



Public Document Pack

Cambridge City Council

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

To: Scrutiny Sub Committee Members: Councillors Reid (Chair), Saunders (Vice-Chair), Blencowe, Brierley, Marchant-Daisley and Price

Alternates : Councillors Blackhurst and Herbert

Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change: Councillor Ward

Despatched: Monday, 2 September 2013

Date: Tuesday, 10 September 2013

Time: 4.30 pm

Venue: Committee Room 1 & 2 - Guildhall

Contact: James Goddard

Direct Dial: 01223 457013

AGENDA

1 APOLOGIES

To receive any apologies for absence.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are asked to declare at this stage any interests, which they may have in any of the following items on the agenda. If any member is unsure whether or not they should declare an interest on a particular matter, they are requested to seek advice from the Head of Legal Services **before** the meeting.

3 MINUTES (*Pages 7 - 30*)

To approve the minutes of the meetings of 29th May 2013 (2.00pm), 29th May 2013 (5.00pm) and 9th June 2013.

4 PUBLIC QUESTIONS (SEE BELOW)

- 5 PROPOSED RESPONSE TO SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN (PROPOSED SUBMISSION CONSULTATION AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY - PRELIMINARY DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE CONSULTATION) *(Pages 31 - 50)***

- 6 PROPOSED CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S DRAFT TRANSPORT STRATEGY FOR CAMBRIDGE AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE *(Pages 51 - 66)***

Information for the Public

Location The meeting is in the Guildhall on the Market Square (CB2 3QJ).

Between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. the building is accessible via Peas Hill, Guildhall Street and the Market Square entrances.

After 5 p.m. access is via the Peas Hill entrance.

All the meeting rooms (Committee Room 1, Committee 2 and the Council Chamber) are on the first floor, and are accessible via lifts or stairs.

Public Participation Some meetings may have parts that will be closed to the public, but the reasons for excluding the press and public will be given.

Most meetings have an opportunity for members of the public to ask questions or make statements.

To ask a question or make a statement please notify the Committee Manager (details listed on the front of the agenda) prior to the deadline.

- For questions and/or statements regarding items on the published agenda, the deadline is the start of the meeting.
- For questions and/or statements regarding items NOT on the published agenda, the deadline is 10 a.m. the day before the meeting.

Speaking on Planning Applications or Licensing Hearings is subject to other rules. Guidance for speaking on these issues can be obtained from Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk.

Further information about speaking at a City Council

meeting can be found at;

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/speaking-at-committee-meetings>

Cambridge City Council would value your assistance in improving the public speaking process of committee meetings. If you any have any feedback please contact Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk.

Filming, recording and photography

The Council is committed to being open and transparent in the way it conducts its decision-making. Recording is permitted at council meetings, which are open to the public. The Council understands that some members of the public attending its meetings may not wish to be recorded. The Chair of the meeting will facilitate by ensuring that any such request not to be recorded is respected by those doing the recording.

Full details of the City Council's protocol on audio/visual recording and photography at meetings can be accessed via:

<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1057&ID=1057&RPID=42096147&sch=doc&cat=13203&path=13020%2c13203>

Fire Alarm

In the event of the fire alarm sounding please follow the instructions of Cambridge City Council staff.

Facilities for disabled people

Level access to the Guildhall is via Peas Hill.

A loop system is available in Committee Room 1, Committee Room 2 and the Council Chamber.

Accessible toilets are available on the ground and first floor.

Meeting papers are available in large print and other formats on request prior to the meeting.

For further assistance please contact Democratic

Services on 01223 457013 or
democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk.

Queries on reports If you have a question or query regarding a committee report please contact the officer listed at the end of relevant report or Democratic Services on 01223 457013 or democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk.

General Information Information regarding committees, councilors and the democratic process is available at <http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/>

This page is intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

29 May 2013
2.00 - 5.10 pm

Present: Councillors Reid (Chair), Saunders (Vice-Chair), Blencowe, Price and Marchant-Daisley

Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change: Councillor Ward

Officers:

- Head of Planning Services: Patsy Dell
- Urban Design & Conservation Manager: Glen Richardson
- Principal Planning Policy Officer: Joanna Gilbert-Wooldridge
- Senior Sustainability Officer: Emma Davies
- Senior Planning Policy Officer: Nancy Kimberley
- Senior Planning Policy Officer: Brendan Troy
- Senior Planning Policy Officer: Bruce Waller
- Committee Manager: James Goddard

Other Officers Present:

- Head of Strategic Housing: Alan Carter
- Housing Strategy Manager: Helen Reed
- Urban Extensions Project Manager: Julian Sykes

- Sustainable Drainage Engineer: Simon Bunn
- Planning Policy & Economic Development Officer: Stephen Miles
- Urban Designer: Matthew Paul
- Consultant: Myles Greensmith

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

13/26/DPSSC Apologies

No apologies were received.

13/27/DPSSC Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor	13/30/DPSSC	Personal: Member of Trumpington

Blackhurst		Resident's Association
Councillor Blencowe	13/30/DPSSC	Personal: Chair of YMCA Football Club
Councillors Reid & Saunders	13/30/DPSSC	Personal: Member of Cambridge Past, Present & Future
Councillors Saunders	13/30/DPSSC	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign

13/28/DPSSC Minutes

The minutes of the 25 March 2013 and 27 March 2013 meetings were approved and signed as a correct record.

13/29/DPSSC Public Questions (See Below)

Members of the public asked a number of questions, and made representations as set out below.

- 1. Mr George and Mr James' representations covered the following issues:**
 - i. Wanted a fit for purpose football stadium.**
 - ii. The current Cambridge United site was not sustainable.**
 - iii. The Club delivered a lot of sports through its community role. It worked with schools through the Trust.**
 - iv. Sport was important for health and well-being. Football was in a powerful position to help young people with their education.**
 - v. The Club experienced the following difficulties in delivering community sports:**
 - a. Lack of funding.**
 - b. Lack of capacity.**
 - c. Lack of facilities and a waiting list for those already in place.**
 - vi. Reiterated CUFC had the desire and expertise to delivery community sports facilities, but required appropriate facilities to do so.**

The Head of Planning Services said the community had been consulted regarding sites for a community stadium through the Local Plan issues

and options 2 consultation. Officers advised there was no exceptional circumstances need as required by the NPPF to release green belt land in Trumpington. DPSSC would consider the advice and make their own decision at this meeting.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change said there was no statutory need for community stadium facilities in the Local Plan. Specific applications would be considered on their merits if submitted to the Planning Committee.

2. Mr Gudgeon's representation covered the following issues:

- i. The need for extra housing that eats into the green belt is not evidenced in the Local Plan.**
- ii. Took issue with use of the green belt and suggested this was open to legal challenge.**

3. Mr Pellew's representation covered the following issues:

- i. Cambridge Past Present and Future were encouraged by the Council's planning stance, but had some reservations.**
- ii. Agreed with Local Plan principles such as being a compact green city.**
- iii. Suggested there were inconsistencies between policies and implementation:**
 - Market towns were omitted from the Local Plan, these should be the priorities after urban centres.**
 - No clear argument under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) why green belt sites were released for development.**

4. Mr Beresford's representation covered the following issues:

- i. Worts Causeway should not be developed for housing, residents object to this.**
- ii. The green belt is valued as a green and leisure space.**

5. Mr Parry-Jones' representation covered the following issues:

- i. Took issue with proposal to develop the green belt.**
- ii. GB1 is important to Cambridge.**
- iii. Took issue with details in the Officer's report:**

- **There was no evidence to justify the development of GB1 for housing.**
- **The Council should protect its heritage assets.**
- **Releasing one area could lead to legal challenges by developers to open up other areas of the green belt etc.**

The Head of Planning Services responded to the questioners as follows:

- i. The planning landscape had changed since the 2006 iteration of the Plan.
- ii. The City Council was working with neighbouring authorities on strategic issues, but the City Council was responsible for activities within the city boundary.
- iii. The NPPF was clear about City Council responsibilities in relation to identifying then seeking to meet development needs through the local plan.
- iv. Referred to policies considered by the City Council when making planning decisions.
- v. The City Council was responsible for finding sites to meet housing needs within its boundaries. Needs had been identified through the joint work with other councils and through the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. This set out the evidence base for demand and supply. The Plan was presented to DPSSC for consideration of the release of four small green belt sites for housing and employment needs.
- vi. Only small green belt sites had been released, in adherence with key Local Plan principles to retain the character of the City as a 'compact city'. Sites had been released due to exceptional circumstance need and all other options within city boundaries on non-green belt sites had been exhausted.
- vii. Referred to Appendix B, table 2 regarding supply figures.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change responded to the questioners as follows:

- i. The intention was to preserve Cambridge as a compact city.
- ii. Local Plan Policy 26 contains mitigation measures to address people's concerns such as protecting the character of the city.

6. Mr Gudgeon's supplementary representation covered the following issues:

- i. **Said the Local Plan was on thin ice.**
- ii. **Took issue with housing demand figures.**

The Head of Planning Services responded that the Local Plan evidence base included the Technical forecasting work and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment covered in the county-wide Memorandum of Co-operation as required by the NPPF. This was where housing supply figures came from.

The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change responded that officers were watching developing case law on new local plans. Authorities were required to satisfy housing needs for face a challenge by the Planning Inspector at local plan examinations.

7. Mr Pellew's supplementary representation covered the following issues:

- i. **Queried how the council reconciled its stated policy of a compact city with the release of the green belt.**
- ii. **Queried why the Draft Local Plan did not include details of the exceptional circumstances for the release of the green belt.**

The Head of Planning Services responded that the policy justification was included in agenda part two reports. She accepted that the policy justification for exceptional Green Belt release could have been made clearer and this issue would be reviewed as the plan moved through the next committee stages

8. Mr Parry-Jones' supplementary representation covered the following issues:

- i. **Queried impact of green belt development on heritage assets.**
- ii. **Queried how the numbers of units could be reduced.**

The Head of Planning Services referred to details in the Officer's report on sites GB1 and 2. The intention was to have no negative impact on heritage buildings, wildlife etc, so this affected the amount of housing that could be delivered.

9. Councillor Birtles' (Ward Councillor for Queen Edith's) representation covered the following issues:

- i. Residents had expressed concerns regarding the development of GB1 and 2 sites.
 - ii. Took issue with development on the green belt.
 - iii. Referred to the NPPF and asked if green belt development met its criteria.
 - iv. Queried predicted job growth figures and thus housing need.
 - v. Asked for clear justification of green belt development.
10. Councillor Swanson's (Ward Councillor for Queen Edith's) representation covered the following issues
- i. Asked for clear justification for development of GB1 and 2. Flora and fauna was under stress.
 - ii. Queried if GB2 was deliverable as a site.
 - iii. Worts Causeway and Babraham Road were busy traffic through routes. This impacted on their being used as an access route.
 - iv. Infrastructure in Queen Edith's Ward was limited, sites would exacerbate existing issues.
11. Councillor Pippas' (Ward Councillor for Queen Edith's) representation covered the following issues representation covered the following issues:
- i. The green belt was an area of natural beauty that needed to be protected.
 - ii. Took issue with GB1 development.
 - iii. Acknowledged the need to build houses, but proposed using alternative sites to the green belt, such as brown field.

The Head of Planning Services responded as follows:

- i. The housing need figure had been established/evidenced.
- ii. Appendix H of the Officer's report showed the justification for housing figures and the reasons for site selection.
- iii. GB2 was a viable site.
- iv. Green belt sites were not required in 2005/6 when considered by the Local Plan Planning Inspector at the time, but were now so were being considered.
- v. A transport assessment would still be required for each site at the appropriate time.

13/30/DPSSC Cambridge Local Plan – Towards 2031 – draft Local Plan including the preferred approach to the Spatial Strategy, Vision and Objectives

Matter for Decision

The current local plan was adopted in July 2006 and runs to 2016 and beyond.

The Officer's report updated the strategic context for the preparation of the new local plan through the agreement amongst the authorities in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to endorse the adoption of a Memorandum of Co-operation on a spatial approach.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change

- i. Agreed that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation (and the technical work that as fed into that approach) be used as the basis for identifying the objectively assessed needs for homes and jobs in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014;
- ii. Agreed the Tranche 4 draft plan sections to be put forward into the composite full draft plan;
- iii. Considered feedback from this committee on the accompanying policy justification documents for each draft policy, which will be published alongside the draft plan as an audit trail of how the policy was evidenced, consulted on and assessed;
- iv. Endorsed the content of the associated evidence base documents for use as an evidence base for the review of the Local Plan and as a material consideration in planning decisions comprising:
 - the Employment Land Review Update 2013,
 - the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment update 2013,
 - the Retail and Leisure Update 2013,
 - City Centre Capacity Study 2013,
 - Student Accommodation – Affordable Housing, Financial Contributions Viability Study,
 - SHLAA and Potential Site Allocations High Level Viability Assessment 2013,
 - Technical Background Document – Part 2 Supplement
- v. Agreed that any amendments and editing changes that need to be made prior to the draft Local Plan version being put to Environment Scrutiny Committee and Full Council in June should be agreed by the Executive Councillor in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Planning Services regarding the draft Local Plan. She said a professional proof reader would review the document and pick up omissions, style changes and typographical errors prior to publication

In response to Members' questions the Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change, Head of Planning Services, Urban Design & Conservation Manager, Principal Planning Policy Officer, Consultant, Senior Sustainability Officer and Senior Planning Policy Officer said the following:

Appendix A

- i. DPSSC had viewed this appendix in previous meetings and it reflected comments thus far.

Appendix B

- ii. DPSSC had viewed this appendix in March 2013 and it was brought back for comment.
- iii. The County Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was being developed on a parallel timetable to the Local Plan. Members would be updated on progress at June 2013 Council, including the progress of neighbouring authorities in addressing strategic needs such as housing and transport.

Appendix C

- iv. The County Council were looking at the impact of the Transport Strategy on the city.
- v. The Area Action Plan looked at how the City Council could work with neighbouring authorities on the wider regeneration of the city.
- vi. Supplementary Planning Documents would still have a role in the planning process supporting the Local Plan with additional details.
- vii. It was noted that the public consultation had not supported development of the green belt, however alternative sites had not come forward to meet the identified need. Various sites needed to be considered to meet the council's identified development needs. The experience from other local plan examinations elsewhere was that Planning Inspectors were strictly applying the NPPF requirements and could penalise the Council for not planning to meet its needs.

Appendix D

- viii. A surcharge could not be imposed on top of the Community Infrastructure Levy charge for student accommodation.
- ix. It was difficult for Officers to specify if the provision of affordable housing or payment of a commuted sum was preferable; this would depend on circumstances. The 2006 Local Plan allowed the use of either option, this position could be reviewed as part of the consultation process for the plan.
- x. Homes in multiple occupation (HMOs) could be used for accommodation by students and others.
- xi. It was hard for local plan policy to be used to limit the number of class 4 HMO properties in an area.

Appendix E

- xii. Permeable paving to mitigate surface run-off was encouraged where gardens were converted into car parking spaces.
- xiii. The City Council was jointly working with the County Council on transport and public realm.
- xiv. Officers noted Member's concerns about developing open/recreational space. Officers explained that the policy will clarify the conditions that would be acceptable for relocated open spaces. Open space could only be developed if further open space, or better alternative recreational facilities were provided within 800m of housing. Members believed that a 400m threshold was a more appropriate distance from the original site for replacement open space. Officers agreed to amend the policy accordingly.
- xv. The policy tried to be flexible to provide quality open space. Officers undertook to review the wording of Policies 67 and 68 to ensure open space was protected, this amendment would be brought back to Environment Scrutiny Committee in future.

Councillor Marchant-Daisley formally proposed an amendment to the text of paragraph B of Policy 68: Open Space and Recreation Provision Through New Development as follows:

“if, taking into account the accessibility/capacity of existing open space facilities and the circumstances of the surrounding area, the open space needs of the proposed residential development can be **exceptionally** met more appropriately by providing either new or enhanced provision off-site”

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the amendment shown in bold.

- xvi. The Planning Committee would judge the merit of protecting trees or not in individual planning applications. It was not appropriate to specify a generic policy position as part of the strategy document.

Appendix F

- xvii. Policy 83 text amendments were set out on the amendment sheet. Health impact assessments would be completed as part of the planning application process.

Appendix H

- xviii. The justification of why sites had been identified as suitable for development were set out in Appendices A and B of the Local Plan; and Appendix H of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).
- xix. The Abbey Stadium was considered as a suitable site for housing in earlier stages of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment work but this had not been the case in the 2006 Plan. However the decision not to allocate a site for a community stadium meant it should not be identified as suitable for housing at this stage.

Appendix N

- xx. The Memorandum of Co-operation summarised the technical work that Councillors on the Cambridgeshire wide Planning and Strategic Transport Governance group have signed up to. The technical work pulled together a number of forecasting models into one evidence base. This was supplemented by the strategic housing market assessment work.
- xxi. The City Council had been involved in the development of the Memorandum of Co-operation. It needed to be adopted by the council as part of the evidence base for the preparation of the local plan.

The Chair decided that the recommendations highlighted in the Officer's report should be voted on and recorded separately:

The Committee unanimously approved recommendation (i).

The Committee approved recommendation (ii) by 3 votes to 0.

The Committee approved recommendation (iii) by 3 votes to 0.

The Committee approved recommendation (iv) by 3 votes to 0.

The Committee unanimously approved recommendation (v).

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

The meeting ended at 5.10 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE29 May 2013
5.30 - 7.45 pm**Present:** Councillors Reid (Chair), Saunders (Vice-Chair), Blencowe, Brierley, Marchant-Daisley and Price

Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change: Councillor Ward

Officers:

Head of Strategic Housing: Alan Carter

Head of Planning Services: Patsy Dell

Principal Planning Policy Officer: Joanna Gilbert-Wooldridge

Senior Planning Policy Officer: Bruce Waller

Planning Policy & Economic Development Officer: Stephen Miles

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Other Officers Present:

Housing Strategy Manager: Helen Reed

Urban Design & Conservation Manager: Glen Richardson

Urban Extensions Project Manager: Julian Sykes

Senior Sustainability Officer: Emma Davies

Senior Planning Policy Officer: Nancy Kimberley

Senior Conservation and Design Officer: Susan Smith

Senior Planning Policy Officer: Brendan Troy

Sustainable Drainage Engineer: Simon Bunn

Urban Designer: Matthew Paul

Consultant: Myles Greensmith

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**13/31/DPSSC Declarations Of Interest**

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Blackhurst	13/32/DPSSC	Personal: Member of Trumpington Resident's Association.
Councillor Blencowe	13/32/DPSSC	Personal: Chair of YMCA Football Club.
Councillor	13/32/DPSSC	Personal: Member of RSPB and Wildlife

Price		Trust.
Councillors Price & Ward	13/32/DPSSC	Personal: Member of Conservators of the River Cam.
Councillors Reid & Saunders	13/32/DPSSC	Personal: Member of Cambridge Past, Present & Future.
Councillors Saunders	13/32/DPSSC	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

13/32/DPSSC Cambridge Local Plan – Towards 2031 – Draft Local Plan

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report concerned the full composite version of the new Cambridge Local Plan to be known as the Cambridge Local Plan 2014.

Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee has on various occasions considered and commented on individual draft sections of the new Plan, and the final sections to be considered appear earlier on the agenda for this meeting.

The report presented the complete version of the Plan for consideration at this meeting, prior to Environment Scrutiny Committee on 11 June, and thereafter, to Full Council.

If Full Council approves the Plan, it will be published for a form of public consultation in which anybody may lodge formal representations. Environment Scrutiny Committee and Full Council will consider those representations in early 2014 and it will then be submitted to the Secretary of State for public examination by an independent planning inspector.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change

- i. Agreed the composite version of the full Cambridge Local Plan subject to any changes recommended by the Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee, for consideration by Environment Scrutiny Committee on 11 June and Full Council on 27 June (including the endorsement of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation).
- ii. Recommended to Environment Scrutiny Committee and Full Council that the Plan is approved for the purposes of publication under

Regulations 19 and 20 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

- iii. Agreed that any amendments and editing changes that need to be made to the Local Plan (and associated Sustainability Appraisal and other appendices) versions put to Environment Scrutiny Committee and Full Council be agreed by the Executive Councillor in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Planning Services regarding the Cambridge Local Plan.

Members of the public asked a number of questions, and made representations as set out below.

1. Mr Mead's representations covered the following issues:

- i. **The green belt to the south of Cambridge had lost a high percentage of some flora and fauna since 1945.**
- ii. **The green belt needed to be protected to protect the habitat of birds, animals and insects, particularly important ones.**
- iii. **Birds nested away from housing. Moving housing (ie building more) would push birds further away.**
- iv. **The development of the green belt set a bad precedent that should only occur in exceptional circumstances.**

The Head of Planning Services said the biodiversity of Worts Causeway had been considered in Officer recommendations. She referred to local Plan Section 3.

In response to Members' questions the Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change, Head of Planning Services, Head of Strategic Housing, Principal Planning Policy Officer, Senior Planning Policy Officer and Planning Policy & Economic Development Officer said the following:

- i. Since the last DPSSC, Dixon Searle Consultants had undertaken research that showed developments of under ten properties could viably provide affordable housing and meet their likely obligations under the Community Infrastructure Levy. Further research was required and would be brought back to DPSSC at a future date. This should set out the threshold for seeking affordable housing and identifying those circumstances when a commuted sum would be acceptable.
- ii. The Council was exploring flexibility regarding occupiers' right to buy with Central Government.
- iii. Housing Co-operatives were not specifically mentioned in the Local Plan, but were in the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document.
- iv. The Senior Planning Policy Officer undertook to do a health check of planning issues and what policies should apply.

Section 5

- v. Policy 44 would be revisited to prevent unintended loss of housing.
- vi. Policy needs to be objective, rather than being too prescriptive. It should refer to quantifiable facts such as scale and mass, rather than subjective areas such as fusing old buildings with new.

Section 6

- vii. Houses that fell outside of sui generis usage needed to be licensed as homes in multiple occupation (HMOs).
- viii. Applications for HMOs would be judged on their merits, taking environmental health comments into account.
- ix. Space requirements were in-line with other authorities.
- x. Referred to amendment sheet page 3.

Section 7

- xi. Letter boxes required under this policy would have to be accessible from the street.

Section 8

- xii. Policy 73d-g is robust enough (with its supporting evidence base as set out in Appendix A of the Officer's report) to demonstrate strategic leisure needs. Provision would be assessed as individual planning applications came forward. The Council had a Retail and Leisure Strategy.
- xiii. All sites were tested through the issues and options paper against criteria agreed by the members. Sites that did not meet the criteria were dropped, although they may have been listed as possible sites in the 2006 Local Plan and further stages of the Strategic Housing Land

Availability Assessment (SHLAA) process. For example, the Abbey Stadium.

- xiv. Previous planning policy referred to different grades of hotels, whereas new policy encouraged high quality hotels (ie not budget ones).
- xv. Reiterated planning policy was to provide general guidance, individual planning applications would reviewed on a case by case basis to judge viability.

Councillor Herbert formally proposed an amendment to the text of paragraph D of Policy 77: Development and Expansion of Hotels: To delete the words “suitably located”.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the amendment.

Appendix F

- xvi. Officers undertook to check if Local Plan Policy 5 would aim to retain industrial areas on Kings Hedges Road for industrial use.

The Committee resolved by 3 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

The meeting ended at 7.45 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

9 July 2013
4.30 - 5.10 pm

Present: Councillors Reid (Chair), Saunders (Vice-Chair), Blencowe, Brierley and Price

Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change: Councillor Ward

Officers Present:

Head of Planning: Patsy Dell

Principal Planning Policy Officer: Joanna Gilbert-Wooldridge

Senior Planning Policy Officer: Brendan Troy

Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

13/32/DPSSC Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Marchant-Daisley.

13/33/DPSSC Declarations of Interest

No interests were declared.

13/34/DPSSC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the 16th April 2013 were agreed as a correct record.

13/35/DPSSC Public Questions (See Below)

Malcolm Schofield

Malcolm Schofield addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- Previous meetings of the Committee had considered public concerns about the impact of developments on wildlife.
- The Cambridge North East site merits a full wildlife investigation.
- Developers are already looking at the opportunities in the area and future decisions deserve to be Council led and not developer driven.

The Head of Planning responded. She stated that her team were already preparing an Area Action Plan for the site which would include a full wildlife and bio diversity study. This would involve joint working with South Cambridgeshire District Council. No development would be permitted until the document was in place.

Malcolm Schofield

Joint working will be the key and will be essential when areas such as Fen Road Travellers site are considered.

Councillor Ward stated that the boundaries of the Area Action Plan had not yet been finalised and would be agreed in consultation with South Cambridgeshire DC. However, there was already agreement that the traveller's site would not be redeveloped.

Ruling in of Late Agenda Item

The Chair ruled that under 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 the late item Cambridge City Council Local Development Scheme 2013 be considered despite not being made publicly available for this Committee five clear days prior to the meeting.

13/36/DPSSC An Update to the Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council Infrastructure Delivery Study

Matter for Decision:

In March 2010 Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council commissioned an Infrastructure Delivery Study. It was endorsed as an evidence base document for the Cambridge Local Plan Review and the Cambridge Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee in September 2012. The document was agreed as a live document that can be updated over time to reflect changing circumstances such as changes in the planned level of provision of housing and employment.

This update had been carried out to reflect the now agreed planned levels of provision emerging through the Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Local Plan Reviews. The updated Infrastructure Delivery Study sets out when and where infrastructure will need to be provided, the scale of funding needed to achieve this and potential sources of funding.

The study had been produced in collaboration with infrastructure and community service providers in order to obtain first hand views on requirements. The output is a study that provides the Council with an evidence base to support its planning policies on infrastructure and developer contributions. The document would form a key part of the evidence base at both Local Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy examinations.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change:

The Executive Councillor resolved:

- i. To endorse the update to the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Delivery Study Update for use as an evidence base document for the Draft Cambridge Local Plan 2031 and the Cambridge Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Reason for the Decision:

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected:

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations:

The Committee received a report from the Senior Planning Policy Officer regarding the update to the Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council infrastructure delivery study.

The Officer clarified the following points in response to questions from the Committee.

- i. Page 120, Ref 396. The apparent shortfall in education funding could be due an existing deficiency. The Head of Planning would investigate this issue and include any corrections in the final version of the report which will be submitted as part of the evidence base at both Local Plan and CIL examinations. .
- ii. Questions were asked regarding leisure provision and the Head of Planning confirmed that while s106 money could not be used to fund existing deficiencies and that CIL should not be used to remedy pre-existing deficiencies unless those deficiencies will be made more severe by new development.
- iii. CIL could also be used to fund utility infrastructure. However, this was thought to be unlikely in Cambridgeshire.

Action

The Committee agreed that it was very difficult for them to scrutinise the document in its current form, and without more detailed background information. The Head of Planning confirmed that the document had been presented at this stage due to its links to the Local Plan. However, the Committee would get further opportunities to scrutinise the document as governance processes and approaches to determining funding priorities were developed.

The Committee resolved by 2 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted)

Not applicable.

13/37/DPSSC Small Sites Affordable Housing Viability Assessment

The Council was in the process of reviewing its Local Plan in order to plan and manage development to 2031. In order to inform development of the Council's affordable housing policy position, the Council commissioned consultants to carry out a high level assessment of the likely potential for the provision of affordable housing on smaller sites than currently required through the adopted Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (15 units). This may be either through on-site provision of affordable housing or via a financial contribution mechanism.

The findings of the draft report (Supplementary Report Small Sites –Affordable Housing Viability) informed the development of the draft policy on affordable housing which was reported to and agreed at Full Council on 27 June 2013.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change:

The Executive Councillor resolved:

- i. To endorse the content of the Supplementary Report on Small Sites – Affordable Housing Viability 2013, the findings of which have been used as a part of development of the draft affordable housing policy agreed at Full Council on 27 June 2013, for use as an evidence base for the review of the Local Plan and as a material consideration in planning decisions.

Reason for the Decision:

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected:

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations:

The Committee received a report from the Principal Planning Policy Officer regarding the Small Sites Affordable Housing Viability Assessment.

The Committee asked the following questions regarding commuted sums:

- i. Could they be added to right to buy receipts?
- ii. How long could the financial contributions be kept before they had to be spent?
- iii. Who was the money available to?
- iv. Could Housing Associations access it?

The Principal Planning Policy Officer stated that she would investigate if commuted sums could be added to right to buy receipts. She agreed to contact the Legal and Housing Departments for guidance regarding the how long the financial contributions could be kept for. She further agreed to contact the Strategic Housing Manager for more information on which organisations could access the money.

Action

In response to questions from the Committee, the Head of Planning confirmed that an Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document would be prepared and was planned to be available ready for adoption of the new local plan. This would include a methodology for calculating commuted sums.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted)

Not applicable.

13/38/DPSSC Cambridge City Council Local Development Scheme 2013**Matter for Decision:**

Cambridge City Council is required to maintain a Local Development Scheme (LDS). An LDS sets out a timetable for the production of new or revised Development Plan Documents (such as a Local Plan).

Following Full Council approval on 27th June 2013 of the Proposed Submission Cambridge Local Plan, it is necessary to update the Council's LDS with the latest timetable and publish it on our website.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change:

The Executive Councillor resolved to:

- i. Approve the updated Local Development Scheme 2013 and agree to it being brought into effect on 10 July 2013.

Reason for the Decision:

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected:

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations:

The Committee received a report from the Principal Planning Policy Officer regarding Cambridge City Council Local Development Scheme 2013.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of interest declared by the Executive Councillor (and any dispensations granted)

Not applicable.

The meeting ended at 5.10 pm

CHAIR



To: Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate
Change: Councillor Tim Ward
Report by: Head of Planning Services
Relevant scrutiny committee: Development Plan Scrutiny Sub- 10/09/2013
committee: Committee
Wards affected: All Wards

PROPOSED RESPONSE TO SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLAN (PROPOSED SUBMISSION CONSULTATION AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY – PRELIMINARY DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE CONSULTATION)

Non Key Decision

1. Background

- 1.1 The City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council have a long history of joint working on planning matters, particularly on plan-making. As part of the duty to cooperate, the three councils have worked collaboratively and in parallel on new local plans and a transport strategy for the Cambridge area. This approach will ensure that cross-boundary issues and relevant wider matters are addressed in a consistent and joined-up manner.
- 1.2 Members will be aware that on 19 July 2013, the City Council published its Local Plan – Proposed Submission document for consultation until 30 September 2013. On the same day, South Cambridgeshire District Council published their South Cambridgeshire Local Plan – Proposed Submission document for consultation. Their consultation runs from 19 July through to 14 October 2013.
- 1.3 In appraising the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, the key issue for the City Council is to ensure that South Cambridgeshire's policies are aligned with those in the City Council's local plan and

the overarching development strategy that the councils have agreed is reflected in the plan.

- 1.4 Additionally, South Cambridgeshire District Council also issued their Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule for consultation from 19 July to 30 September 2013.
- 1.5 This report includes the suggested representations to the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and their Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule for agreement by Members. Once finalised, these representations will be submitted to South Cambridgeshire District Council in advance of the two consultation deadlines of 14 October 2013 and 30 September 2013.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 This report is being submitted to the Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee for prior consideration and comment before decision by the Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change.
- 2.2 The Executive Councillor is recommended to agree the representations to the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan – Proposed Submission set out in Section 7 of the report and that these are submitted to South Cambridgeshire District Council as Cambridge City Council’s formal response to the consultation.
- 2.3 The Executive Councillor is recommended to agree the representations to the South Cambridgeshire Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule set out Section 9 of the report and that these are submitted to South Cambridgeshire District Council as Cambridge City Council’s formal response to the consultation.

3. Plan making and the Duty to Co-operate

- 3.1 At the start of this year, the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England (the East of England Plan) was formally revoked by statutory instrument, along with its addendum relating to Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation. At the same time, all of the remaining policies from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 were revoked. This means that there is no

longer any requirement for the emerging local plans in Cambridgeshire to comply with, or have regard to, any “higher level” strategic development plan (although each plan will be tested for its consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework).

3.2 An important obligation introduced by the Localism Act 2011 is the “duty to co-operate”, which requires local planning authorities and a wide range of other bodies to co-operate with one another in certain defined activities relating to plan making. In Cambridge’s case, co-operation between the City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council has been, and will continue to be, critical. At the strategic level, the approach to identifying objectively assessed needs for homes and jobs and to strategic issues has been set out in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation and Spatial Approach.

3.3 “Co-operation” does not necessarily mean that there must be complete agreement by all parties on every aspect of the Plan; but there must be evidence of joint-working wherever appropriate and attempts to agree on such matters as an evidence base, infrastructure needs, cross-boundary development needs etc. This has been achieved through a close working relationship with South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council through the various stages of plan preparation to date and as overseen by the Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning member governance group. This close working will continue through to submission to the Secretary of State. As a result, there is a high degree of consistency between the local plans for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and the proposed Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (see separate agenda item on the transport strategy).

4. Plan making in South Cambridgeshire

4.1 The current South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF) suite of documents was adopted between January 2007 and January 2010. They set out a vision, policies and proposals for development and land use in South Cambridgeshire to 2016 and beyond for some longer term proposals, e.g. Northstowe. The LDF gives effect to a sustainable development strategy taken from the last Structure Plan and East of England Plan, and includes a sequence of development in South Cambridgeshire with:

- a. development on the edge of Cambridge on land removed from the Green Belt;
- b. the new town of Northstowe;
- c. development in the larger and better served villages designated as Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.

4.2 However, South Cambridgeshire District Council agreed in 2011 to review its plans, with adoption of a new local plan by early 2015 in line with Cambridge's timetable for the production of a new local plan and the County Council's production of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.

5. Content of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan – Proposed Submission (July 2013)

5.1 The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan follows a similar structure to Cambridge City Council's own local plan. It includes a vision, strategic objectives, and specific chapters relating to the future spatial strategy and other topic areas. The chapters are as follows:

- Chapter 1: Introduction which describes the overall purpose of the document;
- Chapter 2: Spatial Strategy sets out the vision and objectives and development needs for South Cambridgeshire to 2031 together with the spatial strategy which focuses development, in priority order, on the edge of Cambridge, at new towns/new villages; and in selected villages. It also has policies for small scale development in villages. It includes a policy about phasing, delivering and monitoring of the Plan to ensure that it continues to meet its objectives;
- Chapter 3: Strategic Sites contains the strategic sites that will contribute most to the delivery of sustainable development in South Cambridgeshire. These sites are:
 - Completion of Orchard Park (allocated for 900 homes);
 - Expansion of the allocated site at land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road (Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document 2010) to provide for 1,000 homes. Despite the site having increased in size, the notional capacity has reduced from 1,100 homes to 1,000 homes;
 - Safeguarding of Majority of Cambridge East and allocation of land north of Newmarket Road for 1,200 homes and north of Cherry Hinton for 110 homes;

- A new town north of Waterbeach for 8,000 to 9,000 homes, 1,400 of which by 2031;
 - A new village based on Bourn Airfield for 3,500 homes, 1,700 of which by 2031;
 - A major expansion of Cambourne for a fourth linked village of 1,200 homes, all of which by 2031.
- Chapter 4: Climate Change is concerned with sustainable development, climate change, water resources and flooding;
 - Chapter 5: Delivering High Quality Places is concerned with design, landscape, and public realm;
 - Chapter 6: Protecting and Enhancing the Natural and Historic Environment contains proposals to protect and enhance the historic built and the natural environment;
 - Chapter 7: Delivering High Quality Homes is concerned with delivering high quality housing and includes village housing sites;
 - Chapter 8: Building a Strong and Competitive Economy deals with the economy, including sections on employment, retail and tourism and development sites;
 - Chapter 9: Promoting Successful Communities deals with the provision of open space, leisure facilities and community facilities;
 - Chapter 10: Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and Infrastructure covers a wide range of infrastructure matters.

A copy of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and its supporting documents can be found at <http://www.scamb.gov.uk/localplan>.

6. Key Issues for Cambridge

6.1 Much of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan – Proposed Submission is not directly relevant to the city council’s administrative area as it relates to development within the extensive rural area outside of Cambridge. That said, all of the plan has been reviewed to ensure there are no issues of concern in these policies. The Council can be supportive of the approach set out within the plan and has worked jointly with South Cambridgeshire District Council on a range of issues. The areas of particular interest for Cambridge are discussed in the draft representations in Section 7 of this report. These issues include:

- Overall spatial strategy;

- Site specific policies relating to Orchard Park and land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road;
- Cambridge Northern Fringe East and Cambridge East;
- Provision of residential moorings;
- Allocation of land at Peterhouse Technology Park;
- Lighting, noise, contaminated land and air quality issues.

6.2 The draft representations detailed in Section 7 of this report are linked to specific policies or paragraphs within the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan – Proposed Submission document. Any representations of over 100 words will be summarised by officers following member steer, with both the full submission and the summary text being provided to South Cambridgeshire District Council. Where no summary has been provided, the draft representation is itself under 100 words. (The 100 word summary is a required element of submitting representations via South Cambridgeshire District Council’s representation processing system).

6.3 For each representation, the Council is required to set out the reason for its support or objection to a policy/paragraph in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan – Proposed Submission; suggested changes to text; and the soundness of the policy/paragraph within the plan. Soundness is a technical issue which is relevant once a development plan document reaches the current stage. The starting point for the plan’s examination is the assumption that a council has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan. Those seeking changes should demonstrate why the plan is unsound by reference to one or more of the soundness criteria. The tests of soundness are set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (paragraph 182) which reads:

The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is “sound” – namely that it is:

- ***Positively prepared*** – *the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is*

reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;

- **Justified** – *the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;*
- **Effective** – *the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and*
- **Consistent with national policy** – *the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.*

7. Proposed Representations on South Cambridgeshire Local Plan – Proposed Submission (July 2013)

Chapter 2 - Spatial Strategy

Policy S/5 Provision of New Jobs and Homes	
Nature of Representation:	Support
Representation:	Cambridge City Council is broadly supportive of the spatial strategy set out in the plan and welcomes South Cambridgeshire District Council’s commitment to deliver 22,000 additional jobs and 19,000 new homes in the plan period, which is in line with the apportionment of homes across Cambridgeshire as agreed in the May 2013 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation.
Change to the Plan:	None
Soundness:	N/A

Policy S/6 The Development Strategy to 2031	
Nature of Representation:	Support B.
Representation:	Cambridge City Council is broadly supportive of the spatial strategy set out in the plan and welcomes South Cambridgeshire District Council's commitment to deliver 22,000 additional jobs and 19,000 new homes in the plan period, which is in line with the apportionment of homes across Cambridgeshire as agreed in the May 2013 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation.
Change to the Plan:	None C.
Soundness:	N/A

Chapter 3 - Strategic Sites

Policy SS/1 Orchard Park	
Nature of Representation:	Support
Representation:	Cambridge City Council is concerned about the quality of life experienced by existing and future residents of Orchard Park, due to the air quality and noise issues created by the close proximity of the A14 to the site. We therefore strongly support inclusion of Policy SS/1 clause 3 and its sub-clauses.
Change to the Plan:	None
Soundness:	N/A

Paragraph 3.5 (Supporting text to Policy SS/1: Orchard Park)	
Nature of Representation:	Object
Representation:	Cambridge City Council supports the ongoing sustainable development of Orchard Park. However, the reference made to the need for a high quality landmark building on the south west corner of the Orchard Park site, fronting Histon Road and Kings Hedges Road, is of concern. The term 'landmark' is considered unnecessary within this paragraph, as it can often denote a building of significant height. A suitable high quality building which effectively addresses this prominent corner

	location is considered to be a more appropriate representation of the type of development which should happen in this location.
Change to the Plan:	Amend the final sentence of paragraph 3.5 to read “A high quality building will therefore be required, which addresses the prominent corner and provides an appropriate frontage to Histon Road, reflecting its edge of City location and the need to respect the separation with Histon and Impington village to the north of the A14.”
Soundness:	Justified

Policy SS/2 Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road

Paragraph 3.16 (Supporting text to Policy SS/2 Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road)

Paragraph 3.18 (Supporting text to Policy SS/2 Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road)

Nature of Representation:	Object
Representation:	<p>With reference to part 2b of the policy and associated paragraph 3.16, this should refer to a design code requirement rather than design guides/design codes. NIAB1 is design coded already and it is important to be consistent, given the contiguous nature of the developments at Darwin Green/NIAB. The design code should be site-wide, rather than having a different design guide/code for each phase as is suggested in the policy. Both Darwin Green 2 and 3 are relatively small sites and coding on a site-wide basis would make more sense.</p> <p>Clause 5 of the policy and associated paragraph 3.18 refer to provision for off-site services and facilities in relation to Darwin Green 2 and 3 being located within NIAB1’s local centre. This needs further consideration because there will be limited space in the NIAB1 local centre for additional facilities to service Darwin Green 2 and 3. There could also be revenue funding implications for Cambridge City Council. As such, this clause should include reference to "subject to agreement with Cambridge City Council as the relevant local</p>

	<p>planning authority" or similar wording. Contributions to off-site facilities should therefore include a reference to "including pump-priming revenue funding where appropriate."</p> <p>Cambridge City Council is also concerned about the quality of life experienced by future residents of land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, due to the air quality and noise issues created by the close proximity of the A14 to the site. We support Policy SS/2 clause 13, particularly the reference to landscaped buffers, but would recommend that both noise and air quality issues are fully investigated and resolved through an Environmental Impact Assessment or pre-application submissions in addition to planning conditions and obligations.</p> <p>Summary (100 words) Cambridge City Council is concerned about continuity of approach for NIAB1 and Darwin Green 2 and 3 developments and about air quality and noise issues created by the close proximity of the A14 to the site. The approach to design coding and to the provision of community facilities for suggested in our full representation would help ensure high quality developments for both Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.</p>
<p>Change to the Plan:</p>	<p>Replace "Design Guides/ Design Codes for each phase of development" with "Design Codes for the development" within clause 2b. Reference to Design Guides should also be removed from paragraph 3.16 (sentence 3).</p> <p>Replace the final section of clause 5 of the policy, which currently reads "the planning obligation will include a requirement for contributions to the provision of offsite services and facilities," with "the planning obligation will be subject to agreement with Cambridge City Council as the relevant local planning authority and will include a requirement for contributions to the provision of offsite services and facilities, including pump-priming revenue funding where appropriate."</p>

	<p>Paragraph 3.18 should also be amended to read: “All necessary community services and facilities will be provided by the development, either onsite or through contributions to off-site provision secured through a planning obligation, for example in the local centre proposed in the adjoining development in Cambridge City if masterplanning determines this is most appropriate and deliverable. If the provision is made offsite within the adjoining development, this provision will be subject to agreement with Cambridge City Council as the relevant local planning authority and will need to include pump-priming revenue funding where appropriate. Open space provision will also provide opportunities for enhanced nature conservation value, and will enable quiet enjoyment of the natural environment.”</p> <p>Replace the second sentence of clause 13 with “If necessary, development will be subject to measures, which may include <u>Environmental Impact Assessment, pre-application submissions and the use of planning conditions and / or planning obligations</u>, a landscaped buffer, and layout and design measures, to mitigate the effects of air pollution and noise caused by traffic using the A14 north of the site and Histon Road east of the site. Noise attenuation fencing will not be permitted.”</p>
Soundness:	Effective and Justified

Policy SS/3 Cambridge East	
Nature of Representation:	Support
Representation:	Cambridge City Council is working in parallel with South Cambridgeshire District Council to prepare respective Local Plans. As part of this joint work, the Councils have undertaken the production of complementary policies on Cambridge East in their respective plans. Cambridge City Council supports the approach taken in policy SS/3 on Cambridge East.
Change to the Plan:	None
Soundness:	N/A

Policy SS/4 Cambridge Northern Fringe East and land surrounding the proposed Cambridge Science Park Station	
Nature of Representation:	Support
Representation:	Cambridge City Council is working in parallel with South Cambridgeshire District Council to prepare respective Local Plans. As part of this joint work, the Councils have undertaken the production of complementary policies on Cambridge Northern Fringe East and land surrounding the proposed Cambridge Science Park Station in their respective plans. Cambridge City Council supports the approach taken in policy SS/4 on Cambridge Northern Fringe East and land surrounding the proposed Cambridge Science Park Station. Cambridge City Council welcomes the opportunity for continued joint working with South Cambridgeshire District Council on the production of an area action plan for this area.
Change to the Plan:	None
Soundness:	N/A

Chapter 4 - Climate Change

Policy CC/6 Construction Methods	
Nature of Representation:	Object
Representation:	Cambridge City Council has made reference in its draft local plan (Figure 4.1) to the need to comply with the County Council's RECAP Waste Management Design Guide. To ensure a consistent approach to waste management across the sub-region, it would be appropriate to make reference to this document within Policy CC/6 or supporting text to ensure robust reasoning and justification for sustainable waste management at all new properties. It is recognised that there is reference to construction waste, but consideration needs to be given to waste and recycling for individual properties at an early stage and throughout the planning process.
Change to the Plan:	Insert "Reference should be made to the requirements set out in Cambridgeshire County

	Council's RECAP Waste Management Design Guide" in the policy or its supporting text.
Soundness:	Justified

Chapter 7- Delivering High Quality Homes

Policy H/6 Residential Moorings	
Nature of Representation:	Support
Representation:	Cambridge City Council has also proposed the allocation of a site (RM1) for residential moorings at Fen Road, Cambridge. The South Cambridgeshire H/6 site lies directly adjacent to Cambridge City Council's site RM1. Cambridge City Council therefore supports the allocation of site H/6 within the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan – Proposed Submission as it renders the RM1 site within the city's administrative boundary more developable, with the potential for positive impacts upon the river in terms of residential and leisure moorings.
Change to the Plan:	None
Soundness:	N/A

Chapter 8 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Policy E/2 Fulbourn Road East (Fulbourn) 6.9 Hectares	
Nature of Representation:	Support
Representation:	Cambridge City Council has proposed the allocation of two sites (GB3 and GB4) adjacent to Peterhouse Technology Park. Cambridge City Council recognises that the allocation site E/2 in tandem with the two sites in the city provide scope for ongoing employment development at Peterhouse Technology Park. Cambridge City Council therefore supports the allocation of this site and welcomes the recognition of the importance of the creation of landscaped buffers to the site and the need to achieve a suitable profile and setting of the development adjacent to the Cambridge Green Belt boundary.
Change to the Plan:	None

Soundness:	N/A
-------------------	-----

Chapter 9 - Promoting Successful Communities

Policy SC/10 Lighting Proposals	
Nature of Representation:	Object
Representation:	Cambridge City Council supports the control of lighting proposals set out in the policy. However, bearing in mind cross-boundary sites and the benefits of both councils having a co-ordinated approach, this policy could benefit from mention of ecological impact in addition to the stated clauses. Cambridge City Council would therefore suggest insertion of an additional clause (f) to read “Impact on wildlife is minimised, particularly in countryside areas.”
Change to the Plan:	Insert an additional clause (f) to Policy SC/10 to read “Impact on wildlife is minimised, particularly in countryside areas.”
Soundness:	Consistent with national policy

Policy SC/11 Noise Pollution	
Nature of Representation:	Object
Representation:	Cambridge City Council supports the aims of Policy SC/11 in addressing noise pollution, but considers that the policy would benefit from a minor change to Policy SC/11 clause 4 to replace “Noise level at nearby existing noise sensitive premises...” with “Noise level at the boundary of the premises subject to the application and having regard to noise sensitive premise...” This is considered appropriate as it would mean that there would be no worsening of noise levels beyond the application site’s boundary.
Change to the Plan:	Replace existing text in Policy SC/11 clause 4 which reads “Noise level at nearby existing noise sensitive premises...” with “Noise level at the boundary of the premises subject to the application and having regard to noise sensitive premise...”
Soundness:	Justified

Policy SC/13 Air Quality	
Nature of Representation:	Support
Representation:	Cambridge City Council supports Policy SC/13 on Air Quality as it represents a comprehensive and effective policy, which incorporates all of the necessary protections and, in addition, promotes low emissions strategies. The Council acknowledges the housing proposed through strategic site allocations, creating additional transport impact on Air Quality Management Areas in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. The impact of these developments in transport terms is considered in the current Draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. However, site-specific air quality issues for these major developments can be addressed using Policy SC/13 Air Quality in tandem with policies on specific sites.
Change to the Plan:	None
Soundness:	N/A

8. South Cambridgeshire Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

- 8.1 This consultation document sets out South Cambridgeshire District Council's preliminary rates of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The CIL was introduced under the Planning Act 2008 and is a levy that Local Authorities can charge on new developments to fund infrastructure needed to support development.
- 8.2 The CIL regulations 2010 with subsequent amendments, and statutory guidance, give guidance to councils implementing the levy. Before a CIL charging schedule is adopted, it must go through two formal rounds of consultation followed by an independent examination. The first formal stage is the development of a Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule for consultation. The second stage of consultation is for the Draft Charging Schedule.
- 8.3 Cambridge City Council has already undertaken consultation on its Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule in March and April 2013.

The Draft Charging Schedule for Cambridge is currently being prepared and is timetabled for discussion at Environment Scrutiny Committee on 8 October 2013 prior to consultation during November and December 2013.

- 8.4 South Cambridgeshire's Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule includes rates which are broadly similar to those proposed in Cambridge City Council's Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule. South Cambridgeshire's Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule can be found at <http://www.scambs.gov.uk/cilpdc>. The two sets of rates are set out in Table 7.1 below for comparison purposes.

Table 8.1: South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule Rates

Accommodation Type	South Cambridgeshire	Cambridge
Residential	£100 per sq m	£125 per sq m (includes student accommodation)
Residential on land north of Cherry Hinton at Teversham Drift	£125 per sq m	£125 per sq m
Residential on six named and zoned strategic sites (i.e. the main locations for their proposed growth)	£0 per sq m	No similar zoning proposal
Retail (large)	£125 per sq m	£75 sq m
Retail (small)	£50 per sq m	£75 sq m
Business	£0 per sq m	£0 per sq m
Other uses	£0 per sq m	£0 per sq m

- 8.5 Following a review of the consultation papers, the proposals seem appropriate and are not incompatible nor would cause any conflict with the City Council's CIL intentions. It is therefore recommended that we confirm to South Cambridgeshire District Council that we have the following representations in Section 9 of this report to make at this stage of their emerging CIL.

9. Proposed Representations on South Cambridgeshire's Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (July 2013)

1. Do you agree that SCDC should introduce a CIL Charging Schedule?

Yes. Cambridge City Council is happy that the joined up approach that exists in relation to other aspects of joined up working also applies to the introduction of CIL.

2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?

No. This is at the discretion of the Council. Cambridge City Council does not intend to introduce a discretionary relief policy but will keep the situation under review.

3. Do you have any views on the introduction of an instalment policy for CIL payments?

Cambridge City Council feels that an instalment policy, which would help to provide the development industry with consistency and certainty, could usefully be worked up between the two authorities. Cambridge City Council will consult South Cambridgeshire District Council prior to publishing a Draft Instalment Policy.

4. Do you think there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate an infrastructure funding gap?

Yes. The Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council Infrastructure Delivery Study 2012 and Update 2013 provide sufficient evidence of an infrastructure funding gap for both authorities.

5. Do you have a view on what infrastructure projects should be prioritised by the District Council

Governance arrangements for the prioritisation of infrastructure projects that have cross boundary or strategic implications need to be worked up in conjunction with Cambridge City Council and other key stakeholders, such as Cambridgeshire County Council.

6. Do you agree with the proposed rates for residential use?

Cambridge City Council does not disagree with the proposed rates. Broadly speaking, the rates proposed are similar to those which have been proposed in the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule for

Cambridge City Council, consulted on in March-April 2013. The Council welcomes the fact that the rate proposed on residential land North of Teversham Drift, which crosses boundary with Cambridge City Council is £125 per sq.m, the same as the proposed Cambridge City rate.

7. Do you agree with the proposed rates for retail use?

Cambridge City Council has no objection to the proposed rates for retail use.

8. Do you agree with the proposed rates for business use?

Cambridge City Council has no objection to the proposed rates for business use, as it is borne out by the approach already taken by Cambridge City Council for this type of use.

9. Do you consider that the District Council should apply a rate for any other use?

The supporting viability evidence identified the potential to levy a charge of up to £125 per sq.m on student accommodation, if occurring at or near to the District/City border. The decision not to levy a charge may relate to the scale of development set to come forward in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan but Cambridge City Council would like a clear explanation as to why South Cambridgeshire District Council have opted not to levy a charge.

10. Do you agree that the District Council should maintain the use of planning obligations to fund onsite infrastructure on strategic development sites?

Yes. This is the most appropriate approach for sites of this scale.

11. Do you agree that the Council should have a zero residential rate for strategic development sites?

Cambridge City Council recognises that the proposed rate is a matter for the appropriate charging authority in terms of striking an appropriate balance and acknowledges that the ability to develop viably the sites and scale of development identified in the Local Plan should not be threatened by inappropriate CIL rates.

10. Implications

(a) Financial Implications

10.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from this report.

(b) Staffing Implications

10.2 There are no direct staffing implications arising from this report.

(c) Equal Opportunities Implications

10.3 There are no direct equal opportunities impacts arising from this report.

(d) Environmental Implications

10.4 Decisions made in the process of producing the new Local Plan for South Cambridgeshire have scope to have direct environmental implications for Cambridge. Cambridge City Council will work with South Cambridgeshire District Council to ensure the most sustainable outcomes for the area.

(e) Consultation

10.5 There are no direct consultation implications arising from this report.

(f) Community Safety

10.6 There are no direct community safety implications arising from this report.

11. Background Papers

These background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan – Proposed Submission (July 2013)
- Cambridge Local Plan 2014 – Proposed Submission (July 2013)
- South Cambridgeshire Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (July 2013)

- Cambridge Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule Consultation Document (March 2013)

12. Appendices

- None

13. Inspection of papers

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Author's Name: Joanna Gilbert-Wooldridge
Author's Phone Number: 01223 457183
Author's Email: joanna.gilbert-wooldridge@cambridge.gov.uk



To: Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate
Change: Councillor Tim Ward
Report by: Head of Planning Services
Relevant scrutiny committee: Development Plan Scrutiny Sub- 10/09/2013
committee: Committee
Wards affected: All Wards

PROPOSED CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S DRAFT TRANSPORT STRATEGY FOR CAMBRIDGE AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE (TSC&SC)

Non Key Decision

1. Background

- 1.1 The City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council have a long history of joint working on planning matters, particularly on plan-making. As part of the duty to cooperate, the three councils have agreed to work collaboratively and in parallel on new local plans and a transport strategy for the Cambridge area. This approach will ensure that cross-boundary issues and relevant wider matters are addressed in a consistent and joined-up manner.
- 1.2 Members will be aware that on 19 July 2013, the City Council published its Local Plan – Proposed Submission document for consultation until 30 September 2013. On the same day, Cambridgeshire County Council published its Draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.
- 1.3 In appraising the draft strategy, the key issue for the City Council is to ensure that the draft strategy reflects the strategic transport aspirations for Cambridge and the sub-region, and helps secure the implementation of the City Council and South Cambridgeshire's local plans.
- 1.4 This report includes representations to the draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (Appendix A)

for submission to Cambridgeshire County Council following member steer at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 This report is being submitted to the Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee for prior consideration and comment before decision by the Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change.
- 2.2 The Executive Councillor is recommended to agree the representations to the Draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire set out in Appendix A and that these are submitted to Cambridgeshire County Council as Cambridge City Council's formal response to the consultation.

3. Plan making and the Duty to Co-operate

- 3.1 At the start of this year, the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England (the East of England Plan) was formally revoked by statutory instrument, along with its addendum relating to Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation. At the same time, all of the remaining policies from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 were revoked. This means that there is no longer any requirement for the emerging local plans in Cambridgeshire to comply with, or have regard to, any "higher level" strategic development plan (although each plan will be tested for its consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework).
- 3.2 An important obligation introduced by the Localism Act 2011 is the "duty to co-operate", which requires local planning authorities and a wide range of other bodies to co-operate with one another in certain defined activities relating to plan making. In Cambridge's case, co-operation between the City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council has been, and will continue to be, critical. At the strategic level, the approach to identifying objectively assessed needs for homes and jobs and to strategic issues has been set out in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation and Spatial Approach. For transport issues this is being addressed through the preparation of the TSC&S.
- 3.3 "Co-operation" does not necessarily mean that there must be complete agreement by all parties on every aspect of the Plan;

but there must be evidence of joint-working wherever appropriate and attempts to agree on such matters as an evidence base, infrastructure needs, cross-boundary development needs etc. Transport issues are fundamental in delivering an appropriate sustainable development strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.

4. The Draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSC&SC)

4.1 The Draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire covers the following areas:

- The strategy's vision and objectives;
- Funding, delivery and review of the strategy;
- Transport modes – the development of the transport strategy for walking, cycling, passenger transport, freight etc;
- High level programme of interventions in specific areas/corridors into the city.

5. Summary of the Council's suggested response

5.1 The development of a transport strategy that takes a long-term view of the needs of Cambridge and the sub-region, and that also seeks to address the transport implications of the sustainable development strategies set out in the draft local plans is fundamentally welcomed.

5.2 The strategy has been produced and subject to consultation in parallel with the emerging local plans and this has enabled transport issues to be appropriately considered in the production of new development plans for the wider area. Whilst there are further necessary iterations in the completion of the TSC&SC, for example to develop an action and investment plan as part of the strategy, the development of the strategy to this stage and beyond is supported.

5.3 The suggested response to the strategy consultation is set out in Appendix A. Key issues of interest for Cambridge include the approach to demand management for vehicles entering the city, public transport improvements within Cambridge and along corridors serving Cambridge, investment in new and improved walking and cycling infrastructure and the implications of the strategy for improvements to air quality management in the city.

6. Recommendation

- 6.1 That Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee asks the Executive Councillor to agree the suggested consultation response set out in Appendix A.

7. Implications

(a) Financial Implications

- 7.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from this report. Funding for transport infrastructure is a key issue for implementation of the TSC&SC.

(b) Staffing Implications

- 7.2 There are no direct staffing implications arising from this report.

(c) Equal Opportunities Implications

- 7.3 There are no direct equal opportunities impacts arising from this report.

(d) Environmental Implications

- 7.4 Decisions made in the process of producing the new Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire have scope to have direct environmental implications for the city. Cambridge City Council will work with Cambridgeshire County Council to ensure the most sustainable outcomes for the area.

(e) Consultation

- 7.5 There are no direct consultation implications arising from this report.

(f) Community Safety

- 7.6 There are no direct community safety implications arising from this report.

8. Background Papers

These background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- Draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire

9. Appendices

- Appendix A: Proposed Representations on the Draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire

10. Inspection of papers

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Author's Name: Patsy Dell
Author's Phone Number: 01223 457103
Author's Email: patsy.dell@cambridge.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix A: Cambridge City Council Response to consultation on the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSC&SC)

1.0 General comments on the strategy document

- 1.1 The development of a transport strategy that takes a longer-term view of transport issues in this area, and has been prepared to help deliver the combined sustainable development strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire is welcomed. The strategy sets out the scale of the impact of growth in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire to 2031, with 44,000 new jobs and 35,000 new dwellings anticipated. The background papers that accompany this strategy identify the potential for significant development related traffic growth, which is set to rise by up to 41% across the wider sub-region and 39% for the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire area unless significant intervention and demand management takes place.
- 1.2 The document as a whole is high on aspiration but needs more detail and an action plan identifying how schemes will be delivered. Cambridge City Council recognises that this is due to the early stage of production of the TSCSC and the long timescales being addressed by the document. However the important relationship between the TSCSC and the growth strategies set out in both local plans means this needs to be addressed in greater detail in future iterations of the document. That said the package of schemes presented in the document appears broadly sensible. It is also noted that associated transport modelling work has also been undertaken in relation to the development strategy options for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.

General comments in relation to cycling:

- 1.3 The TSC&SC is welcomed and should help support a step change in the provision of facilities and infrastructure for cycling within Cambridge and surrounding South Cambridgeshire. However, the document needs to consider more how public transport, particularly bus provision, and cycling fit together given that the proposals for bus priority are all roads of importance to cyclists, many of which currently have fairly poor cycle facilities. There is no detail how increasing bus numbers can affect cyclists both positively and negatively depending on how this is managed.
- 1.4 The TSC&SC does not mention the provision of a cycle and pedestrian route adjacent to any new busway and the obvious benefits of this on these routes. The section on the reallocation of road space does make clear the potential benefits to cyclists and pedestrians but this is not referred to in the walking and cycling strategy approach section. It would be useful to include some sectional drawings showing examples of how cyclists and buses could be accommodated in bus priority streets and in streets where traffic restrictions are proposed.
- 1.5 The development section should introduce the aim of improving the existing network where development opportunities arise. This is particularly important for small developments with a relationship to an existing route which could be improved if there is an explicit policy referring to them.

- 1.6 Future routes such as those over the A14 linking through from NIAB/Darwin Green to Girton and Impington need to be safeguarded. These routes should be marked on a map in the strategy document or as a supplementary document referred to in the strategy.
- 1.7 Generally the emphasis should be on high quality cycle provision in Cambridge, bringing in Dutch-style segregation along the main radial and orbital roads. Cycling and walking often do go together as modes, particularly as off-road paths are usually also to the benefit of pedestrians. However, these different users often have different needs and priorities and this is somewhat lost by always considering them as one mode.

General comments in relation to air quality, noise and nuisance issues

- 1.8 One challenge that the strategy does not address in detail is how the growth in both districts can be accommodated without detrimental impact on air quality and noise, so that levels of ambient air pollution and noise be minimised avoiding a negative impact on human health.
- 1.9 It is clear that strategy is heavily reliant on increased bus services. Given the road network capacity constraints in the city this is acknowledged as the only way in which growth in journey demand can be accommodated. The strategy is nonetheless ambitious in its aims and the focus on provision of more comprehensive access to high quality passenger transport is something that is strongly supported. The longer term aims to increase the number of local rail stations and the possibility of bringing redundant rail corridors back in to use with increased service frequency planned for the current rail network is also supported.
- 1.10 Issues of nuisance and effects on amenity associated with new transport infrastructure can often be a cause of legitimate concern. Careful planning to mitigate noise and lighting problems will be integral to the success of the strategy in the longer term. Particular attention will need given to new transport interchanges and road / busway enhancements.
- 1.11 Under the Noise Insulation Regulations there is provision for noise insulation works to be carried out or grants to be provided by the Highways Authority to existing residential properties where very high levels of noise result from alterations to the highway or new roads have been constructed. However traffic noise below the regulation threshold can still lead to excessive internal noise levels, above those recommended by the World Health Organisation (WHO) and in BS 8233: 1999 "Sound Insulation and noise reduction for buildings-Code of Practice" in properties where natural ventilation strategies (opening windows) are relied upon. There are very few remedies for residents affected in this way once transport measures have been implemented therefore, such impacts should be comprehensively tackled during the development control phase.

General comments in relation to Waste Collection/Management issues

- 1.12 All new roads should be adopted, or where this is not possible built to adoptable standards. Where developers use permeable paving to fulfil SUDS requirements and the roads remain unadopted the regular use by refuse and similar sized vehicles needs to be considered in any maintenance regime.

- 1.13 It should be noted that Cambridge is in the second phase of the DEFRA noise mapping project and that this should help inform network development. Future transport provision should be considered during the Noise Action Planning that forms part of LTP3.

2.0 Comments on the Executive Summary:

- 2.1 In Cambridge and its fringes: This section states that “to enable priority to be given to passenger transport, road space will need to be reallocated from general vehicular traffic” and then goes on to say “the strategy will focus on overcoming pinch points on the passenger transport network as well as creating a comprehensive and coherent cycle and pedestrian network”. The reallocation of road space has the potential to provide significant benefits to cyclists and other road users. These two issues should not be considered separately but in tandem and in a comprehensive manner, as opportunities to improve one part of the network could lead to further opportunities in different areas. Although this is mentioned with regard to some roads it is not given enough emphasis nor is it included in the cycle section.

Section 2. The strategy approach

- 2.2 2-7- challenges to be addressed by the strategy: The section on accessibility should refer to removing barriers to cycling and walking by providing safe and convenient crossing points for pedestrians at junctions and providing for cyclists at difficult junctions either with segregated off-road facilities or with innovative on-road provision such as separate signals or advanced green lights. Reference should also be made to increasing bus patronage and increasing bus priority measures whilst ensuring that existing cycle routes are not negatively affected as a minimum, and improved wherever possible. Another challenge that should be included in this section is managing increasing demand for space on off-road cycle routes. As cycling increases its mode share and as the city grows the inadequate width of many of the city’s off-road paths is likely to become more of a problem, particularly for pedestrians. This should be included as a weakness in the analysis of current strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats in the city table on p5-2.
- 2.3 Para 2 – 10 of the strategy recognises that improvements to the A14 should take account of local circumstances, local opportunities and local impacts. This needs to include the relationship between the growth of Cambridge and questions of local funding for the current A14 scheme. The potential impact of an improved A14 on traffic flows on roads within Cambridge also needs to be carefully considered.
- 2.4 The approach in Cambridge (2-8) section is supported but should include reference to the aim of providing more high quality Dutch-style segregated cycle facilities in the city. The approach in South Cambridgeshire could make more explicit the role of safe cycle routes providing an alternative to conventional bus services for links between villages and towards Cambridge. In relation to road safety, the challenge is to increase cycling in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and not increase the numbers of accidents.
- 2.5 The inclusion of Air Quality as one of the Key Challenges to be addressed by the strategy (2-7) and its inclusion as one of the eight strategy objectives (2-8) is welcomed.

- 2.6 However, subsequent sections relating to Air Quality are less ambitious and point to what has already been achieved or the existing fairly short term plans aimed at current issues. Whilst the successes of the past are worthy of note, particularly the Core Scheme, the Joint Air Quality Strategy and Quality Bus Partnership, they will not ensure continued improvement in air quality when faced with the growth challenges ahead. There is little in the way of actual quantified measures aimed at improving air quality in the strategy area.
- 2.7 The proposed measures relating to increased bus mileage will have a major impact. Increased bus mileage, even if car mileage remains at current levels over the course of the strategy, has the potential to worsen air quality. Even with the current modernised fleet, diesel buses remain the largest single source of transport related emissions within the Cambridge Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). This strategy aims to curb growth in private car mileage largely with an increase in bus services. Whilst we acknowledge and strongly support this way forward, in order to avoid significant worsening of an already unacceptable air quality situation in certain areas of the City, a comprehensive, long-term strategy to significantly reduce individual bus emissions as part of the strategy is essential.
- 2.8 Currently the 'Cambridge Bus Emission Reduction Commitment' is in operation. It was adopted by local bus operators through a 'Quality Bus Partnership' agreement and will run to 2015. This scheme has a target of reducing bus emissions in the city centre by 50% between 2008 and 2015 by maintaining an annually reducing calculated emission envelope for oxides of Nitrogen (NOx) in a specified central area of Cambridge. The scheme has been successful seeing a reduction in notional bus emissions through fleet renewal, a small rationalisation of services, some re-routing and a drop in service frequency on some routes. This has led to a drop in emissions per distance travelled and a reduction in overall bus mileage in the central area.
- 2.9 Improvements in pollutant levels have been realised but are modest and exceedances of the European and UK health based objectives for Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) remain in the city centre, the station area and at junctions on the inner ring road. Thus the current AQMA is still appropriate. An increase in the number of services and their frequency will lead to significantly increased emissions and poor air quality as a result. Without very strong policy measures to reduce bus emissions and ensure very high levels of occupancy in buses operating there will be no air quality benefit over and above the equivalent journeys being made by private car.
- 2.10 Whilst we acknowledge that due to network capacity issues it is impossible to accommodate the number of private cars required for the forecast population and employment it is worth noting the relative emissions for cars and buses to illustrate the scale of the problem.
- 2.11 The table below shows the observed average emissions of NOx per Km for different vehicle types and gives a stark indication of how many passengers need to be on board a bus to achieve an improved emission result over and above the same number of passenger journeys by single occupancy car.

Table 1 - Emission comparison EU4 Bus / Car and Hybrid Bus - Oxides of Nitrogen¹

¹ Emission Data presented at IAPSC 13/12/10 Dr David Carslaw, ERG, Kings College London except

Vehicle Type	NOx g/km	Number of passengers required for emission parity with single occupancy Diesel car	Number of passengers required for emission parity with single occupancy Petrol car
EU4 Double Decker Diesel Bus	11	22	110 *More than capacity
EU4 Diesel Car	0.5 (0.35-0.825)	1	5
EU4 Petrol Car	0.1	0.2	1
'Boris Bus' (Wrightbus Diesel Electric hybrid)	2.048²	5	21

2.12 Noting the figures shown above it is perhaps surprising that a standard diesel double decker bus cannot outperform single occupancy petrol cars in terms of emissions of NOx per passenger mile even when fully occupied. As seen from Table 1, the New Wrightbus (Hybrid) currently in service in London shows one example of current best available technology and leads to potential emission reductions.

Possible Solutions

2.13 The County Council's Local Transport Plans have included an indicator to monitor the level of traffic entering Cambridge (cordon and river crossing), with the aim of keeping traffic levels constant. This will ensure that congestion does not worsen and originally it was considered that air quality would improve as a result as vehicle emissions standards improved. Given recent research on the effectiveness of improved Euro engine standards this is unlikely to be enough to ensure the status quo in terms of air quality. The required health based standards in Cambridge are not currently met in some areas. The Quality Bus Partnership runs until 2015; no formal agreements beyond this date have been agreed or discussed.

2.14 The following measures should be targeted in the strategy document alongside the other ambitious changes proposed:

- that the current Cambridge Core Area traffic management scheme be extended to the extent of the AQMA or equivalent practical boundary, and is upgraded to a formal Low Emissions Zone.
- The current emissions envelope calculations that form part of the Quality Bus Partnership should be widened spatially to match the new restricted zone and should also include all modes of transport.
- A new agreement with bus operators will be needed to ensure a transition to best available, low emission transport technologies, potentially including Hybrid, Electric, hydrogen or fuel-cell buses. This must be realistic and planned over the

² Data published by TFL Transport for London - <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/corporate/media/newscentre/archive/27746.aspx>

medium to long term to allow for operator investment cycles and must acknowledge the investment already made by the bus operating companies. If it is coupled with a consequent improvement in bus infrastructure, priority and publicity then economically beneficial delivery of the key objectives should be achievable.

- Access to the central areas of Cambridge (other than car parks) should be restricted to low-emitting vehicles which are either Passenger Transport, Taxis, Delivery, Service or resident's vehicles at least during peak hours.
- Measures for increased Walking and Cycling provision must be maximised (see below).

Carbon Emissions

2.15 Road transport is a major source of carbon emissions in Cambridge City accounting for 19% of total Carbon emitted nationally³. Whilst the impact is not as marked as for polluting emissions, buses require a good level of occupancy before they are more carbon efficient than single occupancy cars:

Table 2 - Vehicle Type / Occupancy / Equivalent Carbon Emissions

Vehicle Type	CO ₂ g/km	Number of passengers required for emission parity or better with single occupancy car
Double Decker Diesel Bus (London fleet average) ²	1295	9
Fleet Average Car ⁴	159 (80-300+)	1
'Boris Bus' (Wrightbus Diesel Electric hybrid) ²	690	5

2.16 Clearly the argument for bus transport is much stronger for Carbon than it is for polluting emissions but this needs to be quantified and articulated within the strategy document. Currently references to carbon emissions are infrequent (two mentions) and not quantified. Any Comprehensive transport strategy needs to include explicit consideration of Carbon issues.

4. The Transport strategy

2.17 A. Passenger transport: This section could make more reference (based upon survey evidence) to the benefits to cycling of shared use routes alongside additional guided busways such as linking Waterbeach to Cambridge. The provision of a shared use route along the guided bus way between Cambridge and St Ives has significantly boosted the number of cyclists entering and exiting St Ives, and has proved that the provision of a direct and high quality infrastructure encourages cycle

³ Source: National Atmospheric Emissions Inventory (NAEI)

⁴ http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/transport/vehicles/cars/index_en.htm

journeys from longer distances into Cambridge. It is considered appropriate to explicitly mention this as part of the Bus and Guided Bus network section (4-5). New direct, high quality cycle routes should be considered when other guided bus facilities are constructed, furthermore similar facilities could be considered along key roads and routes in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. Encouraging higher take up of long distance cycling could reduce pressure on the road network from commuting traffic and provide facilities for local journeys with associated health and well-being benefits.

- 2.18 The strategy should better consider how different modes of transport can be integrated so as to encourage sustainable methods of transport by different modes. For example trains and busses should better be able to accommodate bicycles; reference should be made to this on pages 3-1 and 4-8.
- 2.19 Taxis: Access, Provision and Priority: Given the focus on high quality passenger transport the document is light on plans for taxi provision. In the high functioning multi modal transport network proposed with considerably reduced private vehicle use per resident across the strategy region it is likely that reliance on private hire and hackney carriages will be significantly higher.
- 2.20 This raises a number of issues about vehicle priority, access and rank provision. The focus on high capacity passenger transport means that this key element of the public transport picture is not given the strategic importance it deserves. The restrictions on provision in the city centre posed by limited physical road space are acknowledged, however effective planning for appropriate taxi provision is vital to the success of the transport strategy proposed.
- 2.21 Taxis and private hire vehicles offer an important and, in some cases, vital provision, particularly for elderly, disabled and infirm people, which enables them to access the city in a way which other modes of transport do not. They also fulfill a significant role in supporting the night-time economy of the city, when buses are not available.
- 2.22 Emissions: The provision to improve vehicle specification is welcomed and this should be considered within the same measures outlined in the air quality section. The use of cleaner fuels is certainly a beneficial option, which needs to be assessed and prioritised.
- 2.23 However the indications illustrated by Table 1 above are that a change to petrol or Petrol Electric hybrid vehicles in particular would minimise the polluting impact of taxis. Taxi emissions of key pollutants remain at least 1 order of magnitude below those of bus services.
- 2.24 As a point of correction (page 4-40), although the 2009 Air Quality Action Plan refers to the Cambridge City Council 8 Year Age limit policy, this has now been updated (2012) and a more directed policy, which requires:
- all existing taxi vehicle licence renewals to meet the Euro IV emission standard and
 - all new taxi Vehicles to be licensed must meet the Euro V emissions standard
 - No taxi licence will be renewed if it is nine years or older.
- 2.25 This combination of policies has allowed Euro 3 vehicles to be excluded from the fleet earlier than under the 8 year rule whilst maintaining continuous improvement.

C. Walking and cycling

- 2.26 The overall approach for walking and cycling is stated as “to create networks for pedestrians and cyclists that provide routes and infrastructure linking together all the major area in Cambridge”. This network already exists but quality varies and there are gaps where cyclists have to negotiate difficult junctions, share the road with high volumes of vehicular traffic or share narrow, poorly maintained, paths with pedestrians. For pedestrians the issue is of poorly maintained footways and lack of safe crossings, particularly at junctions. Rather than an aim of creating networks it should therefore be one of bringing the existing network up to a high quality, filling the gaps and expanding it when opportunities arise.
- 2.27 The level of detail for cycling and walking appears unbalanced as considerably more detail is presented for other modes. Cycling and walking are important modes of transport within Cambridge and the wider area that do not have any negative air quality impact; they need to be integral to the transport strategy.

Fig 4.10

- 2.28 Reducing the speed limit to 50mph on all but major routes is unlikely to make any difference to safety concerns and is therefore unlikely to encourage more cycling. Perhaps consideration of 20mph on roads in villages/market towns could be added under the Walking and Cycling element of the TSCSC (Fig 4.10) to promote these modes. This could also feature under road safety (4-32). Encouraging cycling in villages and enabling more trips to be taken by bicycle within South Cambridgeshire will help people become more confident cyclists and allow them to consider taking longer trips by bicycle (e.g. into Cambridge).
- 2.29 A major barrier to walking is the lack of pedestrian crossing facilities, particularly at some junctions. Providing additional pedestrian crossing facilities in appropriate crossing points should be included in the measures to address this barrier.

In Cambridge

- 2.30 As well as the points included in this section the cycling and walking strategy for Cambridge should emphasize the provision of a high quality network with:
- Dutch-style provision along main radial and orbital corridors where space allows.
 - Bus/cycle lanes which are wide enough for a bus to overtake a cyclist without leaving the lane.
 - High quality cycle and pedestrian paths adjacent to any new busway
 - Cycle safety measures at major junctions which could include innovative solutions such as, but not limited to, separate signals for cyclists.
 - Safe and convenient crossings for pedestrians. All main junctions should include a pedestrian phase and zebra crossings should be considered as the first option elsewhere as they provide genuine priority for pedestrians.

In rural areas:

- 2.31 As above the reduction in speed limit to 50mph is easy to achieve but is unlikely to have any significant effect, certainly not on encouraging cycling or walking. Speed limits of 50mph may improve road safety for motorised vehicles, but it does nothing for cyclist and pedestrians, either to their perception of safety or their reality. This is not an alternative to a segregated route. Changing the speed limit to 50mph should

not be considered to have assisted cyclists or pedestrians, and real measures to help them should be considered.

2.32 Improving links from villages to employment centres and secondary schools is strongly supported. In rural areas coverage is more important than quality at this stage in trying to achieve a network linking schools, employment sites etc. and so it is recommended that a set of guiding principles be applied depending on likely usage and location. These guiding principles could form an appendix or supplementary guidance to the strategy document.

2.33 Leisure cycling to visitor sites should also be encouraged as well as travel by foot.

4-31. Core Traffic Scheme extension:

2.34 This section is very much supported as such closures would have a significant beneficial effect on cycle safety and the attractiveness of these routes to new cyclists (rather than an effect on journey time as stated in this and following sections). It would also benefit pedestrians with an improved environment and better air quality.

E. Freight movements and servicing:

2.35 This section is also very much supported. The reduction of large delivery vehicles in the city centre will greatly improve safety for cyclists.

5. The High Level Programme

2.36 List of interventions in Cambridge: Many of these should also include improvements for cyclists and pedestrians, for example:

- Cambridge Science Park Station with high quality cycle and pedestrian links and cycle parking.
- P&R sites – to include covered cycle parking and improved cycle and pedestrian links to the site.
- Bus priority schemes – should state that these would provide an improved provision for on-road cycling.
- Busway – should include provision of a high quality cycle & pedestrian path.
- City Centre Improvements – this should include the aim of re-routing buses away from Bridge Street to improve the environment for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Provision of a third City Centre cycle park – could be an extension of the existing cycle park in Grand Arcade so change to “Provision of a third City Centre cycle park or extension of one or both of the existing parks”.

Walking and Cycling

2.37 The provision of the Chisholm Trail is strongly supported, subject to full appraisal and consultation on the detailed impact in sensitive locations such as where crossing the river or the commons. It would make more sense to distinguish between cycling and walking as modes here. For cycling it is recommended that interventions include:

- Improving the main radial routes into the city with the aim being to provide Dutch-style segregation where possible.

- Improving the safety of the main junctions along these radial routes with remodelling of roundabouts and re-phasing signalled junctions to include cycle only signals where appropriate.
- Improving the main orbital routes around the city such as East Road – Lensfield Road -Fen Causeway, Queen Edith’s Way – Long Road and Brooks Rd – Mowbray Rd – Fendon Rd.
- Improving the safety of the main junctions along these routes, particularly the remodelling of the Coldham’s Lane/Brooks Road/Barnwell Rd roundabout (the proposed remodelling of the Elizabeth Way/East Road/Newmarket Rd roundabout and improvements to the Fen Causeway/Trumpington Road junction in the City Centre section are strongly supported).
- Remodelling of the Maids Causeway/Victoria Avenue roundabout with a reduction of traffic lanes and incorporating improved crossing points.
- Consider the removal of car parking in order to improve the city cycle network on roads such as Lensfield Road, Davy Road and Coleridge Road.
- Widen and improve the surface of off-road paths with priority given to NCN routes and across Coldham’s Common.
- Improvement to the NCN51 crossing of Ditton Lane.
- Consider the replacement of the bridge and ramps along the Tins path to better accommodate cyclists and pedestrians.
- Improvement of the links to the busway at Trumpington
- Declassifying Victoria Road so that its function as a major through-route is changed to one that is more cycle and pedestrian friendly.

For pedestrians it is recommended that interventions include:

- Pedestrian phase added to the Castle Street/Chesterton Road junction
- Pedestrian phase added to the Coldham’s Lane/Newmarket Road junction
- Pedestrian phase added to the Lady Margaret Road/Madingley Road junction
- Add and improve crossings in the Maids Causeway roundabout area to facilitate access to the bus stops