and 4.5.4 - remove reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32158</b> Marion Bailey [7084]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Extend primary route to East Road but connect with busses, car park and bike park.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be consistent with wider Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) proposals and County Transport Teams engaged on the detail. The Greater Cambridge Partnership's Access Study will also be a key influence on the future of a new bus terminal. There will be a need to agree any changes with the public transport operators, County Transport Team and GCP's Access Team.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32113</b> Mrs H Van De Watering [7095]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

By all means build a cycle lane. Pedestrians have no protection at present as the police do nothing to stop illegal cycling (here and anywhere in town) so 'no cycling' notices are pure fantasy.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. The principle of exploring cycle routes and pedestrian connectivity through Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street as well as other entrances to the Grafton Centre is supported by both the Local and County Councils. Consideration will be needed to ensure cycle speeds remain low where cycling is allowed to prevent conflicts with pedestrian and associated safety implications.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32178</b> Margaret Tait [7113]	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

The proposed new transport plan for Cambridge, one suggestion put forward is for an underground system with the entrance at Drummer St, why not have the entrance at the back of the shops in the Grafton centre; this would bring shoppers to the Grafton, a lot more sensible than having it at Drummer St which is totally congested and simply has not got the space for any more pedestrians or buses. Shoppers could also visit the Bee Hive more easily without coming into the centre of the city.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. The Greater Cambridge Partnership has been working jointly with the Combined Authority on an options appraisal of rapid mass transit for Greater Cambridge and the wider area however the report will not be finalised until January 2018. Opportunities to integrate any potential link with the Grafton Area would be considered on their merits however it is unlikely to be built for some considerable time, if approved and therefore cannot be relied upon as a means of facilitating access to the Grafton Centre.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

**Paragraph 4.2.3**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31980</b> Mrs Valarie Mahy [7093]	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

- Remove the bollards along City Rd to allow service vehicles access to the shops along Fitzroy Street/Burleigh Street to avoid them having to use Paradise Street and other local roads.
- Access to Paradise Street should only be used for residential uses and not for either deliveries accessing shops along Fitzroy Street/Burleigh Street or for construction purposes.
- Current and future servicing of any new or existing retail uses should avoid residential streets, e.g. Paradise Street. The streets are often blocked by retail service vehicles and construction vehicles having to turnaround to leave the area. These activities block access for local people and create a considerable amount of noise throughout both the day and night.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Any access changes to City Road would require an assessment to consider the wider impact of these changes. This would need to be completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular the City Access team. Residential streets should not be used for servicing any shops.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**



<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32029</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

This whole area was chopped up when the Grafton Centre was built and many public rights of way were entirely privatised. As either a pedestrian or cyclist, the area is confusing and has poor permeability, forcing people to take long detours along often unpleasant routes (eg East Road).

**Response**

Comments duly noted.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

**Paragraph 4.2.4**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32124</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

This section fails to note the very poor connections between the St Matthew's Street approach and the Grafton Centre.

**Response**

Comments duly noted. No final decision has been taken regarding the surface treatments / road crossings along East Road. A reference to existing poor connections between the St Matthew's Street approach and the Grafton Centre will be added.

**Action**

Add reference to paragraph 4.2.4 of poor connections between the St Matthew's Street approach and the Grafton Centre.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32071</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Fails to note the extremely poor cycling and walking connectivity from St Matthew's Street to the Grafton Centre, as shown by this difficult and hostile route plan:

<https://www.cyclestreets.net/journey/59440302/#fastest>

The walking connectivity is also poor, with multiple stage crossings involving pig pen pedestrian fencing and narrow pavements.

**Response**

Comments duly noted. No final decision has been taken regarding the surface treatments / road crossings along East Road. A reference to existing poor connections between the St Matthew's Street approach and the Grafton Centre will be added.

**Action**

Add reference to paragraph 4.2.4 of poor connections between the St Matthew's Street approach and the Grafton Centre.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31961</b> Bev Nicolson [7088]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Again, let's not think car here. Walking and cycling must come first.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. The principle of exploring cycle routes and pedestrian connectivity to, from and through the Grafton Centre is supported by both the Local and County Councils.**

*Action*

**No changes to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32030</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

This whole area was chopped up when the Grafton Centre was built and many public rights of way were entirely privatised. As either a pedestrian or cyclist, the area is confusing and has poor permeability, forcing people to take long detours along often unpleasant routes (eg East Road).

*Response*

**Comments duly noted.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

## Paragraph Figure 33 Routes and public realm

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31962</b> Bev Nicolson [7088]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Fig. 33 - It's not entirely clear to me if the yellow shading is an indication that you wish to see junction improvement here. (This is a problem with several plans. The key doesn't always match the drawing.) Fitzroy Lane needs a pavement.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Amendments to yellow shading to improve area indicated. Will be applied.**

*Action*

**Change yellow shading to improve area indicated in Figure 33.**

## Paragraph 4.2.7

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31997</b> Mr John Coyle [7098]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

There is no justification for removing this left hand turn.  
Move the current crossing from the Magistrates Court to opposite the current bus-interchange instead.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. No final decision has been taken regarding the surface treatments / road crossings along East Road.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32072</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Strongly support removal of the feeder lane.

The current situation results in extremely poor pedestrian pavement space. Also, it prevents the provision of a proper cycle track.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

## Paragraph 4.2.8

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32062</b> Frances Dewhurst [7090]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

There are parking queues in Newmarket Rd at the weekends which block the street. Most of the people seem to be families. Attracting more people to central Cambridge to shop seems an odd idea. I think it is a fantasy to imagine these families will arrive from e.g. Waterbeach by bike, or bus as they will not want to carry purchases home. People now have the option of park & ride, but it is still busy. How are you planning to manage the transport of the increased numbers?

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. The Grafton SPD recognises the need to improve the transport connections to, from and through the Grafton Centre in order to reduce the need to travel to the area by car. Improvements to the area's access is supported by both the Local and County Councils. These changes would need to be completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular the City Access team.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32182</b> Russell Whitehead [7111]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

While we support the provision of more homes and amenities etc, they will of course only add to these challenges as they will all order things online, need to get to the hospital occasionally, have things that need mending in their homes from time to time, and so on. It seems to us that the disadvantages caused in these respects outweigh the potential advantages, and we hope further consideration and consultation is undertaken.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Satisfactory access for any new residential units will need to be properly assessed and approved by the County Highways Dept. as part of any planning application.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

**Paragraph 4.2.10**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32073</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

This proposal is not evidenced and should be removed entirely.

Completely inappropriate to allow taxi usage in this area.

I have never heard any statement of demand, and a previous attempt to provide a taxi rank on Fair Street failed due to lack of use.

Having car-like vehicles being driven through this area will encourage illegal use by non-taxis. The area should not be designed to facilitate this.

I speak as a taxi user who supports better provision for taxis overall.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. The County Highways Dept. is not supportive of introducing vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. The reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street will be removed.**

*Action*

**Amend paragraphs 4.2.10, 4.4.24, 4.4.28 8th bullet point and 4.5.4 - remove reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street.**

**Representation(s)** **Nature** **Appearance** **Soundness Tests**

**32125** Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925] **Object** **Not Specified** **None**

*Summary:*

Taxi movements along Fitzroy and Burleigh Streets, on top of proposed delivery movements, constitute a safety hazard for people walking and cycling.

**Response**

**Comments and concerns duly noted. The County Highways Dept. is not supportive of introducing vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. The reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street will be removed.**

**Action**

**Amend paragraphs 4.2.10, 4.4.24, 4.4.28 8th bulletpoint and 4.5.4 - remove reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street.**

**Representation(s)** **Nature** **Appearance** **Soundness Tests**

**32031** Heather Coleman [1863] **Object** **Not Specified** **None**

*Summary:*

Taxi movements along Fitzroy and Burleigh Streets, on top of proposed delivery movements, constitute a safety hazard for people walking and cycling. This is a ridiculous idea. Fewer motor vehicles should be using these streets, even outside "core hours" not more.

**Response**

**Comments and concerns duly noted. The County Highways Dept. is not supportive of introducing vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. The reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street will be removed.**

**Action**

**Amend paragraphs 4.2.10, 4.4.24, 4.4.28 8th bulletpoint and 4.5.4 - remove reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street.**

**Paragraph 4.2.11**

**Representation(s)** **Nature** **Appearance** **Soundness Tests**

**31941** Mr Peter Wakefield [4087] **Support** **Not Specified** **None**

*Summary:*

Welcome change of use of the Grafton Bus Station.  
 Quicker for the P&R bus services to access the city via the quieter Maids Causeway route using a quality bus stop near Sun Street / Napier Street along with the Citi3 and 10/11 routes. Interchange between routes can made if they all went that way. Currently many P&R services divert via Maids Causeway route on an ad hoc basis avoiding the difficult right turn at the Junction with Mill Road and Parkside.

The Grafton Bus station could be opened out onto East Road and developed as an inner city square linked to a linear park with a much calmer and narrower East Road along side it.

**Response**

**Comments duly noted.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**

## Paragraph 4.2.14

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31998</b> Mr John Coyle [7098]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

As I said before- buses should not be using East Road. They have traffic free Emanuel Road to use. Pedestrians can be dropped off at a New Square Bus Terminal. This will save 5 minutes plus on journey times.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. The Greater Cambridge Partnership's Access Study will be a key influence on the future of a new bus terminal and any proposed re-configuration of East Road.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

## Paragraph 4.2.15

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32209</b> Cambridgeshire County Council - Transport Assessment Team (Mr David Allatt) [7162]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

"The proposals for buses stopping on East Road need to be discussed in more detail with bus operators and Public Transport Officers.

In summary for Public Transport, CCC recognises opportunities to improve the public transport interaction with the site and the opportunity for a more attractive arrival environment. Changes to the public transport arrangements should be discussed in detail with the public transport operator Stagecoach, and CCC public transport leads."

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be consistent with wider Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) proposals and County Transport Teams engaged on the detail.**

*Action*

**No Change to SPD**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32032</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Any new bus stops must be "floating". East Road is dangerous enough for cyclists, many of whom have no option but to use it as the Grafton Centre is in the way of other desire lines, without having to dodge in and out past stopped buses on a road that feels more like a race track.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. The Greater Cambridge Partnership's Access Study will be a key influence on the future of East Road's surface treatments including the use of 'floating' bus stops.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

## Paragraph 4.2.16

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32074</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Support provision of better bus facilities on East Road, but this must be in conjunction with proper cycle tracks and bus stop bypasses. This is an extremely wide road and there is plenty of space for both.

*Response*

Comments duly noted.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31943</b> Mr Peter Wakefield [4087]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

There are three major Anglia Ruskin sites along East Road and apart from the residents alongside East Road, the many hundred movements of young people along this road must be taken into account into designs.

*Response*

Comments duly noted.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

## Paragraph 4.2.17

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32211</b> Cambridgeshire County Council - Transport Assessment Team (Mr David Allatt) [7162]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Surely the aspiration should be to remove the conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and servicing vehicles, rather than manage an increased amount?

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of adequate servicing provision to ensure access is satisfactorily designed for both new and existing deliveries. These movements should avoid residential streets. This is necessary to prevent existing conflict between the services of existing retail units via residential streets. The servicing strategy should be developed with the County Highways Dept. and other Transport Teams where appropriate.

*Action*

Add sentence to 4.2.18 explaining a servicing strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area.

## Paragraph 4.2.18

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32210</b> Cambridgeshire County Council - Transport Assessment Team (Mr David Allatt) [7162]	Object	Not Specified	None

### *Summary:*

"(1) Should the statement about service areas not also include the aspiration to provide effective, efficient servicing?  
 (2) The reintroduction of motor vehicles, or increased servicing utilising Fitzroy Street or Burleigh Street is seen as a retrograde step.  
 (3) Modification of the Traffic Regulation Order governing the streets concerned is a process is outside the planning process and so may not be deliverable."

### *Response*

(1) New development will need to take account of adequate servicing provision to ensure access is satisfactorily designed for both new and existing deliveries. These movements should avoid residential streets. This is necessary to prevent existing conflict between the services of existing retail units via residential streets. The servicing strategy should be developed with the County Highways Dept. and other Transport Teams where appropriate.  
 (2) The County Highways Dept is not supportive of introducing vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. The reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street will be removed.  
 (3) Add sentence explaining that the modification of the Traffic Regulation Order governing the streets concerned is a process outside the planning process and may not be deliverable.

### *Action*

(1) Amend 1st sentence of 4.2.18 to read "Proposals involving servicing (and those including taxi access) will be subject to a clear servicing strategy and assessment." Add sentence at end of paragraph "Taxi movements will not be allowed on Fitzroy/Burleigh and the expectation is that taxi arrangements will be proposed in that context."  
 (2) Amend paragraphs 4.2.10, 4.4.24, 4.4.28 8th bulletpoint and 4.5.4 - remove reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street.  
 (3) Add sentence to 4.2.18 explaining that the modification of the Traffic Regulation Order governing the streets concerned is a process outside the planning process and may not be deliverable.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32126</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Object	Not Specified	None

### *Summary:*

The language is not strong enough against on-street servicing, particularly from East Road. Currently, on-street deliveries to East Road Tesco Express block the cycle lane with a dangerous vehicle. Those deliveries could be made behind the building from the car park, but there is not a sufficient enforcement mechanism. This paragraph should contain stronger language against delivery vans parking in cycle lanes.

### *Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. As part of any re-configuration of uses, satisfactory servicing of new and existing uses will need to be agreed. It is however important that residential streets are not used for servicing any shops. Delivery lorries using East Road may therefore present the preferred means of servicing to protect local amenity for local residents.

### *Action*

No change to the SPD.



<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32033</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The language is not strong enough against on-street servicing, particularly from East Road. Currently, on-street deliveries to East Road Tesco Express block the cycle lane with a dangerous vehicle. Those deliveries could be made behind the building from the car park, but there is not a sufficient enforcement mechanism. This paragraph should contain stronger language against delivery vans and lorries parking in cycle lanes.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. As part of any re-configuration of uses, satisfactory servicing of new and existing uses will need to be agreed. It is however important that residential streets are not used for servicing any shops. Delivery lorries using East Road may therefore present the preferred means of servicing to protect local amenity for local residents.**

*Action*

**No Change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31964</b> Bev Nicolson [7088]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

4.2.18 - I object to on-street servicing. It causes conflict with pedestrians and bike users

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. As part of any re-configuration of uses, satisfactory servicing of new and existing uses will need to be agreed. It is however important that residential streets are not used for servicing any shops. Delivery lorries using East Road may therefore present the preferred means of servicing to protect local amenity for local residents.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32075</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Support the general principles here.

On-street servicing in the area is currently an acceptable balance.

However, this section should note the need to retain the current Grafton Centre servicing, i.e. that servicing of its internal units from Burleigh / Fitzroy Streets would be wholly inappropriate.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. As part of any re-configuration of uses, satisfactory servicing of new and existing uses will need to be agreed. In some cases, improved surface access avoiding Burleigh/Fitzroy streets may remove the need for existing service areas. Residential streets should not be used for servicing any shops.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32111</b> Patrick Zutshi [7105]	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

I support this section re. service access. I wish to point out that this is not currently observed, despite the statement at 2.2.15 that retail units on Fitzroy and Burleigh Street are serviced on-street. In fact, Eden Street is used for this purpose, causing congestion, pollution, noise and disturbance to residents. Any plans should ensure that servicing rules are enforced.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. This issue is an enforcement matter and has been forwarded onto the Council's Enforcement Team to investigate.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

**Paragraph 4.2.21**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32212</b> Cambridgeshire County Council - Transport Assessment Team (Mr David Allatt) [7162]	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>

*Summary:*

In summary for Car Parking Policy

\* Redevelopment of the existing deck car park in Grafton West to provide same number of spaces in a single basement level would enhance the area whilst maintaining current level of spaces. This supports better connectivity to/from the site to Newmarket Road, with a strong emphasis on creating a safer passage between these areas.

\* CCC supports the need for electric charging points, and this should also be encouraged in any redevelopment of the retail/public car parks.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

## Paragraph 4.2.22

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31991</b> Eden Baptist Church (Mr Tom Sparrow) [7097]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

This implies that there may be a significant period during which Grafton West car park is not operational either in its existing form or in a potential new underground form. This would have a detrimental impact on older or less physically able users of facilities at the west end of the Grafton Area, including but not limited to Eden Chapel which hosts many community events throughout the week as well as two large Sunday services.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. It is not proposed to the increase car parking to a greater level than the current number of spaces. Paragraph 4.2.23 outlines the need for a car parking strategy to inform planning decisions. Any redevelopment of the Grafton West Car Park will be conditional on car parking evidence supporting its redevelopment. Any proposal to close the Grafton West Car Park temporarily will first need to have an agreed plan in place to minimise disruption to existing users and ensure alternative provision is available for older or less physically able users of the local facilities such as the Eden Baptist Church.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32076</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Support reduction of general on-street car storage with dedicated car park, to improve the public realm.

Changes must continue to recognise needs of disabled badge holders, however.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

## Paragraph 4.2.23

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31921</b> Jonathan Hefford [7077]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

CARS. More shopping = more cars. Shoppers will sit in car queues for ages rather than get on a bus. Let's at any rate be adamant that there will be no additional parking for shoppers.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. Paragraph 4.2.23 confirms that the overall provision of car parking will not be increased.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

## Paragraph 4.2.24

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32213</b> Cambridgeshire County Council - Transport Assessment Team (Mr David Allatt) [7162]	Object	Not Specified	None

### *Summary:*

- (1) For the statement that the 'City Council's car parking standards are expressed as maximum standards in line with national guidance', this is no longer National Guidance - please refer to the NPPF. Residents will not have access to Residents' Permits
- (2) The County Council is not supportive of taxis on a through route between Fitzroy Street and East Road, this would result in rat running and safety concerns for pedestrians and cyclists.
- (3) For the statement about the aspiration to create an integrated approach to movement on Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street. This could involve improved management of servicing where this occurs on street, potential for the introduction of out of hours taxi operation, cycling and other streetscape improvements.
- Servicing activity on Fitzroy Street would take place out of hours and would require enforcement, potentially utilising ANPR cameras.
  - Provision for a contraflow cycle lane on Fitzroy Street to accommodate cyclists throughout the day (24/7, not restricted access as currently) is also key.
  - The Highway Authority does not support this approach.
  - Modification of the Traffic Regulation Order governing the streets concerned is a process outside the planning process and so may not be deliverable.
  - If Burleigh Street is open to vehicular traffic, this is undeliverable on several levels, not least of which is highway safety.
  - Provision of a segregated cycleway in the pedestrian area is not seen as beneficial. Identification of a segregated vehicular route will be interpreted as priority space reserved for their use.

### *Response*

- (1) Comments and concerns duly noted. Paragraph 4.2.24 will be amended to reflect site's intention to maximise opportunities for car-free residential developments.
- (2) The County Highways Dept is not supportive of introducing vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. The reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street will be removed.
- (3) Comments duly noted. The reference to a 'contraflow cycle lane' will be re-worded to reflect the fact that the detail of how the cycling will be best achieved has yet to be decided.

### *Action*

- (1) Update paragraph 4.2.24 to reflect current NPPF policy. Amend to reflect site's intention to maximise opportunities for residential developments either car-free or with minimal car parking.
- (2) Amend paragraphs 4.2.10, 4.4.24, 4.4.28 8th bullet point and 4.5.4 - remove reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street.
- (3) All referencing of a 'contraflow cycle-lane' in the SPD will be removed. The following bullet point will be added in 4.4.24: "Provision for a shared surface for both cyclists and pedestrians designed to ensure safety for all surface users is also key."

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31999</b> Mr John Coyle [7098]	Object	Not Specified	None

### *Summary:*

I question any survey that says people in this area do not own cars.  
As a City resident of over 40 years it is obvious that the ridiculous one car per dwelling has led to major capacity problems on the surrounding area.  
Car ownership is well over 1 per household.

### *Response*

Comments duly noted.

### *Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32181</b> Russell Whitehead [7111]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

We would suggest, incidentally, that the Dover Street car-park is made into residents-only, including cycle parking, freeing up some of the street parking to return to no-parking and making the zone no-other-parking except residents and their permitted visitors. With effective signage, the zone could be protected from those seeking free alternatives to the paying car-parks and prevent the current problem of cars circulating apparently endlessly looking for spaces.

**Response**

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to the resident's parking arrangements would require an assessment to consider the wider impact of these changes. This would need to be completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular the City Access team.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32078</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

The assumption that "Car ownership is well over 1 per household." is not evidenced and according to common sense is not correct.

As clearly shown from images of the area:

<https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@52.2044143,0.133008,127a,35y,308.98h,45t/data=!3m1!1e3>

car parking in most of these streets is one side of the road only. The width of a car is around the same as the width of a house, and space is needed for reversing. The ownership level on those streets therefore cannot be greater than around 0.45.

Heavy car ownership in this area is inappropriate - car clubs should be used instead, given lack of space.

**Response**

**Comments duly noted.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**

## Paragraph 4.2.27

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

32079 Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]

Support

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Strongly support.

Space given to private car storage on public land in this area is far too high. The area has some of the best transport accessibility levels in the city. Vehicles in central terraced areas of Cambridge are often left for weeks unused - a complete waste of space. Car clubs should be used to free up this space for more productive uses like trees, play spaces, cycle parking, bin areas for delivery days, etc.

### Response

Comments duly noted. Paragraph 4.2.27 confirms this approach towards car clubs.

### Action

No change to the SPD.

## Paragraph 4.2.28

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

32163 Marion Bailey [7084]

Support

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

Figure 42 is imaginative.

### Response

Comments duly noted.

### Action

No change to the SPD.

## Paragraph 4.2.30

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

31965 Bev Nicolson [7088]

Object

Not Specified

None

#### Summary:

4.2.30 Suggest sites for cycle parking. Although if Grafton East went underground, could the over ground part become a cycle park?

### Response

Comments duly noted. New development will need to take account of cycle parking provision to ensure enough provision is provided, and it the right locations. We will ensure cycle parking locations are convenient whilst not detracting from the streetscape, where this can be avoided. It is noted that the existing cycle parking stands outside shops are convenient yet often full.

### Action

Add the following sentence to paragraph 4.2.30: "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area."

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32127</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

We support an increase in cycle parking provision. We also recommend that inclusive cycle parking requirements be added to the SPD: cycle parking for tricycles, cargo-cycles and adapted-cycles used by persons with disabilities. This would be for both long stay and short stay.

**Response**

Comments duly noted. New development will need to take account of cycle parking provision to ensure enough provision is provided, and it the right locations. We will ensure cycle parking locations are convenient whilst not detracting from the streetscape, where this can be avoided. It is noted that the existing cycle parking stands outside shops are convenient yet often full.

**Action**

Add the following sentence to paragraph 4.2.30: "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area."

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32080</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Support retention and increase of cycle parking spaces.

A review of locations to avoid pedestrian obstruction would be acceptable.

Putting all cycle parking in a single cycle parking would not work, and would lead to untidy fly parking. Must be spread around. However, if a cycle park were provided as an additional facility, this would be welcomed.

This paragraph needs to give a clearer idea of how 1,000 spaces is actually achievable.

**Response**

Comments duly noted. New development will need to take account of cycle parking provision to ensure enough provision is provided, and it the right locations. We will ensure cycle parking locations are convenient whilst not detracting from the streetscape, where this can be avoided. It is noted that the existing cycle parking stands outside shops are convenient yet often full.

**Action**

Add the following sentence to paragraph 4.2.30: "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area."

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32034</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

I support an increase in cycle parking provision, which is desperately needed. It should be a mixture of on-street and more secure longer stay parking. If cycle parking is not in a convenient location it will not be used.

**Response**

Comments duly noted. New development will need to take account of cycle parking provision to ensure enough provision is provided, and it the right locations. We will ensure cycle parking locations are convenient whilst not detracting from the streetscape, where this can be avoided. It is noted that the existing cycle parking stands outside shops are convenient yet often full.

**Action**

Add the following sentence to paragraph 4.2.30: "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area."

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31907</b> Mr Nicholas Flynn [7072]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I support the proposal to significantly increase the amount of cycle parking. I often cycle to the Grafton centre - one of the benefits of shopping at the Grafton centre is that cycle parking is conveniently close by to the shops on Fitzroy Street. This makes it feasible to pop by after work or for other quick visits. I hope that short stay cycle parking is maintained at multiple convenient locations rather than just all being lumped together in a large cycle park.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. New development will need to take account of cycle parking provision to ensure enough provision is provided, and it the right locations. We will ensure cycle parking locations are convenient whilst not detracting from the streetscape, where this can be avoided. It is noted that the existing cycle parking stands outside shops are convenient yet often full.**

*Action*

**Add the following sentence to paragraph 4.2.30: "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area."**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31992</b> Eden Baptist Church (Mr Tom Sparrow) [7097]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

We support the proposed increase in cycle parking spaces. This section suggests that new spaces would be long stay - we note that there is a distinct shortage of short stay cycle parking near Eden Chapel especially on Sunday morning where it overflows in all directions down the railings beside New Square.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. New development will need to take account of cycle parking provision to ensure enough provision is provided, and it the right locations. We will ensure cycle parking locations are convenient whilst not detracting from the streetscape, where this can be avoided. It is noted that the existing cycle parking stands outside shops are convenient yet often full.**

*Action*

**Add the following sentence to paragraph 4.2.30: "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area."**

**Paragraph 4.2.31**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32000</b> Mr John Coyle [7098]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Pedestrians do not want cyclist or cycle parking in either of these highways. We do not want them in the town either. Divert the cyclist to the side roads. Use the current bus-stop area at the front of the Grafton for a cycle park. A charge of £2.00 for using the park should apply for policing to fine cyclist caught using Burleigh Street and Fitzroy Street.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. Careful consideration of cycle parking will be needed to ensure enough provision is provided, whilst ensuring location of parking is convenient, but does not detract from the streetscape.**

*Action*

**Add the following sentence to paragraph 4.2.30 "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area".**



<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32128</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

We support convenient locations for short-stay cycle parking and would suggest investigating the side-street entrance plazas as another set of sites with potential. This could include cycle parking on the side streets: replacing on-street car parking spaces with on-street cycle parking racks. We also recommend that inclusive cycle parking requirements be added to the SPD: cycle parking for cargo cycles and adapted cycles for persons with disabilities. This would be for both long stay and short stay.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. New development will need to take account of cycle parking provision to ensure enough provision is provided, and it the right locations. We will ensure cycle parking locations are convenient whilst not detracting from the streetscape, where this can be avoided. It is noted that the existing cycle parking stands outside shops are convenient yet often full.**

*Action*

**Add the following sentence to paragraph 4.2.30: "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area."**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32081</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Object that the area being covered in car storage.

Cycle parking should replace some current car storage in the surrounding streets. Currently these streets are massively dominated by car storage yet have zero cycle parking, which is grossly unbalanced.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. Careful consideration of cycle parking will be needed to ensure enough provision is provided, whilst ensuring location of parking is convenient, but does not detract from the streetscape.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32035</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I support convenient locations for short-stay cycle parking and would suggest investigating the side-street entrance plazas as another set of sites with potential. I normally end up parking on one of the side street entrances as the bulk racks on Burleigh and Fitzroy Sts are invariably full. I would suggest this could include cycle parking on the side streets: replacing on-street car parking spaces with on-street cycle parking racks. Cycle parking should have provision for cargo and non-standard bikes.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. Careful consideration of cycle parking will be needed to ensure enough provision is provided, whilst ensuring location of parking is convenient, but does not detract from the streetscape.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

### Paragraph 4.2.32

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32129</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

We partly object to this paragraph because it suggests locating the long-stay cycle parking within the car parks. Unfortunately the location of and access to the car parks makes this a difficult and awkward option that won't work. Our recommendation is to use some space within or among the shops, much like the Grand Arcade does. We also recommend that inclusive cycle parking requirements be added to the SPD: cycle parking for cargo cycles and adapted cycles for persons with disabilities. This would be for both long stay and short stay.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. Careful consideration of cycle parking will be needed to ensure enough provision is provided, whilst ensuring location of parking is convenient, but does not detract from the streetscape.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32086</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Cycle parking in car parks does not work. It does not feel safe in personal safety terms, and involves cycles mixing with vehicles in a constrained and dangerous area. Neither drivers nor cyclists would welcome such a kind of provision.

Only when there is dedicated access that is also as convenient as on-street parking would it be likely to work.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. Careful consideration of cycle parking will be needed to ensure enough provision is provided, whilst ensuring location of parking is convenient, but does not detract from the streetscape.**

*Action*

**Add the following sentence to paragraph 4.2.30 "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area".**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32036</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The car parks are off dangerous roads like East Road. Are you really suggesting routing cyclists along there in order for them to park? No-one will go there, bar possibly a few shop workers doing 8 hour shifts. Most shoppers spend about an hour at the Grafton and tend to go to the city centre as well. Therefore being stuck around the back is deeply unattractive and they're more likely just to go to the city centre.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. Careful consideration of cycle parking will be needed to ensure enough provision is provided, whilst ensuring location of parking is convenient, but does not detract from the streetscape.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

## Paragraph 4.2.33

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32130</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

We support good cycle parking provision for residential elements. We recommend our guide that is available online: [www.camcycle.org.uk/resources/cycleparking/guide/](http://www.camcycle.org.uk/resources/cycleparking/guide/)

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Careful consideration of cycle parking will be needed to ensure enough provision is provided, whilst ensuring location of parking is convenient, but does not detract from the streetscape.

*Action*

Add the following sentence to paragraph 4.2.30 "A cycle parking strategy will be developed for the Grafton Area".

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32082</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Document should note the strong dislike of double-stacker cycle parking stands. Sheffield stands should be more strongly recommended here.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Careful consideration of cycle parking will be needed to ensure enough provision is provided, whilst ensuring the type and location of parking is convenient, but does not detract from the streetscape.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

## Paragraph Figure 34 Access and servicing

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31963</b> Bev Nicolson [7088]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Enhanced public space. There is potential for conflict in a shared space environment as this would turn out to be. Fig 34 strongly suggests there would be.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. For pedestrians, the principal shared spaces will most likely be along Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street with cyclists. East Road will have its own pavement for pedestrians separate from cycle lanes.

*Action*

No changes to the SPD.

Figure 34 Access and servicing

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31984</b> Donald Fung [7089]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Building on the Grafton car park will cast a shadow over the properties at the rear of Maids Causeway that sit on Salmon Lane, these buildings are the annexes of the properties on Maids Causeway. Flats or houses built on the car park would cut off natural light to the annexes which are used as living accommodation, offices and workshops.  
 To build residential units over an existing car park will be costly and not in the interest of the tax payer, the land where the car park is located has a history of subsidence.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Further studies are required to test the feasibility of underground car parking allowing for some form of development above. Any proposed developments will need to respond to their local context including any proposed building heights and the potential for over-shadow these may cause.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31981</b> Mrs Valarie Mahy [7093]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

- Remove the bollards along City Rd to allow service vehicles access to the shops along Fitzroy Street/Burleigh Street to avoid them having to use Paradise Street and other local roads.
- Access to Paradise Street should only be used for residential uses and not for either deliveries accessing shops along Fitzroy Street/Burleigh Street or for construction purposes.
- Current and future servicing of any new or existing retail uses should avoid residential streets, e.g. Paradise Street. The streets are often blocked by retail service vehicles and construction vehicles having to turnaround to leave the area. These activities block access for local people and create a considerable amount of noise throughout both the day and night.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. Concerns regarding current retail servicing access is noted. Any proposed changes to retail provision must provide a revised servicing strategy to avoid residential streets, where possible.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

**Paragraph Figure 35 Indicative uses plan - ground floor plan**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31966</b> Bev Nicolson [7088]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Fig 35 I am uneasy about suggesting no. 17 Fitzroy Street could turn into an hotel. I envisage conflict with pedestrians and bikes because of the servicing needed and the guests arriving.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Any proposal to convert No. 17 Fitzroy St. into a hotel will need to properly address its usage including any servicing arrangements and travel arrangements for hotel guests. Any proposal will also need to provide a Transport Assessment to minimise travel disruption to and from the site.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

Figure 35 Indicative uses plan - ground floor plan

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31988</b> Eden Baptist Church (Mr Tom Sparrow) [7097]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Eden Chapel is marked as red which suggests an indicative use of "retail/leisure/food & drink" which is not correct. Figure 9 correctly identifies it as "community".

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Amend red shading to not cover Eden Chapel which should have a separate 'community' designation.

*Action*

Amendment to Figure 35: Amend red shading to not cover Eden Chapel which should have a separate 'community' designation.

**Paragraph Figure 36 Indicative uses plan - typical upper floor plan**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31989</b> Eden Baptist Church (Mr Tom Sparrow) [7097]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

This figure includes Eden Chapel within the area with indicative use for residential or office on upper floors. We are not aware of any such plans above our building and question whether this shading is correct.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Amend red shading to not cover Eden Chapel which should have a separate 'community' designation.

*Action*

Amendment to Figure 36: Amend green shading to not cover Eden Chapel which should have a separate 'community' designation.

## Paragraph 4.3.7

### Representation(s)

32083 Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

Object Not Specified None

#### Summary:

Not clearly evidenced why there is a need for night time activities in this area.

The area is residential in character and I would agree that residents do deserve some peace.

The city centre is trying to attract more night time use, so it makes no sense to split night time attractions thinly over two locations - better to centralise in one place.

### Response

Comments and concerns duly noted. The Grafton Area is identified in the emerging Local Plan, under Policy 11 as a location for expansion and/or redevelopment for both retail and leisure use with residential and student accommodation on upper floors. The need for additional retail and leisure floorspace is based upon the Council's evidence base, in particular the updated 'Retail and Leisure Study' completed in 2013. The Grafton Area renovation is a long-term project to invest in the area to ensure it meets the needs of a modern city centre providing a range of uses and activities. There are genuine concerns about the centre's appeal when the shops are closed. Additional leisure uses will broaden the area's attractiveness and remove the area's current reliance on retail activities to attract people. Additional retail and leisure activities will also increase local employment opportunities.

### Action

No change to the SPD.

### Representation(s)

31914 Mr Malcom Underwood [3555]

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

Object Not Specified None

#### Summary:

I do not see why we need yet more eateries or 'nightlife': there is more than enough of this in the city centre proper.

### Response

Comments and concerns duly noted. The Grafton Area is identified in the emerging Local Plan, under Policy 11 as a location for expansion and/or redevelopment for both retail and leisure use with residential and student accommodation on upper floors. The need for additional retail and leisure floorspace is based upon the Council's evidence base, in particular the updated 'Retail and Leisure Study' completed in 2013. The Grafton Area renovation is a long-term project to invest in the area to ensure it meets the needs of a modern city centre providing a range of uses and activities. There are genuine concerns about the centre's appeal when the shops are closed. Additional leisure uses will broaden the area's attractiveness and remove the area's current reliance on retail activities to attract people. Additional retail and leisure activities will also increase local employment opportunities.

### Action

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31925</b> Jonathan Hefford [7077]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

NIGHT TIME ACTIVITIES. Very apprehensive about this. Residents have bad experiences. Litter, noise, vomit, urination, graffiti, vandalism, car keying. You get the picture.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. The Grafton Area is identified in the emerging Local Plan, under Policy 11 as a location for expansion and/or redevelopment for both retail and leisure use with residential and student accommodation on upper floors. The need for additional retail and leisure floorspace is based upon the Council's evidence base, in particular the updated 'Retail and Leisure Study' completed in 2013. The Grafton Area renovation is a long-term project to invest in the area to ensure it meets the needs of a modern city centre providing a range of uses and activities. There are genuine concerns about the centre's appeal when the shops are closed. Additional leisure uses will broaden the area's attractiveness and remove the area's current reliance on retail activities to attract people. Additional retail and leisure activities will also increase local employment opportunities.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31990</b> Eden Baptist Church (Mr Tom Sparrow) [7097]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The first sentence omits community use despite Eden Chapel being correctly identified as such in Figure 9. We believe this is a valid and valuable ground floor use.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. A reference to the current community use of Eden Chapel will be added.

*Action*

Add sentence to paragraph 4.3.7 acknowledging the current community use of Eden Chapel. Figure 9 will also be amended to reflect the community use at Eden Chapel will be retained as part of any re-development of the immediate area.

## Paragraph 4.3.8

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
--------------------------	---------------	-------------------	------------------------

<b>32174</b> Universities Superannuation Scheme Limited (USS) Aberdeen Asset Management on behalf of Barclays Nominees (Aberdeen) [7115]	Object	Not Specified	None
--	--------	---------------	------

*Agent: Deloitte LLP (Mr John Adams) [7114]*

*Summary:*

We express our concerns in regard to the retail capacity identified within the SPD on page 17, first raised in 2013 following the publication of the Cambridge Retail and Leisure Study Update (2013). Following this update, the Local Plan adopted the highest growth scenario for retail development in the City Centre. We raised concerns at the time that this was ambitious in light of the changing face of retail which indicated that retailers were reviewing their real estate portfolios.

We recommend that an updated Retail and Leisure Study is commissioned to feed into the SPD to reflect not only the changes to the retail environment but also the wider discussions in Cambridge regarding housing numbers.

The SPD could be bolder in its support for the mix of uses provided helping to futureproof the Grafton Area for further retail changes.

---

### *Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. The Grafton Area is identified in the emerging Local Plan, under Policy 11 as a location for expansion and/or redevelopment for both retail and leisure use with residential and student accommodation on upper floors. The need for additional retail and leisure floorspace is based upon the Council's evidence base, in particular the updated 'Retail and Leisure Study' completed in 2013. The Grafton Area SPD is a long-term project to attract investment in the area to ensure it meets the needs of a modern city centre providing a range of uses and activities. Paragraphs 3.2.8 and 3.2.9 of the Grafton SPD outline the document's proposed approach in order to adapt to shifting dynamics in the retail economy over both the short and long-term. It should be noted that the area along Newmarket Road will be subject to significant change with the recently built hotels and proposed new offices and student accommodation. The Grafton Area provides an opportunity to complement these new developments as well as improving the link between Newmarket Road and the City Centre.**

### *Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

=====

## Paragraph 4.3.9

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
--------------------------	---------------	-------------------	------------------------

<b>32084</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Object	Not Specified	None
---	--------	---------------	------

*Summary:*

Use of scarce land for hotels in an area with low housing affordability seems very odd. There are new hotels on Newmarket Road and that seems a far more sensible place.

---

### *Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Both national and Local Plan policies support new hotels in town centre locations. Additional city-centre type uses will also broaden the area's attractiveness and remove the area's current reliance on retail activities to attract people. New hotel activities will also increase local employment opportunities.**

### *Action*

**No changes to the SPD.**

=====



<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31891</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

4.3.9 We note the reference to the demand for hotel uses and the identification of potential frontages for hotel uses in figures 35 and 36. It is not clear from these figures whether the location would affect the grade II listed 17 Fitzroy Street. We would note that any proposals (for a hotel or other uses) in this area will need to give careful consideration to the listed building and its setting.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Any re-refurbishment of the grade II listed building at 17 Fitzroy Street would first need to be granted the relevant planning / Listed Building consent before any alterations were made.**

*Action*

**No changes to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31967</b> Bev Nicolson [7088]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

4.3.9 - I am uneasy about more central hotels. What about some affordable flats instead?

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Both national and Local Plan policies support new hotels in town centre locations. Additional city-centre type uses will also broaden the area's attractiveness and remove the area's current reliance on retail activities to attract people. New hotel activities will also increase local employment opportunities.**

*Action*

**No changes to the SPD.**

**Paragraph 4.3.12**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31934</b> Jonathan Hefford [7077]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

SMALL SHOPS. Grafton Management seems not to like small units and squashed a number out of existence, though I suppose those twee faux market stalls inside provide some opportunities. I'd be happy to see more of the genuine stalls in the street. Will rent rises push out the smaller traders? The charity shops are popular and provide an excellent way of putting second hand goods back into circulation at affordable prices

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. The Grafton SPD recognises the benefits of small/independent shopping units complements the other much large retail units. However, for smaller/independent units to flourish, there needs to be sufficient footfall to support these shops which is often achieved by have large, 'anchor' stores which attract people to the area. There is clear recognition on behalf of the Grafton SPD to retain small/independent shops in and around the Grafton Area including market stalls.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32067</b> Frances Dewhurst [7090]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Shopping in Fitzroy St and Burleigh St needs to retain units that will be affordable for shops that serve local people, such as the vacuum cleaner shop. I would prefer to shop locally and on foot and would spend more in the area if there were more e.g. food shops. (Wilko has been a welcome addition to the area extending the range of goods available.)

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. The Grafton SPD recognises the benefits of small/independent shopping units complements the other much large retail units. However, for smaller/independent units to flourish, there needs to be sufficient footfall to support these shops which is often achieved by have large, 'anchor' stores which attract people to the area. There is clear recognition on behalf of the Grafton SPD to retain small/independent shops in and around the Grafton Area including market stalls.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

**Paragraph 4.3.14**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32176</b> Margaret Tait [7113]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Why not have a roof garden with a view and a good restaurant, there is a great shortage of good restaurants?

*Response*

Comments duly noted. At this stage of the planning process, we are only consulting on the masterplan for the Grafton Area. However, there is no reason why a roof garden with a view and a good restaurant could not be incorporated into future proposals for the Grafton Area. This would be subject to the submission of a planning application permission and the relevant planning consent being granted.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

**Paragraph 4.3.15**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31935</b> Jonathan Hefford [7077]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

HOUSING. Cambridge is desperate for affordable social housing, but will we get exclusive penthouses for Hong Kong purchasers?

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Beyond the remit of planning to restrict ownership of a private property on the open market. It is unlikely that penthouses would be the most appropriate type of dwelling for this area. Affordable housing will be sought in accordance with the applicable Local Plan Affordable Housing policy.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32114</b> Mrs H Van De Watering [7095]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Shops should have flats above. Developers should be obliged to have some proportion of 'affordable' i.e. council level rents.

**Response**

Comments duly noted. There is no policy requirement to require a proportion of retail units to be affordable (i.e. at a below market rate). Affordable housing will be sought in accordance with the applicable Local Plan Affordable Housing Policy.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

### Paragraph 4.3.16

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31985</b> Donald Fung [7089]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Furthermore the privacy of the annexes on Salmon lane will be removed as the proposed development will overlook them

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. Amenity issues are crucial considerations when considering the acceptability of new development proposals.

**Action**

Final sentence of paragraph 4.3.16 to be re-worded to read 'Housing adjacent to Salmon Lane will be domestic in scale to respond to the finer grain of the lane.'

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32108</b> Mr. John Lee [7100]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

I live in Maids Causeway and our house backs onto Salmon Lane, a narrow road serving the garages of the Maids Causeway houses.

I would become more supportive of the proposals if the residential development was sympathetic to the regency style of many of the houses and also if Salmon Lane was not used for access to such new properties. Salmon Lane should retain its current style and charm and not be widened to allow further vehicular access, so access to any new dwellings should be via the Grafton Centre not Salmon Lane.

The new development adjacent to Salmon Lane should not be greater than two storeys, as any higher development would overlook many of the gardens at the bottom of the lane and would also interfere with light.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of the existing built heritage such as the residential buildings on Salmon Lane.

**Action**

Final sentence of paragraph 4.3.16 to be re-worded to read 'Housing adjacent to Salmon Lane will be domestic in scale to respond to the finer grain of the lane.'

**Representation(s)**

**32187** Sheila Lawlor [7109]

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**Object Not Specified None**

*Summary:*

A potential increase in vehicle traffic accessing Salmon Lane. Salmon Lane cannot accommodate any more traffic. Residents of Maids Causeway use it for their vehicle access, because they have no on street access for cars on Maids Causeway. It is also busy because of deliveries and bin collection, and also for pedestrians and cyclists, both residents and those using it as a short cut for the Grafton Centre.

No further access to cars to Salmon Lane should be permitted. This means the approach for vehicles to any new dwellings should be via the Grafton Centre not Salmon Lane.

**Response**

**Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of the existing built heritage such as the residential buildings on Salmon Lane.**

**Action**

**Final sentence of paragraph 4.3.16 to be re-worded to read 'Housing adjacent to Salmon Lane will be domestic in scale to respond to the finer grain of the lane.'**

**Representation(s)**

**32168** Prof. Rob Miller [7116]

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**Object Not Specified None**

*Summary:*

The outline speaks of 2-3 storey houses being built. There are no 3 story buildings currently on Salmon lane. The current coach houses are low pitch two storey houses or single story with attic rooms. They are also currently of a low density. Any building on the Salmon lane should be keeping with height, scale and density of the rear coach houses currently on Salmon lane.  
 - The scale, height and density of any proposed new building on the Lane side of the Centre should be in keeping with the look and feel of current coach houses.

**Response**

**Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of the existing built heritage such as the residential buildings on Salmon Lane.**

**Action**

**Final sentence of paragraph 4.3.16 to be re-worded to read 'Housing adjacent to Salmon Lane will be domestic in scale to respond to the finer grain of the lane.'**

**Paragraph 4.3.17**

**Representation(s)**

**32085** Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**Object Not Specified None**

*Summary:*

Scarce land should be used for conventional residential dwellings rather than student housing. Student housing continues to fuel short-term language school building which does not represent a long-term asset to the city.

**Response**

**Comments and concerns duly noted. The Grafton Area is identified in the emerging Local Plan, under Policy 11 as a location for expansion and/or redevelopment for both retail and leisure use with residential and student accommodation on upper floors. Student housing supports a wide range of academic institutions not just language schools.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32001</b> Mr John Coyle [7098]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

The City is swamped with Student Accommodation. It is obvious that accommodation is required for the lower paid workers within the area where they will be employed. It is time the City Council insisted that all future Student Accommodation should pay Section 106 money for the 40% affordables that they are not providing.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. The Grafton Area is identified in the emerging Local Plan, under Policy 11 as a location for expansion and/or redevelopment for both retail and leisure use with residential and student accommodation on upper floors. Student housing supports a wide range of academic institutions not just language schools.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32064</b> Frances Dewhurst [7090]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Housing. We need more housing in Cambridge but "affordable" is not affordable for the lower paid. Social housing, not student or private housing would be a good idea, but no more parking, the area is heavily congested.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. Affordable housing will be sought in accordance with the applicable Local Plan Affordable Housing policy. New residential units will also need to ensure that vehicular movements are kept to a minimum. These could also be designed to be car-free developments. Given the site's central location, a car-free housing development could be a realistic option subject to approval by the County Highways Department.

**Action**

Update paragraph 4.2.24 to reflect current NPPF policy. Amend to reflect site's intention to maximise opportunities for residential developments either car-free or with minimal car parking.

**Paragraph 4.3.19**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32087</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

There is a need for youth and community provision in the area.

Now that the Howard Mallett Centre has been lost thanks to continual failures by City Council planning officers to condition use of the building correctly, need is ever-greater.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any new residential development in the Grafton Area will need to provide commensurate community facility provision. The type of provision provided will be determined during the Development Management process when determining the planning application for any new housing.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

Figure 38 Indicative building heights (also paragraph 4.4.8 - 4.4.15). Note - Overall heights should be inclusive of plant

**Paragraph Figure 38 Indicative building heights (also paragraph 4.4.8 - 4.4.15).**

**Note - Overall heights should be inclusive of plant**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32183</b> John Marenbon [7110]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I am writing to object to the part of the proposals which has two to three-storey dwellings fronting Salmon Lane. Such large buildings in such density will destroy the character of this laneway and be detrimental to that of the whole conservation area.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Any proposed developments will need to respond to their local context including any proposed building heights and the potential for over-shadow these may cause.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

**Paragraph 4.4.3**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32002</b> Mr John Coyle [7098]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

As the area is owned by many different people/businesses you have no control over replacement buildings. Your vision has little chance of happening.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. The SPD provides the basis for a co-ordinated framework to guide the development in the SPD area including an holistic approach to future access and movement within and around the area. Section 4.6 also details mechanisms for helping to deliver improvements.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

**Paragraph 4.4.7**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31892</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

4.4.7 We welcome the proposals for re-instatement of historic shopfronts. See our earlier comments on historic shopfronts.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. Suggested amendments will be made.**

*Action*

**Amend paragraph 4.4.7 to include reference to historic shopfronts.**

### Paragraph 4.4.9

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32139</b> Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mrs Debbie Baker) [5616]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The areas of Fitzroy Street, Burleigh Street and Grafton Area fall within the statutory 15.2m height and technical safeguarding consultation zones surrounding Cambridge Airport and also fall within the statutory birdstrike safeguarding consultation zones.  
 This office would need to be consulted on any development at this location exceeding the 15.2m height criterion and for any SUDs schemes or development including the creation of balancing ponds / green roofs as these types of development may have the potential to attract flocking bird species hazardous to air traffic safety.

I can confirm the MOD has no objection to proposals for future development within the Grafton Area, but would wish to be consulted upon any relevant planning applications in accordance with the procedures set out under Town and Country Planning (Safeguarding Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosive Storage Sites) Direction 2002.  
 Please note the above comments are purely related to the DIO Statutory Safeguarding interests.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

### Paragraph 4.4.11

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31679</b> Rachel Engler [5760]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I believe "the opportunity to allow additional height within the SPD area, subject to acceptable design and assessment" is too vague and subjective. Height should be limited to the court house height. Period. If restrictions aren't well articulated they can't be enforced. We end up with another CB1.

Modulation and variety to the roofscape and streetscape is a very good idea. Recent developments have tended to be identa-kit boxes.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. Paragraph 4.4.11 states that additional height may be allowed subject to 'acceptable design and assessment'.**

*Action*

**Add sentence to paragraph 4.4.11 which reads: Any proposal must be in line with Policy 60: Tall buildings and the Skyline in Cambridge that identifies the expected methodology for consideration of tall buildings.**

### Paragraph 4.4.13

#### Representation(s)

#### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
32188 Sheila Lawlor [7109]	Object	Not Specified	None

#### Summary:

Scale, Height and Density of Buildings. The outline speaks of 2-3 storey houses being built. Buildings of such a height, scale and density facing Salmon Lane will be inconsistent with its character and be detrimental to the setting and rear aspect of the Grade II listed terrace.

The scale and density of any proposed new building on the Lane side of the Centre should be in keeping with the look and feel of the rear terrace and in line with the one storey building recently approved for Willow Walk.

[https://idox.cambridge.gov.uk/online-applications/files/4E380D513A8EC0B6CFA17EA9B8662DA6/pdf/16\\_1942\\_FUL-REVISED\\_PROPOSED\\_WILLO\\_WALK\\_BUILDING-2078722.pdf](https://idox.cambridge.gov.uk/online-applications/files/4E380D513A8EC0B6CFA17EA9B8662DA6/pdf/16_1942_FUL-REVISED_PROPOSED_WILLO_WALK_BUILDING-2078722.pdf)

#### Response

Comments duly noted. Paragraph 4.4.11 states that additional height may be allowed subject to 'acceptable design and assessment'.

#### Action

Add sentence to paragraph 4.4.11 which reads: "Any proposal must be in line with Policy 60: Tall buildings and the Skyline in Cambridge that identifies the expected methodology for consideration of tall buildings."

#### Representation(s)

#### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
32159 Marion Bailey [7084]	Support	Not Specified	None

#### Summary:

Agree no.17 should dominate. That means surroundings must be lower.

#### Response

Comments duly noted.

#### Action

No change to the SPD.

### Paragraph 4.4.14

#### Representation(s)

#### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

Representation(s)	Nature	Appearance	Soundness Tests
32160 Marion Bailey [7084]	Object	Not Specified	None

#### Summary:

Respect to low buildings. Don't smother them by 5-6 stories nearby.

#### Response

Comments duly noted. Paragraph 4.4.14 says that buildings 'could step up to 5 or 6 storeys'. Given the breaks between the opportunity sites it is likely that scale transition will mean building heights rise in steadily rather than abruptly to the height limits indicated in the coloured zone identified in Figure 38.

#### Action

No change to the SPD.



<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31968</b> Bev Nicolson [7088]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

4.4.14 - Let us hold to this. When you say exceptional, let us mean exceptional, not a 5 storey building that could be anywhere in the country. Maybe they could echo no 17?

**Response**

Comments duly noted. Local Plan Policy 11, which covers the whole of the Grafton SPD area sets out that development in the area should be of a high quality.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

**Paragraph 4.4.17**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32161</b> Marion Bailey [7084]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Tall blocks make the nearby conservation area feel disrespected, absurd, and in time (as can be seen by the language used to describe hoe much bigger Grafton and how courts are) will lead to increased heights becoming the norm - I see its suggested 'up to 6 or 6 storeys". This is disproportionate - even 4 storeys should be exceptional. The illustration F.39 is bland and detracts from the beauty of no.17 which gives me pleasure everytime I look upwards. Flat squares do not draw the eye to the beauty!

**Response**

Comments duly noted. Figure 39 is purely indicative and illustrative and therefore only intended to show how the public realm changes could be implemented to demonstrate the overall streetscape. These do not represent the final design of any new / refurbished buildings.

**Action**

Delete Figure 39.

**Paragraph 4.4.19**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31893</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

4.4.19 The heritage statement should 'accompany' the planning application, rather than 'support'. It should be an objective assessment of significance and impact. We also suggest the addition of the words, 'and significance of heritage assets' to the end of the paragraph.

**Response**

Comment duly noted. The following words will be added to the paragraph: 'and significance of heritage assets'.

**Action**

Add the following words to paragraph 4.4.19: 'and significance of heritage assets'.

## Paragraph 4.4.21

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**31894** Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]      **Object**      **Not Specified**      **None**

#### Summary:

4.4.21 Please add reference to the grade II\* listing on Newmarket Road. Please also add the word heritage before assets.

### Response

**Comment duly noted. The word 'heritage' will be added before the word 'asset' and a reference to both Grade II and Grade II\* Listed buildings.**

### Action

**Add the word 'heritage' before the word 'asset' and a reference to both Grade II and Grade II\* Listed buildings in paragraph 4.4.21.**

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**32189** Sheila Lawlor [7109]      **Object**      **Not Specified**      **None**

#### Summary:

Salmon Lane is at the rear of a Regency terrace, mostly grade-two listed, with original sash windows, slate grooves and bricks seen through gardens and low garden walls. Any new development on the Salmon Lane side of the Grafton Centre, should not only be kept to one storey, but it should be built in the same style as the Maids Causeway terrace, following the precedent recently set by John Simpson's renovation of the University Arms Hotel.

The architecture of any new dwellings should fit the Regency style of Maids Causeway and the Kite area.

### Response

**Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of the existing built heritage such as the residential buildings on Salmon Lane.**

### Action

**Final sentence of paragraph 4.3.16 to be re-worded to read 'Housing adjacent to Salmon Lane will be domestic in scale to respond to the finer grain of the lane.'**

### Representation(s)

### Nature Appearance Soundness Tests

**32169** Prof. Rob Miller [7116]      **Object**      **Not Specified**      **None**

#### Summary:

The houses and coach houses between Maids Causeway and Salmon Lane are of a regency style of the 1820s. Any new building on Salmon lane must be of a similar style. This would follow the recent precedent set by the excellent improvements to the University Arms Hotel by the Architect John Simpson.  
- The architecture of any new dwellings should fit the Regency style of Maids Causeway, Salmon Lane and the wider Kite area.

### Response

**Comments and concerns duly noted. New development will need to take account of the existing built heritage such as the residential buildings on Maids Causeway and Salmon Lane.**

### Action

**Final sentence of paragraph 4.3.16 to be re-worded to read 'Housing adjacent to Salmon Lane will be domestic in scale to respond to the finer grain of the lane.'**

Figure 39 Artist impression of Fitzroy Street including illustrative proposals for streetscape and public realm.

**Paragraph Figure 39 Artist impression of Fitzroy Street including illustrative proposals for streetscape and public realm.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32134</b> Dr Angus Gowland [7106]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

My family has been resident in 5 Fitzroy Lane for the past seventeen years. In the artist impression of Fitzroy St, we are deeply shocked to see that our home has been replaced by a different building, presumably indicating an intention to demolish our home and replace it with something else. The building that we occupy is not one of the several eyesores on the street - in fact it is architecturally quite pleasing and very well-maintained. There is no demonstrable 'public interest' in demolishing a set of family homes here and replacing

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Figure 39 is purely indicative and illustrative and therefore only intended to show how the public realm changes could be implemented to demonstrate the overall streetscape. These do not represent the final design of any new / refurbished roads or buildings including No.5 Fitzroy Street. Any proposals for re-development would need to take account of the existing use and other considerations such as architectural aesthetic merit which enhance the area's appeal.**

*Action*

Delete Figure 39.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32077</b> Steven Graham [7101]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I would like to express my concerns that there is very little mention of the market stalls currently in residence on Fitzroy Street. I note that the before and after picture of Fitzroy Street is taken where my stall sits but is missing from both the photograph and the artists impression. Can you please confirm that this is an oversight?

I have been trading on Fitzroy Street since 1992 as Grahams Fruiterers and as we have not been consulted during the planning process, I would like to be reassured that the proposed plans including the cycle way and taxi access will not impact on my stall and daily trading from these pitches.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Figure 39 is purely indicative and illustrative and therefore only intended to show how the public realm changes could be implemented to demonstrate the overall streetscape. These do not represent the final design of any new / refurbished roads or buildings. Section 4.5.3 explains how future use of Fitzroy Street should accommodate other functions such as al-fresco eating and occasional market stalls.**

*Action*

Delete Figure 39.

Figure 39 Artist impression of Fitzroy Street including illustrative proposals for streetscape and public realm.

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31927</b>	Jonathan Hefford [7077]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The artist's impression on p.66 should give an Awful Warning of lowest denominator boxes by a developer who knows the Council cannot afford an Appeal.  
 STREET SCENES. Gone are the cycle racks, market stalls, cafe seating. A developer's sterile street scene. Not much life and bustle here.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Figure 39 is purely indicative and illustrative and therefore only intended to show how the public realm changes could be implemented to demonstrate the overall streetscape. These do not represent the final design of any new / refurbished roads or buildings.

*Action*

Delete Figure 39.

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31899</b>	Tam Parry [7076]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

It looks to me that the road is for cycling in the middle of Fitzroy street. It should be paved for pedestrian use with only a 2m wide strip for cyclists to use. This should be clearly marked for cyclists. Cyclists are a menace at the moment to pedestrians and should be given some but not 5 m worth of space. The out of hours deliveries can use the areas paved for pedestrians.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Figure 39 is purely indicative and illustrative and therefore only intended to show how the public realm changes could be implemented to demonstrate the overall streetscape. These do not represent the final design of any new / refurbished roads or buildings.

*Action*

Delete Figure 39.

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32088</b>	Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Strongly support provision of a cycle route here. This is long overdue.

*Response*

Comments duly noted.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

### Paragraph 4.4.22

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32170</b> Prof. Rob Miller [7116]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

It is important that Salmon Lane is not narrows and that the grass and tree strip on the Grafton side of Salmon Lane is maintained and enhanced.  
 - The new dwellings should be set behind the current trees, grass strip and wall.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. These details will be addressed during the Development Management process for any planning application that alters the existing land uses. It should be noted that new development proposals will need to comply with the Local Plan, in particular any proposal will need to respond to its local context and the issues raised about the trees and retention of grass strips will need to be addressed.**

*Action*

**Final sentence of paragraph 4.3.16 to be re-worded to read 'Housing adjacent to Salmon Lane will be domestic in scale to respond to the finer grain of the lane.'**

### Paragraph 4.4.23

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31895</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

4.4.23 The final clause of the last sentence as currently drafted does not make sense. Please re-word.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. The final sentence has been re-worded.**

*Action*

**Re-word final sentence of paragraph 4.4.23.**

### Paragraph 4.4.24

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31922</b> Jonathan Hefford [7077]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

CYCLING. The route behind the north side of Fitzroy Street shops and beyond is muddled. Conversely, on Fitzroy and Burleigh Streets I'd advise against making them too clear, since cyclists will speed up and pedestrians wander into them without thinking. Remove the time restrictions but make cyclists pick their way through

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. The principle of exploring cycle routes and pedestrian connectivity through Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street as well as other entrances to the Grafton Centre is supported by both the Local and County Councils. Consideration will be needed to ensure cycle speeds remain low where cycling is allowed to prevent conflicts with pedestrian and associated safety implications.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32003</b> Mr John Coyle [7098]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I object to any cycling along Fitzroy Street. Make these superfit humans walk like the rest of us.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. Both the Local and County Council support the approach of a shared user movement corridor between pedestrians and cyclists along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32179</b> Russell Whitehead [7111]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

A current problem with Fitzroy Street is that there is insufficient signage to use the intended cycle routes through the area and so too many irresponsible cyclists cycle along Fitzroy and Burleigh Streets, often with risk to pedestrians. There is little evidence of attempts to police this.

The solution is NOT to turn both pedestrian areas into streets for cycles. Even in the simulated artwork, one can see a child in proximity to a cyclist.

Where would all the existing things in the streets go? (Café seating, public seating, cycle parking, street trading etc) There isn't much space as it is.

There is no reason why this pedestrian area should be given over to cyclists.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Section 4 of the SPD identifies frameworks for informing new development in the area including the movement and access network. The intention is to significantly improve the quality of cycle infrastructure within the SPD area. The principle of exploring cycle routes and pedestrian connectivity through Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street as well as other entrances to the Grafton Centre is supported by both the Local and County Councils. However it is crucial that cycle speeds remain low to prevent conflicts with pedestrians and the shopping function of the streets. Details regarding café seating, public seating, cycle parking and street trading will needed to be addressed as public realm schemes are developed for the main shopping streets.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32162</b> Marion Bailey [7084]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Taxi movement is an issue and 'after hours' access would encourage vehicular access.

*Response*

The County Highways Dept is not supportive of introducing vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. The reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street will be removed. The SPD needs to articulate the arrangement for taxis mindful that the area's currently closed to vehicles will remain as such. This could be part of a servicing strategy for the Grafton Area.

*Action*

- (1) Amend paragraphs 4.2.10, 4.4.24, 4.4.28 8th bulletpoint and 4.5.4 - remove reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street.
- (2) Amend 1st sentence of 4.2.18 to read "Proposals involving servicing (and those including taxi access) will be subject to a clear servicing strategy and assessment." Add sentence at end of paragraph "Taxi movements will not be allowed on Fitzroy/Burleigh and the expectation is that taxi arrangements will be proposed in that context."

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31969</b> Bev Nicolson [7088]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

4.4.24. - I strongly object to the space being used by pedestrians, bikes with taxis and servicing vehicles. This is not a recipe for a pleasant, attractive boulevard, but a stressful, noisy, mall. There would also be damage to any surfacing used.  
Yes to 24/7 use by bikes.

*Response*

The County Highways Dept is not supportive of introducing vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. The reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street will be removed. The SPD needs to articulate the arrangement for taxis mindful that the area's currently closed to vehicles will remain as such. This could be part of a servicing strategy for the Grafton Area.

*Action*

- (1) Amend paragraphs 4.2.10, 4.4.24, 4.4.28 8th bulletpoint and 4.5.4 - remove reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street.
- (2) Amend 1st sentence of 4.2.18 to read "Proposals involving servicing (and those including taxi access) will be subject to a clear servicing strategy and assessment." Add sentence at end of paragraph "Taxi movements will not be allowed on Fitzroy/Burleigh and the expectation is that taxi arrangements will be proposed in that context."

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32184</b> John Marenbon [7110]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Moreover, unless all vehicular access is from the other side, there will be impossible congestion in Salmon Lane and danger to the pedestrians and cyclists who use it. More dwellings in the area will also increase the number of cars, which already congest the city centre. The best solution would be to put the car park underground and replace it with a green space. Less good, but tolerable, would be one-storey dwellings designed to blend into the architectural environment.

*Response*

**The County Highways Dept is not supportive of introducing vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. The reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street will be removed. The SPD needs to articulate the arrangement for taxis mindful that the area's currently closed to vehicles will remain as such. This could be part of a servicing strategy for the Grafton Area.**

*Action*

- (1) Amend paragraphs 4.2.10, 4.4.24, 4.4.28 8th bulletpoint and 4.5.4 - remove reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street.
- (2) Amend 1st sentence of 4.2.18 to read "Proposals involving servicing (and those including taxi access) will be subject to a clear servicing strategy and assessment." Add sentence at end of paragraph "Taxi movements will not be allowed on Fitzroy/Burleigh and the expectation is that taxi arrangements will be proposed in that context."

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32167</b> Prof. Rob Miller [7116]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Salmon Lane cannot accommodate more traffic access. The entrance by the Hopbine Pub is already busy with cars, delivery vans and bin lorries and residents already often have to queue in the morning to get onto fair street. The houses between Maids Causeway and Salmon lane have no front access for cars and so Salmon Lane is their only access.  
 - No further access to cars to Salmon Lane should be permitted. This means the approach for vehicles to any new dwellings should be via the Grafton Centre not Salmon Lane.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Amend to reflect site's intention to maximise opportunities for car-free residential developments.**

*Action*

**Update paragraph 4.2.24 to reflect current NPPF policy. Amend to reflect site's intention to maximise opportunities for residential developments either car-free or with minimal car parking.**



<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31896</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

4.4.24 We welcome the key interventions. Reference should be made in the fourth bullet point regarding the need to preserve the listed building and its setting.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. Section 1.4.2 of the SPD has been updated to reflect the proposed amendments to Policy 11: Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area of Major Change in the emerging Cambridge Local Plan. These amendments include additional text to criterion (b) which now reads as : "be sensitive to surrounding residential areas and the character and setting of the historic core and heritage assets;".

The fourth bulletpoint in paragraph 4.4.24 will be replaced to read:

- Some potential redevelopment along parts of Fitzroy Street.
- Retention of No. 17 Fitzroy Street."

*Action*

Section 1.4.2 of the SPD will be updated to reflect the proposed amendments to Policy 11 which covers the area of the SPD. Paragraph 4.4.24 will be amended to clarify No. 17 Fitzroy Street will be retained.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32131</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

We support the principle of finding a way to have a safe and inclusive cycle route on Fitzroy and Burleigh Streets. We are puzzled why this is referred to as a 'contraflow cycle lane' because that presumes a certain type of infrastructure. We believe it would be best if this was left as 'Provision for a bidirectional cycle route on Fitzroy Street throughout the day'.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. The reference to a 'contraflow cycle lane' will be re-worded to reflect the fact that the detail of how the cycling will be best achieved has yet to be decided.

*Action*

All referencing of a 'contraflow cycle-lane' in the SPD will be removed. The following bullet point will be added in 4.4.24: "Provision for a shared surface for both cyclists and pedestrians designed to ensure safety for all surface users is also key."

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32037</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I support the principle of finding a way to have a safe cycle route on Fitzroy and Burleigh Streets. I am somewhat puzzled why this is referred to as a 'contraflow cycle lane' because that presumes a certain type of infrastructure. I think it would be best if this was left as 'Provision for a bidirectional cycle route on Fitzroy Street throughout the day'.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. The reference to a 'contraflow cycle lane' will be re-worded to reflect the fact that the detail of how the cycling will be best achieved has yet to be decided.

*Action*

All referencing of a 'contraflow cycle-lane' in the SPD will be removed. The following bullet point will be added in 4.4.24: "Provision for a shared surface for both cyclists and pedestrians designed to ensure safety for all surface users is also key."

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31908</b> Mr Nicholas Flynn [7072]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I support the proposal for 24/7 two way cycling along Fitzroy Street.

*Response*

Comments duly noted.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

**Paragraph Figure 41 Artist impression of East Road - illustrative only**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32089</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

This crossing was redesigned only 10 years ago, and remains problematic.

The diagram fails to show cyclists using the toucan (i.e. pedestrian AND cycle) crossing, and as such is misleading. Cycling needs to be designed in - Norfolk Street / Burleigh Street is a heavily-used desire line.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. Figure 41 is purely indicative and illustrative and therefore only intended to show how the public realm changes could be implemented to demonstrate the overall streetscape. These do not represent the final design of any new / refurbished roads or buildings. Figure 41 is purely indicative and does not reflect any final proposed road crossing along East Road.

*Action*

Amend Figures 41 to highlight it is only indicative and illustrative.

**Paragraph 4.4.25**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32132</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

East Road most certainly could look a lot better. Especially with a protected cycleway having trees and verges between motor traffic and people.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be consistent with wider Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) proposals and County Transport Teams engaged on the detail. The Greater Cambridge Partnership's Access Study will also be a key influence on the future of a new bus terminal. There will be a need to agree any changes with the public transport operators, County Transport Team and GCP's Access Team.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

**Representation(s)**

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**32068** Frances Dewhurst [7090] Support Not Specified None

*Summary:*

East Rd. This is a fairly horrible street and the shops/restaurants seem to be marooned. The pavement is too narrow to encourage lingering, and the buildings lack any kind of coherence. So yes, to ideas about how this could be made more attractive.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be consistent with wider Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) proposals and County Transport Teams engaged on the detail. The Greater Cambridge Partnership's Access Study will also be a key influence on the future of a new bus terminal. There will be a need to agree any changes with the public transport operators, County Transport Team and GCP's Access Team.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

**Paragraph 4.4.26**

**Representation(s)**

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**32090** Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211] Object Not Specified None

*Summary:*

Proper, segregated cycle route needed along East Road.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be consistent with wider Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) proposals and County Transport Teams engaged on the detail. The Greater Cambridge Partnership's Access Study will also be a key influence on the future of a new bus terminal. There will be a need to agree any changes with the public transport operators, County Transport Team and GCP's Access Team.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

**Representation(s)**

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**31970** Bev Nicolson [7088] Object Not Specified None

*Summary:*

4.4.26 - Reduce carriageway for motor traffic and add a cycle route for the whole length. Improve Norfolk St end with a clearer cycling and walking routes to follow. This plan must integrate with the Eastern Gate SPD. It must be a goal that it does, not a vague desire. There is no point in having a piecemeal approach to the area.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be consistent with wider Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) proposals and County Transport Teams engaged on the detail. The Greater Cambridge Partnership's Access Study will also be a key influence on the future of a new bus terminal. There will be a need to agree any changes with the public transport operators, County Transport Team and GCP's Access Team.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32106</b> Corsten Douglas [7102]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The proposal to restrict East road to single lane traffic or presumably interrupt traffic by bus stops or traffic calming represents extremely backward thinking. This will lead to greater pollution. Restricting East road will cause larger bottlenecks, more aggravation to local residents and discourage people from either visiting or even living in Cambridge. Many people, particularly commuters and the disabled cannot simply be forced onto bicycles or public transport. Don't punish car users. From a cyclist's perspective, converting road lanes into dedicated cycle lanes is not safer than previously.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be consistent with wider Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) proposals and County Transport Teams engaged on the detail. The Greater Cambridge Partnership's Access Study will also be a key influence on the future of a new bus terminal. There will be a need to agree any changes with the public transport operators, County Transport Team and GCP's Access Team.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32180</b> Russell Whitehead [7111]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Reducing parking spaces in conjunction with turning East Road into a sort of bus station will cause a significant increase in congestion (and pollution). As it is, several streets in the Kite area are treated as free car parks by non-residents and this problem would worsen. The obstructed traffic caused will of course include taxis used by non-car-owners, tradespeople such as emergency plumbers and those maintaining homes and businesses, doctors and carers on visits, and delivery vehicles of all sorts. For these categories of user, switching to bicycle, bus or foot is generally not a viable solution.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be consistent with wider Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) proposals and County Transport Teams engaged on the detail. The Greater Cambridge Partnership's Access Study will also be a key influence on the future of a new bus terminal. There will be a need to agree any changes with the public transport operators, County Transport Team and GCP's Access Team.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32133</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

We object only because we would like to see another key principle added, which is to support safe and inclusive cycling with protected facilities for cycling separate from motor traffic and separate from footways, using modern Dutch-style standards.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be consistent with wider Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) proposals and County Transport Teams engaged on the detail. The Greater Cambridge Partnership's Access Study will also be a key influence on the future of a new bus terminal. There will be a need to agree any changes with the public transport operators, County Transport Team and GCP's Access Team.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31900</b> Tam Parry [7076]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I agree to this. Reduce the highway space as much as possible.

*Response*

Comments duly noted.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32016</b> Mx Valerie Cornish [7099]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

East Road is currently very unattractive. The key element of the proposed changes will be good architectural designs that lift the area , not merely be service providers.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Local Plan Policy 11, which covers the whole of the Grafton SPD area sets out that development in the area should be of a high quality.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

Figure 42 Artist impression of Burleigh Street - illustrative only

## Paragraph Figure 42 Artist impression of Burleigh Street - illustrative only

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31971</b>	Bev Nicolson [7088]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Fig 42. Shows limited space for pedestrians, trees removed, bike racks gone, seating gone. It looks a lot like shared space and I strongly object to that.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Figure 42 is purely indicative and illustrative and therefore only intended to show how the public realm changes could be implemented to demonstrate the overall streetscape. These do not represent the final design of any new / refurbished roads or buildings. Both the Local and County Council do, however support a shared user movement corridor along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street between pedestrians and cyclists. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy.

*Action*

Amend Figure 42 to reflect public realm changes and highlight the image is only indicative and illustrative.

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31901</b>	Tam Parry [7076]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

It looks to me that a wide area in the middle of the street could be used for cycling. Cyclists should be given a 2m wide strip in the middle of the road no more. This should be clearly marked. Cyclists are a menace to pedestrians at the moment and do not give them 5m of space as poor pedestrians will have no chance.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Figure 42 is purely indicative and illustrative and therefore only intended to show how the public realm changes could be implemented to demonstrate the overall streetscape. These do not represent the final design of any new / refurbished roads or buildings.

*Action*

Amend Figure 42 to reflect public realm changes and highlight the image is only indicative and illustrative.

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32091</b>	Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Agree strongly with need for cycle route.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. Figure 42 is purely indicative and illustrative and therefore only intended to show how the public realm changes could be implemented to demonstrate the overall streetscape. These do not represent the final design of any new / refurbished roads or buildings.

*Action*

Amend Figure 42 to reflect public realm changes and highlight the image is only indicative and illustrative.

**Paragraph 4.4.27**

**Representation(s)**

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**31926 Jonathan Hefford [7077] Object Not Specified None**

*Summary:*

BUILDING DESIGN. The document has some encouraging things to say, but do you really think the Primark building is an improvement on its grand, confident, quirky predecessor, whose facade we worked so hard to try and keep? (Developer pressure won the day). Buildings put up before this in Fitzroy and Burleigh Streets at the time of Grafton One had a reasonable shot at using sympathetic materials, facades and scale.

**Response**

**Comments duly noted.**

**Action**

**Third sentence of paragraph 2.5.5 to be amended to read: 'A number of recent retail buildings have helped to raise the quality of retail space and offer on both Burleigh Street and Fitzroy Street.'**

**Representation(s)**

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**31982 Mrs Valarie Mahy [7093] Object Not Specified None**

*Summary:*

- Access to Paradise Street should only be used for residential uses and not for either deliveries accessing shops along Fitzroy Street/Burleigh Street or for construction purposes.
- Current and future servicing of any new or existing retail uses should avoid residential streets, e.g. Paradise Street. The streets are often blocked by retail service vehicles and construction vehicles having to turnaround to leave the area. These activities block access for local people and create a considerable amount of noise throughout both the day and night.
- Please remove the bollards along City Rd to allow service vehicles access to the shops along Fitzroy Street/Burleigh Street to avoid them having to use Paradise Street and other local roads.

**Response**

**Comments and concerns duly noted. As part of any re-configuration of uses, satisfactory servicing of new and existing uses will need to be agreed. In some cases, improved surface access avoiding Burleigh Street or underground servicing may remove the need for existing service areas. New development will need to take account of adequate servicing provision to ensure access is satisfactorily designed for both new and existing deliveries. These movements should avoid residential streets including Paradise Street. This is necessary to prevent existing conflict between the services of existing retail units via residential streets. The servicing strategy should be developed with the County Highways Dept. and other Transport Teams where appropriate. Part of this representation is an enforcement matter and has been forwarded onto the Council's Enforcement Team to investigate.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31949</b> Mrs Hannah Lea [7083]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Cambridge is revered for it's beautiful HISTORIC architecture and it's period homes command premium prices. This surely demonstrates the value we place on historical architectural detail. It seems short sighted and faddish to continue to build structures that resemble post apocalyptic bunkers (CB1, Ninewells, Abode) particularly in such a historically sensitive and high profile setting.

Whilst I support the concept of the proposed illustration. They seem to be replacing one incongruous eyesore with another. Please can the frontages of new buildings echo more of the historic architectural style that provides the character and charm that post war building has obliterated!!

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. Figure 42 is purely indicative and illustrative and therefore only intended to show how the public realm changes could be implemented to demonstrate the overall streetscape. These do not represent the final design of any new / refurbished buildings.**

*Action*

**Delete Figure 39. Amend Figures 41 and 42 to highlight they are only indicative and illustrative. Amend Figure 42 with new surface treatments and description to read: Artist impression of Burleigh Street including illustrative improvements to the public realm and streetscape.**

**Paragraph 4.4.28**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31897</b> Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

4.4.28 We broadly welcome the key elements set out in this paragraph. We suggest the addition of a reference to historic shopfronts in bullet point 2.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. Suggested amendments will be made.**

*Action*

**Amend 2nd bullet point of paragraph 4.4.28 to include reference to 'historic shopfronts'.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31972</b> Bev Nicolson [7088]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

4.4.28. - Jargon. (See first point. to paragraph 2.7.2) Contraflow bike lane, yes. Servicing too? No, no, no.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. As part of any re-configuration of uses, satisfactory servicing of new and existing uses will need to be agreed. In some cases, improved surface access avoiding Burleigh Street or underground servicing may remove the need for existing service areas. The reference to a 'contraflow cycle lane' will be re-worded to reflect the fact that the detail of how the cycling will be best achieved has yet to be decided.**

*Action*

**All referencing of a 'contraflow cycle-lane' in the SPD will be removed. The following bullet point will be added in 4.4.24: "Provision for a shared surface for both cyclists and pedestrians designed to ensure safety for all surface users is also key."**



<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32004</b> Mr John Coyle [7098]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

I object to any vehicle movement in Burleigh Street and Fitzroy Street.  
The remaining section of Burleigh Street needs a ban on vehicles to make it more pedestrian friendly and an inviting entrance.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. The County Highways Dept is not supportive of introducing vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. The reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street will be removed.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32017</b> Mx Valerie Cornish [7099]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Enhancing Burleigh Street and helping to make it a more attractive, vibrant space is welcome.  
A cycling contraflow is a great mistake. It is currently, and will continue to be dangerous for pedestrians. The artists impression is not realistic and is hazardous. People are reluctant to use spaces with small children with cyclists. Many cyclists use their cycling as part of their fitness regimes and are inconsiderate in shared spaces. There needs to be a separate cycle route to cross the Grafton Centre.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. The principle of exploring cycle routes and pedestrian connectivity through Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street as well as other entrances to the Grafton Centre is supported by both the Local and County Councils. Consideration will be needed to ensure cycle speeds remain low where cycling is allowed to prevent conflicts with pedestrian and associated safety implications

**Action**

All referencing of a 'contraflow cycle-lane' in the SPD will be removed. The following bullet point will be added in 4.4.24: "Provision for a shared surface for both cyclists and pedestrians designed to ensure safety for all surface users is also key."

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32135</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

We support the principle of finding a way to have a safe and inclusive cycle route on Fitzroy and Burleigh Streets. We are puzzled why this is referred to as a 'contraflow cycle lane' because that presumes a certain type of infrastructure. We believe it would be best if this was left as 'Provision for a bidirectional cycle route on Fitzroy Street throughout the day'.

**Response**

Comments duly noted. The reference to a 'contraflow cycle lane' will be re-worded to reflect the fact that the detail of how the cycling will be best achieved has yet to be decided.

**Action**

All referencing of a 'contraflow cycle-lane' in the SPD will be removed. The following bullet point will be added in 4.4.24: "Provision for a shared surface for both cyclists and pedestrians designed to ensure safety for all surface users is also key."

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31909</b> Mr Nicholas Flynn [7072]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I support the proposal to allow two way cycling along Burleigh street at all times.

*Response*

Comments duly noted.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

**Paragraph 4.5.2**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32005</b> Mr John Coyle [7098]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The clutter is mainly cycle racks. Getting rid of these will improve the environment for Pedestrians. Café/Restaurants could be licenced in the Evening to have seating areas outside their frontages.

*Response*

Comments duly noted.

*Action*

No changes to the SPD.

**Paragraph 4.5.3**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32214</b> Cambridgeshire County Council - Transport Assessment Team (Mr David Allatt) [7162]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

How do you have both footways and shared surfaces? A scheme can either be shared surface/space or segregated, not both. Provision of segregation in what is now a pedestrianised is not seen as beneficial. Identification of a segregated vehicular route will be interpreted as priority space reserved for their use.

*Response*

Comments duly noted. This will be re-phrased to avoid confusion.

*Action*

Comments duly noted. Amend paragraph 4.5.3: removing the reference to "defined footways" and the description of pavements; and amending the use of shared spaces to include other functions such as outdoor eating and market stalls. Paragraph 4.5.3 will read: "Subject to further assessment, proposals should demonstrate an integrated approach to cyclist and pedestrian movements including the creation of shared surfaces. The new carriageways could have the character of a shared surface, enabling informal negotiation between users including pedestrians and cyclists as well as supporting other functions such as al-fresco eating and occasional market stalls."

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32164</b> Marion Bailey [7084]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Add an extra chair to each of those tables and there is little space for pedestrians. And cyclist will be weaving between pushchairs. Please be realistic. Add mobility scooter. Older people with shopping bags on wheels. The vision is unrealistic. Re-route cyclists. Restrict café fronts. Give priority to pedestrians.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. The principle of exploring cycle routes and pedestrian connectivity through Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street as well as other entrances to the Grafton Centre is supported by both the Local and County Councils. Consideration will be needed to ensure cycle speeds remain low where cycling is allowed to prevent conflicts with pedestrian and associated safety implications.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31973</b> Bev Nicolson [7088]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

4.5.3 - Either this is to be a 'c' road, or it is a pedestrianised shopping centre. It can't be both.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. The principle of exploring cycle routes and pedestrian connectivity through Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street as well as other entrances to the Grafton Centre is supported by both the Local and County Councils. Consideration will be needed to ensure cycle speeds remain low where cycling is allowed to prevent conflicts with pedestrian and associated safety implications. The County Highways Dept. is not supportive of introducing vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. The reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street will be removed.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32136</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

We would support a careful approach to designing a safe and inclusive cycle route for Fitzroy and Burleigh Streets, with clearly defined area for cycling that is separate from dedicated footways. The design must be legible for partially sighted persons and accessible for people using mobility aids.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. The principle of exploring cycle routes and pedestrian connectivity through Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street as well as other entrances to the Grafton Centre is supported by both the Local and County Councils. Consideration will be needed to ensure cycle speeds remain low where cycling is allowed to prevent conflicts with pedestrian and associated safety implications.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32092</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Strongly support principle of a cycle route through here.

However, needs to have clearer demarcation than "shared space". The design in the city centre area shows how this could be done.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. The principle of exploring cycle routes and pedestrian connectivity through Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street as well as other entrances to the Grafton Centre is supported by both the Local and County Councils. Consideration will be needed to ensure cycle speeds remain low where cycling is allowed to prevent conflicts with pedestrian and associated safety implications.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32038</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

I would support a careful approach to designing a cycle route for Fitzroy and Burleigh Streets, with clearly defined area for cycling that is separate from dedicated footways. The design must be legible for partially sighted persons and accessible for people using mobility aids.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. The principle of exploring cycle routes and pedestrian connectivity through Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street as well as other entrances to the Grafton Centre is supported by both the Local and County Councils. Consideration will be needed to ensure cycle speeds remain low where cycling is allowed to prevent conflicts with pedestrian and associated safety implications.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31923</b> Jonathan Hefford [7077]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

WALKING. The nest of roads around Grafton East car park entrance is a pedestrians' nightmare. The entrance to the West car park and service area simply punches its way through the pavement on Maids' Causeway. Let us at least install surfaces to suggest to motorists that these are routes for pedestrians too.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. The principle of exploring and improving cycle routes and pedestrian connectivity to and around the Grafton Centre is supported by both the Local and County Councils. Consideration will be needed to ensure cycle speeds remain low where cycling is allowed to prevent conflicts with pedestrian and associated safety implications.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

## Paragraph 4.5.4

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32215</b> Cambridgeshire County Council - Transport Assessment Team (Mr David Allatt) [7162]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

(1) The reinstatement of carriageway for use by motorised vehicles is not supported by the County Council. The County Council are not supportive of the introduction of taxis on Fitzroy Street and Burleigh Street. In summary for Taxi movements,  
 \* The County Council are not supportive of taxis on a through route between Fitzroy Street and East Road, this would result in rat running and safety concerns for pedestrians and cyclists.  
 \* Given the above, consideration should be given to a more appropriate location for taxi pick up and drop off - but taxis should not be allowed in any areas that are currently pedestrianised.  
 (2) The Highway Authority does not support this approach, this is not regarded as a desirable aspiration, but a retrograde step. Modification of the Traffic Regulation Order governing the streets concerned is a process outside the planning process and so may not be deliverable.

*Response*

**(1) The County Highways Dept is not supportive of introducing vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. The reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street will be removed. The SPD needs to articulate the arrangement for taxis mindful that the area's currently closed to vehicles will remain as such. This could be part of a servicing strategy for the Grafton Area.**  
**(2) The County Highways Dept is not supportive of introducing vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. The reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street will be removed.**

*Action*

**(1) Amend paragraphs 4.2.10, 4.4.24, 4.4.28 8th bullet point and 4.5.4 - remove reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street. Amend 1st sentence of 4.2.18 to read "Proposals involving servicing (and those including taxi access) will be subject to a clear servicing strategy and assessment." Add sentence at end of paragraph "Taxi movements will not be allowed on Fitzroy/Burleigh and the expectation is that taxi arrangements will be proposed in that context."  
 (2) Add sentence to 4.2.18 explaining that the modification of the Traffic Regulation Order governing the streets concerned is a process outside the planning process and may not be deliverable.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32137</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

We are concerned about the safety hazards of adding even more motor vehicles to these streets.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. The County Highways Dept is not supportive of introducing vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. The reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street will be removed.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32039</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

This is a ridiculous idea. Currently it's thought far too dangerous to allow cyclists (who generally get more hurt if they collide with a pedestrian as they have further to fall) to cycle along these streets between 10am and 4pm. There should be fewer motor vehicles on these streets and more use made of the service yards.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. The County Highways Dept is not supportive of introducing vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. The reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street will be removed.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31910</b> Mr Nicholas Flynn [7072]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Increasing vehicle use would go against the attractive environment and setting which this planning document seeks to achieve.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. The County Highways Dept is not supportive of introducing vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Streets. The reference to the potential for vehicular access along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street will be removed.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

### Paragraph Figure 43 Burleigh street - Indicative typical section illustrating a segregated cycle route, space for on-street cycle parking and service access

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32006</b> Mr John Coyle [7098]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

We do not want the cycle lanes

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. Both the Local and County Council support a shared user movement corridor along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street between pedestrians and cyclists. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy. Figure 43 is therefore no longer required as the design of any new shared surface will not include segregated lanes for different users.

**Action**

Delete Figures 43 and 44.

Figure 43 Burleigh street - Indicative typical section illustrating a segregated cycle route, space for on-street cycle parking and service access

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31930</b> Matthew Danish [7080]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

The numbers do not add up on this diagram. It claims the carriageway is 3.4 metres, but somehow is composed of a 2m cycle lane and a 3m service lane. In fact Burleigh Street is only 10.7 metres wide so there is clearly insufficient room to have a 5 metre carriageway in the centre while still maintaining the street as a pedestrianised centre. This whole concept for Burleigh Street does not work and needs to be completely rethought.

Your numbers don't add up.  $2 + 3 = 5$ , not 3.4

There's not enough space on Burleigh Street for all these elements. It would completely lose its pedestrianised character. Back to the drawing board on this one.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. Both the Local and County Council support a shared user movement corridor along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street between pedestrians and cyclists. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy. Figure 43 is therefore no longer required as the design of any new shared surface will not include segregated lanes for different users.

**Action**

Delete Figures 43 and 44.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31902</b> Tam Parry [7076]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

2m only for cycling. 3m for pedestrians and servicing only paved for pedestrians. Don't give cyclists all that space pedestrians will have no chance.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. Both the Local and County Council support a shared user movement corridor along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street between pedestrians and cyclists. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy. Figure 43 is therefore no longer required as the design of any new shared surface will not include segregated lanes for different users.

**Action**

Delete Figures 43 and 44.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32040</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Not sure the numbers on this diagram add up. Please redraw it having done more design work. It's a nice idea but not workable as per that diagram.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. Both the Local and County Council support a shared user movement corridor along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street between pedestrians and cyclists. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy. Figure 43 is therefore no longer required as the design of any new shared surface will not include segregated lanes for different users.

**Action**

Delete Figures 43 and 44.

Figure 43 Burleigh street - Indicative typical section illustrating a segregated cycle route, space for on-street cycle parking and service access

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32093</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

I do want the cycle route, which is important to provide.

However, the numbers don't add up, and the proportion allocated to pedestrian space is too low - 5m is not proportionate use of the space, which should remain predominately pedestrian-orientated in character but still allow cycling.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Both the Local and County Council support a shared user movement corridor along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street between pedestrians and cyclists. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy. Figure 43 is therefore no longer required as the design of any new shared surface will not include segregated lanes for different users.**

*Action*

Delete Figures 43 and 44.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32138</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

We strongly support a carefully-designed safe and inclusive cycle route. However, the numbers do not add up on this diagram. It claims the carriageway is 3.4 metres, but somehow is composed of a 2m cycle lane and a 3m service lane. In fact Burleigh Street is only 10.7 metres wide so there is clearly insufficient room to have a 5 metre carriageway in the centre while still maintaining the street as a pedestrianised centre. This whole concept for Burleigh Street does not work and needs to be completely rethought.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Both the Local and County Council support a shared user movement corridor along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street between pedestrians and cyclists. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy. Figure 43 is therefore no longer required as the design of any new shared surface will not include segregated lanes for different users.**

*Action*

Delete Figures 43 and 44.



Figure 44 Fitzroy street - Indicative section which is typically wider than Burleigh Street. With a 3m space provided for service access and a 2m wide segregated space for cycles, a wide space for ped

**Paragraph Figure 44 Fitzroy street - Indicative section which is typically wider than Burleigh Street. With a 3m space provided for service access and a 2m wide segregated space for cycles, a wide space for ped**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32007</b> Mr John Coyle [7098]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

We do not want the cycle lanes.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. Both the Local and County Council support a shared user movement corridor along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street between pedestrians and cyclists. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy. Figure 43 is therefore no longer required as the design of any new shared surface will not include segregated lanes for different users.

*Action*

Delete Figures 43 and 44.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31903</b> Tam Parry [7076]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Too much space for cycling. Take out cycling in the service area and pave this for pedestrians only. Cyclists are a menace.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. Both the Local and County Council support a shared user movement corridor along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street between pedestrians and cyclists. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy. Figure 43 is therefore no longer required as the design of any new shared surface will not include segregated lanes for different users.

*Action*

Delete Figures 43 and 44.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32041</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

The proposed 5 metre kerb-separated carriageway for Fitzroy Street would dominate too much of what is supposed to be a pedestrianised street. I do want to see an all-day cycle-route but it should be achieved in a more sensitive and integrated manner that retains the pedestrianised character of the street.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. Both the Local and County Council support a shared user movement corridor along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street between pedestrians and cyclists. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy. Figure 43 is therefore no longer required as the design of any new shared surface will not include segregated lanes for different users.

*Action*

Delete Figures 43 and 44.

Figure 44 Fitzroy street - Indicative section which is typically wider than Burleigh Street. With a 3m space provided for service access and a 2m wide segregated space for cycles, a wide space for ped

**Representation(s)**

**Nature Appearance Soundness Tests**

<b>32094</b>	Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Object	Not Specified	None
--------------	------------------------------	--------	---------------	------

*Summary:*

I do want the cycle route, which is important to provide.

However, the numbers don't add up, and the proportion allocated to pedestrian space is too low - 5m is not proportionate use of the space, which should remain predominately pedestrian-orientated in character but still allow cycling.

Objector stating that "cyclists are a menace" is tarring all users with the same brush. For instance, children leaving school at 3.30pm, when there is plenty of space for cycling here, are denied access to safe routes as a result of the current ban.

**Response**

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Both the Local and County Council support a shared user movement corridor along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street between pedestrians and cyclists. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy. Figure 43 is therefore no longer required as the design of any new shared surface will not include segregated lanes for different users.**

**Action**

Delete Figures 43 and 44.

**Representation(s)**

**Nature Appearance Soundness Tests**

<b>32140</b>	Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Object	Not Specified	None
--------------	--	--------	---------------	------

*Summary:*

The proposed 5 metre kerb-separated carriageway for Fitzroy Street would dominate too much of what is supposed to be a street with pedestrian priority. We do want to see an all-day safe and inclusive cycle route but it should be achieved in a more sensitive and integrated manner that retains the pedestrianised character of the street.

**Response**

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Both the Local and County Council support a shared user movement corridor along Fitzroy/Burleigh Street between pedestrians and cyclists. This requires further analysis and development with the County as a key stakeholder in future discussions. Both Councils seek to deliver a safe and attractive space that conforms to the user hierarchy. Figure 43 is therefore no longer required as the design of any new shared surface will not include segregated lanes for different users.**

**Action**

Delete Figures 43 and 44.

Figure 45 East road - An indicative typical section illustrating the road widths and the potential to accommodate on-street bus stops. Generally there should be no guardrailing within the design of th

**Paragraph Figure 45 East road - An indicative typical section illustrating the road widths and the potential to accommodate on-street bus stops. Generally there should be no guardrailing within the design of th**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32008</b> Mr John Coyle [7098]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

This is a primary traffic route. Move the buses to Emanuel Road.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be complemented with commensurate access improvements. These changes would need to be consistent and completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular consistent with the City Access project. The illustrative layout of a re-configured East Road in Figure 45 is therefore beyond the scope of the SPD and no longer required.

*Action*

Delete Figure 45.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31974</b> Bev Nicolson [7088]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Fig 45 - No guard rail at all, thank you. Crossings can be effectively designed for busy roads without them.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be complemented with commensurate access improvements. These changes would need to be consistent and completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular consistent with the City Access project. The illustrative layout of a re-configured East Road in Figure 45 is therefore beyond the scope of the SPD and no longer required.

*Action*

Delete Figure 45.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31931</b> Matthew Danish [7080]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Where is the cycling provision on this very wide road? There should be cycleways protected by trees and verges on both sides of the road, separate from motor traffic and separate from footways. There's no reason to force people who are walking across the road to wait in a central refuge. Make the road smaller by getting rid of the central median and put those trees on the sides of the road. Crossing the road should happen in a single stage. I have attached a conceptual drawing to show what a better East Road could look like.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be complemented with commensurate access improvements. These changes would need to be consistent and completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular consistent with the City Access project. The illustrative layout of a re-configured East Road in Figure 45 is therefore beyond the scope of the SPD and no longer required.

*Action*

Delete Figure 45.

Figure 45 East road - An indicative typical section illustrating the road widths and the potential to accommodate on-street bus stops. Generally there should be no guardrailing within the design of th

**Representation(s)**

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**32042 Heather Coleman [1863]** Object Not Specified None

*Summary:*

Decent cycle lanes (aka those on Hills Road) must be part of the plans for East Road. The proposed plan is also deeply pedestrian unfriendly.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be complemented with commensurate access improvements. These changes would need to be consistent and completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular consistent with the City Access project. The illustrative layout of a re-configured East Road in Figure 45 is therefore beyond the scope of the SPD and no longer required.

**Action**

Delete Figure 45.

**Representation(s)**

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**32095 Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]** Object Not Specified None

*Summary:*

Bus passengers should be given top-quality accessibility. Having an urban motorway through this area is unpleasant for pedestrians and the amount of space given to car driving here is unnecessarily high. There is plenty of space for other users.

Guard-railing is 40 years out of date and should be avoided.

There should be a proper segregated cycle route on each side, plus trees. There is plenty of space - this is a very wide road:  
<https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@52.2064596,0.1356992,3a,75y,46.06h,71.65t/data=!3m6!1e1!3m4!1sCHRMUuqPpbGJcMsfUgl1-Q!2e0!7i13312!8i6656>

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be complemented with commensurate access improvements. These changes would need to be consistent and completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular consistent with the City Access project. The illustrative layout of a re-configured East Road in Figure 45 is therefore beyond the scope of the SPD and no longer required.

**Action**

Delete Figure 45.

Figure 45 East road - An indicative typical section illustrating the road widths and the potential to accommodate on-street bus stops. Generally there should be no guardrailing within the design of th

**Representation(s)**

	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32142</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Future designs for East Road must have protected cycleways. The median should be removed, the carriageway shrunk, and good footways and separate, protected cycleways should be installed on either side. Crossings should be in a single-stage, with no islands nor guard-rail.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be complemented with commensurate access improvements. These changes would need to be consistent and completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular consistent with the City Access project. The illustrative layout of a re-configured East Road in Figure 45 is therefore beyond the scope of the SPD and no longer required.

**Action**

Delete Figure 45.

**Representation(s)**

	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31904</b> Tam Parry [7076]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Wonderful I agree

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be complemented with commensurate access improvements. These changes would need to be consistent and completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular consistent with the City Access project. The illustrative layout of a re-configured East Road in Figure 45 is therefore beyond the scope of the SPD and no longer required.

**Action**

Delete Figure 45.

**Paragraph 4.5.6**

**Representation(s)**

	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32009</b> Mr John Coyle [7098]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Any reduction in road width will have a major effect on the surrounding area. This is the problem with these sort of Schemes. Piecemeal disjointed projects focusing on small areas without looking at the bigger picture. The City is strangling itself by ignoring vehicle movements. We need to identify major arterial routes through/across the City before we continue to block more.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any new or improved carriageways along East Road would require a traffic assessment to consider the wider impact of these changes. This would need to be completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular the City Access team who are overseeing all the various access and movement schemes to do with Cambridge City Centre and beyond.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32143</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

We support the integrated approach to public realm on East Road with additional tree plantings, alongside protected cycleways with separation of motor traffic from people cycling, and a separate footway for people walking.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any new or improved carriageways along East Road would require a traffic assessment to consider the wider impact of these changes. This would need to be completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular the City Access team who are overseeing all the various access and movement schemes to do with Cambridge City Centre and beyond.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32096</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Support this.

It is entirely possible to have a carriageway of the current function of a through route while vastly improving the current unpleasant streetscape. The number of lanes is unnecessary, bus laybys are in the wrong place, the central division is ugly and unnecessarily, the pavements are poor, etc.

Having SIX lanes of traffic is completely ridiculous:

<https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@52.2064596,0.1356992,3a,75y,46.06h,71.65t/data=!3m6!1e1!3m4!1sCHRMUuqPpbGJcMsfUgl1-Q!2e0!7i13312!8i6656>

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any new or improved carriageways along East Road would require a traffic assessment to consider the wider impact of these changes. This would need to be completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular the City Access team who are overseeing all the various access and movement schemes to do with Cambridge City Centre and beyond.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32043</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Nice ideas. Pity about the lack of cycle lanes.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any new or improved carriageways along East Road would require a traffic assessment to consider the wider impact of these changes. This would need to be completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular the City Access team who are overseeing all the various access and movement schemes to do with Cambridge City Centre and beyond.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

## Paragraph 4.5.7

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32144</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

We support the reduction in carriageway width on East Road. Our only objection is that some of that space should be used for creating protected cycleways, and that principle needs to be noted in this paragraph.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Any new or improved carriageways along East Road would require a traffic assessment to consider the wider impact of these changes. This would need to be completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular the City Access team who are overseeing all the various access and movement schemes to do with Cambridge City Centre and beyond.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32044</b> Heather Coleman [1863]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Reducing the carriageway would be great. But decent cycle lanes, removal of loading in said cycle lanes, and, if bus stops are to be on-road, they need to be floating. Generous space given to cyclists as well as pedestrians.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Any new or improved carriageways along East Road would require a traffic assessment to consider the wider impact of these changes. This would need to be completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular the City Access team who are overseeing all the various access and movement schemes to do with Cambridge City Centre and beyond.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32165</b> Marion Bailey [7084]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Trees on East Road look good but surely reducing lanes for vehicles will cause huge problems?

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Any new or improved carriageways along East Road would require a traffic assessment to consider the wider impact of these changes. This would need to be completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular the City Access team who are overseeing all the various access and movement schemes to do with Cambridge City Centre and beyond.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32097</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

East road is a sewer for cars, which is not a pleasant place to visit. It will not be an attractive destination unless the carriageway is reduced.

There is much scope to improve the streetscape.

However, a proper segregated cycle track on each side should be added - there is plenty of space:

<https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@52.2064596,0.1356992,3a,75y,46.06h,71.65t/data=!3m6!1e1!3m4!1sCHRMUuqPpbGjCmSfUgl1-Q!2e0!7i13312!8i6656>

**Response**

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Any new or improved carriageways along East Road would require a traffic assessment to consider the wider impact of these changes. This would need to be completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular the City Access team who are overseeing all the various access and movement schemes to do with Cambridge City Centre and beyond.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31940</b> Mr Peter Wakefield [4087]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Welcome positive suggestion for East Road.

Current 3 pedestrian crossings on East Road from Petersfield at Anglia Ruskin, Norfolk St and St Matthews Street prioritise cars over people crossing.

Need to unify Petersfield and Grafton across East Road at these crossings and elsewhere.

Proposals that seek to make East a Road more a city boulevard are to be welcomed. The south end is already a much more positive area. East Road is a hostile inner city environment, including the dualled part the fence along which separates Grafton and Petersfield!

Remove both dualled part and fence. Include cycle lanes and linear park to Newmarket Road with trees.

**Response**

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Any new or improved carriageways along East Road would require a traffic assessment to consider the wider impact of these changes. This would need to be completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular the City Access team who are overseeing all the various access and movement schemes to do with Cambridge City Centre and beyond.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**



<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31911</b> Mr Nicholas Flynn [7072]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

East road is a sewer for cars, which is not a pleasant place to visit. It will not be an attractive destination unless the carriageway is reduced.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Any new or improved carriageways along East Road would require a traffic assessment to consider the wider impact of these changes. This would need to be completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular the City Access team who are overseeing all the various access and movement schemes to do with Cambridge City Centre and beyond.**

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

**Paragraph Figure 47 Proposed indicative East road bus stop layout (subject to further discussion and detailed design)**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32145</b> Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Committee (Trustees) of the Charity) [925]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

This diagram does not show space for safe and inclusive cycling. There should be protected cycleways on both sides of the road so that people cycling are separate from motor traffic. The central median should be removed and the carriageway narrowed. The crossing of the road should be in a single stage and straight across. No staggered crossings and no guard rail. Instead of trees in the median the trees should be planted between the carriageway and the cycleways.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be complemented with commensurate access improvements. These changes would need to be consistent and completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular consistent with the City Access project. The illustrative layout of a re-configured East Road bus stop re-configuration in Figure 47 is therefore beyond the scope of the SPD and no longer required.**

*Action*

Delete Figures 46 and 47.

Figure 47 Proposed indicative East road bus stop layout (subject to further discussion and detailed design)

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32045</b>	Heather Coleman [1863]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

This diagram would have the effect of banning cycling along East Road. This diagram does not show space for safe cycling. There should be protected cycleways on both sides of the road so that people cycling are separate from motor traffic. The central median should be removed and the carriageway narrowed. The crossing of the road should be in a single stage and straight across. No staggered crossings and no guard rail. Instead of trees in the median the trees should be planted between the carriageway and the cycleways.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be complemented with commensurate access improvements. These changes would need to be consistent and completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular consistent with the City Access project. The illustrative layout of a re-configured East Road bus stop re-configuration in Figure 47 is therefore beyond the scope of the SPD and no longer required.

*Action*

Delete Figures 46 & 47

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32120</b>	Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Cycle tracks, separate from both pedestrians and buses, needed. There is plenty of space.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be complemented with commensurate access improvements. These changes would need to be consistent and completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular consistent with the City Access project. The illustrative layout of a re-configured East Road bus stop re-configuration in Figure 47 is therefore beyond the scope of the SPD and no longer required.

*Action*

Delete figures 46 & 47

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31933</b>	Matthew Danish [7080]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

This diagram does not have any cycling infrastructure. You should include protected cycleways that are separate from cars and buses. The crossing of East Road looks like it is blocked by a tree in this diagram. The crossing should be straightened out and made into a single-stage crossing. There should not be any staggered crossings anymore. Let people walk across the whole road without having to wait and wait.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be complemented with commensurate access improvements. These changes would need to be consistent and completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular consistent with the City Access project. The illustrative layout of a re-configured East Road bus stop re-configuration in Figure 47 is therefore beyond the scope of the SPD and no longer required.

*Action*

Delete Figures 46 & 47

Figure 47 Proposed indicative East road bus stop layout (subject to further discussion and detailed design)

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31975</b>	Bev Nicolson [7088]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Fig 47. - A bus lane shared with bikes? No. Not on East Road, thanks.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be complemented with commensurate access improvements. These changes would need to be consistent and completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular consistent with the City Access project. The illustrative layout of a re-configured East Road bus stop re-configuration in Figure 47 is therefore beyond the scope of the SPD and no longer required.

*Action*

Delete Figures 46 & 47

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31905</b>	Tam Parry [7076]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Agree but where do you get the bus from? If on east road then great.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. Any changes to East Road would need to be complemented with commensurate access improvements. These changes would need to be consistent and completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular consistent with the City Access project. The illustrative layout of a re-configured East Road bus stop re-configuration in Figure 47 is therefore beyond the scope of the SPD and no longer required.

*Action*

Delete Figures 46 & 47

**Paragraph 4.5.9**

<i>Representation(s)</i>		<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32116</b>	Mrs J. A. Surry [7094]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Any car/lorry/taxi access to the area is worrying. This would add to environmental concerns - quality of air. I feel strongly that taxi access is not necessary and wish to have my concerns on the record.

*Response*

Comments and concerns duly noted. The Grafton Grafton Area of Major Change is located within an Air Quality Management Area. Development of the site will need to take full account of the sites location and could also present opportunities to reduce air pollution, for example through the promotion of sustainable modes of transport. Any new or improved carriageways along East Road would require a traffic assessment to consider the wider impact of these changes. This would need to be completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular the City Access team.

*Action*

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32112</b> Mrs H Van De Watering [7095]	Object	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Fitzroy St and Burleigh St are the 'backbone' of this plan. The Council should be aware of the very serious problem of air pollution we have and should be doing everything they can to reduce the sources that are causing it. Children and old people are at real risk in particular. To be even considering allowing motor vehicle access to a pedestrianized road shows a lack of concern for our need to reduce pollution which I find very worrying. If we allow taxis even (let alone the others that will follow inevitably - cars - lorries delivering) it's the thin end of the wedge.

**Response**

Comments and concerns duly noted. The Grafton Area of Major Change is located within an Air Quality Management Area. Development of the site will need to take full account of the sites location and could also present opportunities to reduce air pollution, for example through the promotion of sustainable modes of transport. Any new or improved carriageways along East Road would require a traffic assessment to consider the wider impact of these changes. This would need to be completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular the City Access team.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31916</b> Environment Agency (Mr Tony Waddams) [1273]	Support	Not Specified	None

**Summary:**

Whilst the Agency would be unlikely to have any fundamental objection to the proposal, any subsequent planning application must address the following issues.

## Contaminated Land:

In the case of brownfield re-development the possibility of ground contamination must be investigated. An intrusive ground contamination investigation and remediation scheme will be required. SuDS drainage will not be permitted in contaminated land.

**Response**

Comments duly noted.

**Action**

No change to the SPD.

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31942</b> Mr Peter Wakefield [4087]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Air pollution  
 The volume of traffic using East Road is too much. Particulates from engines, dust from tyres wear, dust from brake linings and road asphalt wear is a major problem from this road and it should be an imperative to discourage as traffic as possible from this road. Many people have chest problems caused by this pollution. Hopefully "benign" design such as narrowing and the creation of a linear park will discourage through traffic.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. The Grafton AoMC is located within an Air Quality Management Area. Development of the site will need to take full account of the sites location and could also present opportunities to reduce air pollution, for example through the promotion of sustainable modes of transport. Any new or improved carriageways along East Road would require a traffic assessment to consider the wider impact of these changes. This would need to be completed in partnership with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and in particular the City Access team.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

**Paragraph 4.5.10**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>31915</b> Environment Agency (Mr Tony Waddams) [1273]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

Whilst the Agency would be unlikely to have any fundamental objection to the proposal, any subsequent planning application must address the following issues.

Surface Water Drainage:

A sustainable scheme for the disposal of uncontaminated surface water will be required.

Foul Water Drainage:

All foul sewage shall be discharged to the public foul sewer with the prior approval of Anglian Water.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted.**

*Action*

**Add reference to paragraph 4.5.20 requiring: a sustainable scheme for the disposal of uncontaminated surface water; and all foul sewage shall be discharged to the public foul sewer with the prior approval of Anglian Water.**

### Paragraph 4.5.12

**Representation(s)**

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**31936** Jonathan Hefford [7077] **Object Not Specified None**

*Summary:*

TREES AND GREENERY AND OTHER LANDSCAPING. Fine, as long as they are maintained. I can think of five trees planted at the time of Grafton One that either failed to thrive or were vandalised. Never replaced. Planted beds in private sector areas filled with rank weeds and litter and fly tipped. Scabby patched surfaces. Cycle route markings not renewed. General shabbiness. Interior of Grafton pristine.

**Response**

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Section 4 of the SPD identifies, at a high level, the improvements to be made in landscape, environment and public realm. However it is beyond the scope of the SPD to specify these details but they will be considered as improvements to the various streets and spaces are developed.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**

**Representation(s)**

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**32100** Corsten Douglas [7102] **Support Not Specified None**

*Summary:*

We welcome ideas to add more plant matter to the area. We especially think that having rooftop gardens or meadows over businesses would be a wonderful idea. Trees at the public level are also very needed today, when less private residences are able to keep up trees and hedges for birds and insects.

**Response**

**Comments duly noted.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**

### Paragraph 4.5.13

**Representation(s)**

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**31920** Jonathan Hefford [7077] **Support Not Specified None**

*Summary:*

ENERGY. There is scope for significant energy capture on roofs.

**Response**

**Comments duly noted. Development of the Grafton Area presents the opportunity to enhance the site's environmental sustainability with improved energy efficiency through the use of renewable and low carbon technologies.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**

**Paragraph 4.5.20**

**Representation(s)**

**Nature Appearance Soundness Tests**

<b>31986</b>	Donald Fung [7089]	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
--------------	--------------------	---------------	----------------------	-------------

*Summary:*

There will inevitably be an increase in noise pollution from any addition of residential units

**Response**

**Comments duly noted. It is the intention of the Grafton SPD to raise the quality and appeal of the whole area for both local residents and visitors to the area. The SPD will provide a more holistic approach to improving the environmental quality of the area. Detailed matters such as noise and pollution will be taken into consideration as part of any proposal for new residential development during the Development Management process.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**

**Representation(s)**

**Nature Appearance Soundness Tests**

<b>32103</b>	Corsten Douglas [7102]	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
--------------	------------------------	---------------	----------------------	-------------

*Summary:*

Further, the Graft Centre is already a cause of regular noise and disturbance to residents. Visitors loiter, argue, litter and look for criminal opportunities in the area. We have had a substantial vermin problem with pigeons because of food litter, which we are sure the Grafton is aware of, but which they have never mentioned they were taking any action on. It is insulting to suggest that increasing links between the Grafton Centre and adjacent residential streets would be beneficial to anyone concerned. This is certain to increase loitering, litter and noise in the affected streets, some of which are already facing problems with drug dealing, which the Grafton Centre Security has already refused to take any action over. At a recent neighbourhood meeting (BRUNK), it became apparent that while many residents had contacted the police over drug offences, only 2 calls were officially recorded. A far larger problem exists than is officially noted.

**Response**

**Comments duly noted. It is the intention of the Grafton SPD to raise the quality and appeal of the whole area for both local residents and visitors to the area. The SPD will provide a more holistic approach to improving the environmental quality of the area. Detailed matters such as noise and pollution will be taken into consideration as part of any proposal for new development during the Development Management process.**

**Action**

**No change to the SPD.**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32018</b> Mx Valerie Cornish [7099]	Support	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

All these objectives are laudable. There has been a great deterioration in the noise, pollution and quality of the area over the last 30 years.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. It is the intention of the Grafton SPD to raise the quality and appeal of the whole area for both local residents and visitors to the area. The SPD will provide a more holistic approach to improving the environmental quality of the area. Detailed matters such as noise and pollution will be taken into consideration as part of any proposal for new development during the Development Management process.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

**Paragraph 4.6.1**

<i>Representation(s)</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Appearance</i>	<i>Soundness Tests</i>
<b>32098</b> Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]	Object	Not Specified	None

*Summary:*

This is not enough.

The Eastern Gate SPD has failed to result in *\*any\** change, because the County Council Highway Department argues that it is not possible to obtain any S106 funds because the lack of a proper costed set of schemes for the area.

Accordingly, this paragraph should state:

"The City Council will work with the County Council to draw up a costed set of schemes for the area within 24 months."

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. Detailed matters involving the local highway to make a development acceptable in planning terms will need to be agreed as part of the planning application stages during the Development Management process.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**



### Paragraph 4.6.6

**Representation(s)**

*Nature    Appearance    Soundness Tests*

<b>31953</b>	NHS England (Ms Kerry Harding) [5842]	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
--------------	---------------------------------------	---------------	----------------------	-------------

*Summary:*

There are currently 8 main GP practices and 2 branch surgeries within a 1km radius of this Grafton Area site, which is located centrally within Cambridge city. These GP practices do not have capacity for development growth. Development on this site would likely give rise to a need for improvements to primary healthcare capacity, in line with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP); a proportion of the cost of which would need to be met by the developer(s). The nature and scale of this will be calculated at the appropriate time, when proposals are more developed and formal planning applications are produced and submitted.

NHS England has identified shortfalls in capacity at existing premises covered by this SPD. Provision needs to be made within the SPD to address the impacts of development on health infrastructure and to ensure timely cost-effective delivery of necessary infrastructure improvements, in the interests of pursuing sustainable development.

*Response*

**Comments and concerns duly noted. Detailed matters involving the provision of local healthcare will depend on proposals for new residential development as will therefore need to be agreed as part of any relevant planning application during the Development Management process.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

### Paragraph 4.6.10

**Representation(s)**

*Nature    Appearance    Soundness Tests*

<b>32060</b>	Frances Dewhurst [7090]	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>None</b>
--------------	-------------------------	---------------	----------------------	-------------

*Summary:*

I have very little interest in the shopping offer in the Grafton which doesn't cater for middle-aged middle-class women. I spend my money elsewhere. Nor will a gym be of much interest. The discussion I had at the display seemed all about serving younger incoming Cambridge residents. But the population of Cambridge is aging and older people have more cash. A bit more thought should be given to who might use the facilities here.

*Response*

**Comments duly noted. Decisions regarding the actual type and range of retail and leisure facilities to be provided is a matter for the local retail/leisure market. It is however important that the Grafton Area is able to provide a modern, attractive and accessible centre which people will want to visit. Long-term improvements to the area should make it more attractive to visit both during the day and at night. It should be easier for people to access and move around the area as well as improve the perception of safety with better design which prevents crime.**

*Action*

**No change to the SPD.**

## Paragraph All types of development

### Representation(s)

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**32019 Mx Valerie Cornish [7099]**

**Support Not Specified None**

*Summary:*

These are all good objectives. The implementation may result in great disruption and deterioration of the area during the building work. This has historically been our experience. It means people will avoid the area, and it has a great impact on local residents who are active in supporting our local space. Community cohesion, neighbourliness, care for the environment, law and order all improve city centre living. Implementation issues will be important.

### Response

Comments duly noted.

### Action

No change to the SPD.

## Appendix A: Glossary of Terms

### Paragraph Appendix A: Glossary of Terms

#### Representation(s)

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**31898 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]**

**Object Not Specified None**

*Summary:*

Glossary - We would suggest that the terms, 'Heritage Assets', and 'Locally Listed Buildings' are added to the glossary.

### Response

Comments duly noted. Suggested amendments will be made.

### Action

Add 'Heritage Assets', and 'Locally Listed Buildings' to Glossary.

## Appendix C: List of Figures

### Paragraph Appendix C: List of Figures

#### Representation(s)

*Nature Appearance Soundness Tests*

**32099 Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]**

**Object Not Specified None**

*Summary:*

Photos should be credited.

### Response

Comments duly noted.

### Action

Add credits to photos in Appendix C.