



Cambridge City Council
Glen Richardson
Guildhall
Cambridge
CB2 3OJ

7 March 2016

Dear Mr Richardson

Ref: Consultation Response to the draft SPD for the redevelopment of the Ridgeon's site

Cambridge Past, Present & Future's Planning Committee have reviewed and discussed the above referenced Supplementary Planning Document for the redevelopment of the Ridgeon's site. It is clear that the proposals have progressed past that seen last summer and we acknowledge some of our previous comments have been addressed.

CambridgePPF welcome the principle of development on this brownfield land. This is both positive and encouraging, especially as this falls in line with our own development principles. However, whilst this is good to see, we believe there are still issues that need addressing.

First, regardless of our comments on the document, there is a fundamental issue that remains, which is that the SPD is not capable of being adopted unless and until the draft Local Plan proposals are approved by the Inspector in due course. This presents a potential challenge if either the draft Local Plan or the draft SPD are not supported. As a result, it is strongly recommended that the principles and objectives of developing the site (as outlined in the SPD) would remain regardless of the proposal to ensure the same considerations are given.

Second, CambridgePPF raises the following comments and concerns on the draft SPD:

2.2.6/7- there is an opportunity for enhancement

2.2.11- ensure mitigation against noise and air pollution

2.5.7 and 2.5.9- CambridgePPF are not commenting specifically on the provisions of health care, child care or schools, but acknowledge an allocation of a space within the site has been included in the SPD. The location, design, and use of this space/building needs to be better understood and carefully considered. If after an assessment it is found that the facilities aren't required, what will happen to the allocated land or building? A better understanding of the developer's obligations is worth inclusion to assure residents, such as Section 106 or CIL monies.

2.6- is a section that invariably raises concerns that the SPD does not address other than making promises. This is an already congested area and it is imperative to demonstrate what the additional

numbers of cars would be and how an increase might be managed. It would be worthwhile to compare the existing heavy good vehicle and patron vehicle movements against the proposed residential use, both in terms of volume and timing. Is it a balanced trade off? What about visitors to the homes? Disabled parking? Deliveries, refuse, etc.? The SPD infers a variety of parking typologies, but again there is no detail on what, where or how.

2.6.8- the inclusion of the City Deal's Chisholm Trail for cycle and pedestrian movements is supported, however, what remains unclear is the practicalities of incorporation with the site, timing and coordination, especially in light of the EIP of the Local Plans and the overall City Deal programme. Without being overly prescriptive, fleshing this out more may be worthwhile.

2.6.10- the relatively casual dismissal of a pedestrian bridge is unfortunate. It is suggested that further discussions with the City Deal are explored to see if funding could be leveraged through the Chisholm Trail or through developer contributions. This is something that the residents have asked for and are passionate about. The nearest existing routes over the rail are Mill Road and Coldham's Lane. Both of these are far from the site, particularly on foot and the result could isolate the site from the city.

2.7- despite the availability of open space adjacent to the site, it is vital that sufficient and well-designed landscaping is available within this site. Figure 136 depicting a more undulating and organic green space is preferred to the overly simplistic linear form.

2.8- this section only talks about what is adjacent and within the immediate area, but nothing site specific

2.9.3- this section only talks about what is adjacent and within the immediate area, but nothing site specific

2.10- key objectives are supported, but how will they be implemented in this site, this is just a promise without evidence of how it will be implemented

3.2- key principles are supported, but how will they be implemented in this site, this is just a promise without evidence of how it will be delivered

4.2- 40% affordable housing provision is welcome, but location and types need to be varied and integrated into the site, this includes one bedroom and bungalow sized properties which the market is failing to provide

4.2.3- how and where is this within the site?

4.3.4- one entrance for 300 plus cars is questioned, and considerations of a secondary access south of site should be made

4.3.8- the variety of parking options mentioned is welcome, but the indicative plan does not show any cars at all- this is visually confusing and misleading, which may raise concerns about practicalities

4.3.11- Figures 125-128 do not sufficiently demonstrate the proposed elevation cut through and this graphic should be made clearer

4.4- the existing site has no internal trees or green space, therefore the proposed open space should include mixture of mature and newly planted trees. Should the Chisholm Trail follow a tree lined path? How obvious should the trail be? There is no mention of street furniture, benches, bins, maintenance, who will own the land, etc.

4.5- it is appreciated that a mix of housing types and heights are required to accommodate the density and that the taller buildings be located adjacent to the railway. However, every effort should be made to minimise the maximum height to accord with the adjacent residential area.

4.6- Figure 136 is the most helpful and enables some opportunity to visualise the concept. This is also the form and shape preferred compared to the over simplified linear figures. Those flats located adjacent the railway may be most disadvantaged due to noise, odour and vibration. Mitigations should be suggested in the SPD to allay fears. Figure 136 shows some sort of structures located against the boundary- would these be storage units? Clarification is recommended. There are two buildings (one being the marker) that are hexagon shaped and could mislead people. Further clarification on both structures and an in-principle statement about the nature and intent to be derived from the 'marker' or 'landmark' building should be included. Key elevations include views from existing rear gardens onto side of proposed new terraces, views from railway and other key views. Perhaps further description of how these key viewpoints will be dealt with would again ease neighbour concerns.

4.7- key objectives are supported, but how will they be implemented in this site. Further details would be very helpful

Additionally, there is no mention of public art within the site. The small development located at Yarrow Road and Cambridge Road demonstrates how art, enclosure, sustainability and quality can be done quite well. Also, there are no clear proposals for enhancing biodiversity, wildlife, etc.? The document shows the potential use of bird boxes and solar panels, but little else.

Finally, CambridgePPF requests that it is included in future discussions about the specific details and design parameters that typically precede a formal planning application. The draft SPD is an excellent starting point, but we feel some of the detail that gives character and definition, such as offering a palette of materials, details, etc. could be useful. We encourage a variety to avoid further developments taunting [?] the new 'Cambridge vernacular'.

CambridgePPF look forward to reviewing further versions of this draft SPD when available. Thank you

Kind regards



Stacey Weiser, IHBC
Head of Planning and Conservation
On behalf of the Planning Committee