



# Public Document Pack

## Cambridge City Council

### DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

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

**Alternates :** Councillors Herbert and Stuart

**Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change:** Councillor Ward

*Despatched: Monday, 5 November 2012*

**Date:** Tuesday, 13 November 2012

**Time:** 4.30 pm

**Venue:** Committee Room 1 & 2 - Guildhall

**Contact:** Toni Birkin

**Direct Dial:** 01223 457086

### 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

The minutes of the meeting of 16<sup>th</sup> October 2012 to follow.

#### 4 PUBLIC QUESTIONS (SEE BELOW)

**5 CAMBRIDGE LOCAL PLAN - TOWARDS 2031 ANALYSIS OF COMMENTS AND OPTIONS** Planning Policy Manager (*Pages 1 - 132*)

# 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](mailto:democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk).

Further information about speaking at a City Council

meeting can be found at;

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/Having%20your%20say%20at%20meetings.pdf>

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](mailto: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:

[www.cambridge.gov.uk/democracy/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1057&ID=1057&RPID=33371389&sch=doc&cat=13203&path=13020%2c13203](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/democracy/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD1057&ID=1057&RPID=33371389&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](mailto: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](mailto:democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk).

**General Information** Information regarding committees, councilors and the democratic process is available at [www.cambridge.gov.uk/democracy](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/democracy).

This page is intentionally left blank



To: Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change: Councillor Tim Ward  
Report by: Head of Planning  
Relevant scrutiny committee: Development Plan 13/11/2012  
Scrutiny Sub Committee  
Wards affected: All Wards

### **CAMBRIDGE LOCAL PLAN - TOWARDS 2031**

Approach to draft Plan - vision, objectives and climate change.

#### **Not a Key Decision**

#### **1. Executive summary**

1.1 The Local Plan is a key document for Cambridge, and the review of the current Local Plan is currently underway. Following on from consultation on the Issues and Options Report, which took place between June and July 2012, officers are working on the analysis of the comments received to the consultation and developing the preferred approach to take forward into the draft Plan. It has previously been agreed that future reports would be brought to Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee to analyse the comments received and options to take forward in more detail in order to seek a steer from Members on the approach to take forward in the draft Plan.

1.2 This report considers the approach to be taken forward in relation to the Vision and Objectives and the Climate Change section of the Issues and Options Report as part of developing the content of the new Plan.

#### **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 consider the key issues related to vision, objectives and climate change as set out in Appendices A and B; and
- To endorse the response and approach to take forward in the draft Plan, as set out in Appendices A and B and tables 1 and 2.

#### **3. Background**

## **The Issues and Options Report**

- 3.1 The Local Plan is a key document for Cambridge. The current Local Plan was adopted in 2006, and sets out a vision, policies and proposals for future development and land use in Cambridge to 2016 and beyond.
- 3.2 The Issues and Options Report included a vision, strategic objectives, and specific chapters relating to the future spatial strategy, possible opportunity areas and other topic areas. Over 11,000 representations were received, and the key issues raised were presented to Development Plan Scrutiny Committee on the 16<sup>th</sup> October 2012. For further information, please see the following link:  
<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/democracy/documents/s13919/Local%20Plan%20Key%20Issues%20and%20Timetable%20Update.pdf>
- 3.3 At this committee, it was agreed that future reports would be brought to committee to analyse the comments received and options to take forward in more detail in order to seek a steer from Members on the approach to take forward in the draft Plan. This report considers the approach to be taken forward in relation to the Vision and Objectives and the Climate Change section of the Issues and Options Report as part of developing the content of the new Plan.

## **Responses and Preferred Approach**

- 3.4 Appendix A contain the officer analysis of the key issues raised for the vision and objectives, as well as summaries of the representations received. Appendix B contains the same for the climate change section. The appendices have been structured around each of the issues and associated options set out in the Issues and Options Report. For each of the options consulted on, the key issues raised during consultation have been identified. A summary of the analysis of the options from the Interim Sustainability Appraisal has been provided, along with the Council's evidence base. An officer analysis of the key issues raised is then provided alongside a recommendation as to the approach that should be taken forward into the draft Plan, which will be subject to consultation from June to July 2013. Due to the large volume of representations received, it is not possible to provide detailed responses to every one at this stage. It is suggested that the analysis and recommendation forms the response to the representations.
- 3.5 At this stage, detailed policy wording has not been provided, but



sufficient detail of the evidence behind potential policy options has been provided to give Members a steer as to what would be included in the policy. Following on from this committee, officers will draft the relevant policies, which will be presented to Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee at the end of March 2013.

- 3.6 A breakdown of the number of representations received to each of the issues has also been included, including the number of supports and objections raised. For each issue, a tally of all of the representations received to that section of the Issues and Options Report has been taken; this includes representations received to the paragraphs, options and questions contained within each section. In some instances respondents have chosen to focus their comments on the policy options, while others have focussed on responding to the questions raised. It should be noted that in some instances, objections contain qualified support for an option, i.e. that they support the general principle of an option but feel that it does not go far enough in responding to certain issues. Officers have taken this into account when analysing representations and proposing a preferred approach.

### **Vision and Objectives**

- 3.7 Chapter 2 of the Issues and Options Report set out a new vision and strategic objectives for Cambridge towards 2031. The chapter recognises that the existing vision for Cambridge in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 has been very effective. However, the Issues and Options Report acknowledged that the current vision may not encompass all the elements now needed to act as key drivers for the ongoing growth and success of the city and needs to be updated. Option 1 sets out twelve main areas at the heart of the revised vision for Cambridge. The eighteen strategic objectives elaborate upon the vision and represent broad intentions of purpose that the more detailed policies and proposals within the new Local Plan will strive to deliver.
- 3.8 Whilst the new vision and strategic objectives were broadly supported, respondents raised additional detail on a wide range of issues that they considered worthy of inclusion. Additionally, concern was raised about the need for greater integration of the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans and Cambridgeshire County Council's Transport Strategy.
- 3.9 Appendix A contain the officer analysis of the key issues raised for the vision and objectives, as well as summaries of the representations received.

Table 1: Recommended preferred approach for Vision and Objectives

OPTION/OBJECTIVE NUMBER AND DESCRIPTION	PREFERRED APPROACH FOR DRAFT PLAN
Option 1 – Cambridge 2031 Vision	The recommended approach is to pursue the approach taken in the proposed Option 1 – Cambridge 2031 Vision, subject to detailed consideration during the drafting of policies within the Local Plan to ascertain whether it provides appropriate coverage of relevant strategic issues. The Vision and all strategic objectives will need to reflect policies being taken forward.
Strategic objectives 1 - 18	The objectives and all comments received have all been carefully assessed and the objectives are considered to remain appropriate at this stage. However, as part of working through each topic and developing policies, it may be that future amendments need to be made to the strategic objectives as a result. This is to ensure that all strategic objectives will reflect the policies being taken forward.

## Climate Change

3.10 Chapter 6 of the Issues and Options Report considered policy approaches required to ensure that Cambridge develops in the most sustainable way possible. This chapter focussed on policy approaches for both climate change adaptation and mitigation. Climate change mitigation focuses in designing new communities and buildings to be energy and resource efficient, utilising renewable and low carbon energy generation and promoting patterns of development that reduce the need to travel by less environmentally friendly modes of transport. This is covered in Options 42 – 48 and Option 50. Climate change adaptation focuses on ensuring that new developments and the wider community are adaptable to our changing climate, covered by Option 49. For the city, this is likely to involve an increase in the urban heat island effect due to increasing temperatures and an increase in flooding, both from rivers and watercourses and from surface water flooding following periods of intense rainfall. It should be noted that local planning authorities are

required through the Planning Act (2008) to develop policies that relate to both climate change mitigation and adaptation.

- 3.11 On the whole there was a strong level of support from respondents for the Council to be seen to be leading that way in responding to the challenges presented by climate change, water and flooding. There was a view that the Council should be ambitious in setting targets in relation to carbon reduction and water efficiency, with many respondents recognising the seriousness of the issue of water scarcity for Cambridge. Concerns were raised as to the impact of future policy on the viability of new development and consistency with the national zero carbon policy agenda. In line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), viability is a key consideration when developing policy requirements, and this has been taken into consideration in the evidence base produced to support the development of climate change policy.
- 3.12 Appendix B contain the officer analysis of the key issues raised for climate change, as well as summaries of the representations received.

Table 2: Recommended preferred approach for climate change

OPTION NUMBER AND DESCRIPTION	PREFERRED APPROACH FOR DRAFT PLAN
Option 41: Strategic priority – Innovative and sustainable communities	The recommendation is to pursue option 41 and develop a strategic objective focussed on innovative and sustainable communities. Additional reference will be made to support for community energy schemes and the role of sustainable modes of transport in reducing carbon emissions.

<p>Option 42: Develop a comprehensive sustainable development policy</p>	<p>The recommendation is to pursue Option 42 with emphasis placed on the importance of ensure that the principles of sustainable design and construction is integrated in the design of all new developments. Reference will be added to the need to make efficient use of land, and the encouragement of mixed-use development, as well as promoting the use of materials with low embodied energy and the promotion of local skills development. This policy area will also include a definition of sustainable development, either as part of the supporting text or policy wording itself.</p>
<p>Option 43: Sustainable construction standards</p>	<p>The recommendation is to pursue Option 43, with a minimum of Code Level 4 being sought for new housing and BREEAM 'very good' being sought up to 2016 with BREEAM excellent from 2016 onwards. This could form part of an overarching sustainable construction standards policy, which will also include carbon reduction requirements, water efficiency requirements and links to the development of a Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund.</p>
<p>Option 44: Detailed targets for on-site carbon reduction that relate to the levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes being sought.</p>	<p>For non-residential development the recommended approach is to develop a carbon reduction policy linked to the timetable for introducing zero carbon non-residential buildings in 2019.</p>
<p>Option 45: Detailed targets for on-site carbon emissions reductions in line with the findings of Decarbonising Cambridge</p>	<p>With regards to the approach for residential development, it is recommended that Option 44 is pursued, but with flexibility to allow for further investigation of the viability of pursuing</p>

<p>Option 46: Leave carbon reduction to Building Regulations and continue to operate a percentage renewable energy policy</p>	<p>Option 45 and Options 46. This flexibility would allow time for the implications of any changes from Government to be taken into account, and for further discussions with the CLG of the appropriateness of setting a higher level of carbon reduction than national zero carbon policy in light of the wording of the NPPF.</p> <p>This could form part of an overarching sustainable construction standards policy, which will include BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes requirements, water efficiency requirements, and links to the development of a Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund.</p>
<p>Option 47: Establishment of a Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund</p>	<p>The recommendation is to continue to explore option 47 and the potential to develop a policy to enable the establishment of a Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund and identify of eligible projects. This will be subject to ongoing discussions with national government with regards to the timescales and practical arrangements for the establishment of Allowable Solutions.</p> <p>This could form part of an overarching sustainable construction policy, which will include carbon reduction requirements, BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes requirements and water efficiency standards.</p>
<p>Option 48: Renewable and low carbon energy generation</p>	<p>The recommendation is to pursue option 48, which will set out the a positive policy approach for supporting renewable and low carbon energy generation proposals, while at the same time ensuring that any adverse impacts are minimised. As part of this policy, a strategic district heating area covering the city centre will be identified, with developments within this area being required to connect to a heat network should one become available.</p>

Option 49: Climate change adaptation	The recommendation is to pursue Option 49. This would see the development of a policy requiring the integration of climate change adaptation measures into the overall design of new developments. Compliance with the policy would need to be demonstrated as part of Design and Access Statements, which will need to illustrate how climate change adaptation measures have been integrated into areas such as the layout, scale and landscaping of new developments.
Option 50: Consequential improvements policy	The recommendation is to pursue option 50 and introduce a consequential improvements policy, which will look to implement cost-effective energy efficiency measures in homes undergoing improvement works for which planning permission is required. Consideration will also be given to the retrofitting of simple water efficiency measures, such as water metres and low flow appliances. The policy should be linked to the Green Deal and Energy Company Obligation, to help reduce costs for homeowners. Applicants would be asked to complete a simple home energy questionnaire, from which a home energy report would be produced, recommending possible measures to be implemented.

## Next steps

3.13 Following on from this committee, and subsequent committees to provide a steer on the preferred approach for other topic areas, officers will be drafting policy wording in line with the agreed approach. Draft policies will be presented to this committee at the end of March 2013 for consideration, prior to consideration of the entire new Local Plan at Environment Scrutiny Committee. The draft plan will then be made available for a six-week period of public consultation, prior to being formally submitted to the Secretary of States for examination.

## 4. Implications

### (a) Financial Implications

There are no direct financial implications arising from this report. Policy recommendations will be considered as part of the review of the Local Plan, which has already been included within existing budget plans.

(b) **Staffing Implications** (if not covered in Consultations Section)

There are no direct staffing implications arising from this report. The review of the Local Plan has already been included in existing work plans.

(c) **Equal Opportunities Implications**

There are no direct equal opportunity implications arising from this report. An Equalities Impact Assessment will be prepared as part of the draft Plan stage.

(d) **Environmental Implications**

The new Local Plan for Cambridge will assist in the delivery of high quality and sustainable new development along with protecting and enhancing the built and natural environments in the City. This will include measures to help Cambridge adapt to the changing climate as well as measures to reduce carbon emissions from new development, as considered within this committee report. Overall there should be a positive climate change impact.

(e) **Procurement**

There are no direct procurement implications arising from this report.

(f) **Consultation and communication**

The consultation and communications arrangements for the Local Plan are consistent with the agreed Consultation and Community Engagement Strategy for the Local Plan Review, 2012 Regulations and the Council's Code for Best Practice on Consultation and Community Engagement.

(g) **Community Safety**

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

## 5. **Background papers**

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

- Cambridge Local Plan – Towards 2031 Issues and Options Report, June 2012:

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/local-plan-review-issues-and-options-report.pdf>

- National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/nppf>

## **6. Appendices**

- Appendix A: Analysis, responses and preferred approach to the Vision and Objectives, plus summaries of representations received;
- Appendix B: Analysis, responses and preferred approach to the Climate Change section, plus summaries of representations received.

## **7. Inspection of papers**

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

Author's Name: Sara Saunders  
Author's Phone Number: 01223 457186  
Author's Email: [Sara.saunders@cambridge.gov.uk](mailto:Sara.saunders@cambridge.gov.uk)



## Appendix A – Analysis, responses and preferred approach to Vision and Strategic Objectives, plus summaries of representations received.

Setting a vision and strategic objectives for Cambridge involves considering what Cambridge could be like in 2031, outlining what needs to be achieved and how the Local Plan will help bring it to fruition. The vision and strategic objectives need to reflect the Council’s priorities and be specific to Cambridge, providing a spatial perspective that gives the Local Plan purpose and direction.

The strategic objectives elaborate upon the Vision and represent broad intentions of purpose that the more detailed policies and proposals within the Local Plan will strive to deliver. It is crucial that the strategic objectives relate to and are capable of addressing local, national and regional issues and drivers, so as to ensure that the Vision is deliverable. In line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Local Plan’s strategic objectives are positively worded in order to promote the sustainable growth of the city.

If any gaps in policy coverage are recognised as a result of responses to the Issues and Options consultation, this will need to be addressed by the provision of further policy options and will also need to be appropriately reflected in the Vision and strategic objectives.

### ISSUE: VISION

(Page 16 of the Issues and Options Report)

<b>Total representations: 136</b>	
<b>Objections: 89</b>	<b>Support: 47</b>

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
<p>Option 1 – Cambridge 2031 Vision</p> <p>This option sets out the elements needed to form the vision for Cambridge towards 2031.</p> <p>(This section also incorporates responses to paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2 and Question 2.1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considerable support for the Vision, even if only part (often most) of it;</li> <li>• Needs more mention of existing developments, not just new development;</li> <li>• Needs to remain a compact ‘small town like’ city;</li> <li>• Cambridge should become a beacon for urban design and sustainable development;</li> <li>• Vision should address socio-economic inequalities, particularly with reference to housing;</li> <li>• Vision should explicitly mention protection of Green Belt;</li> <li>• No mention of diverse natural environment or wildlife in Vision;</li> <li>• Vision should reflect having healthy lifestyles as a priority;</li> <li>• Needs to better reflect housing needs, anticipated workforce and job growth;</li> <li>• Needs to better reflect the problems faced in terms of</li> </ul>

	<p>energy supply, climate change, traffic congestion and food security;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More reference needs to be made to high quality sustainable transport infrastructure;</li> <li>• Needs to tie into Vision and plans for surrounding districts, particularly South Cambridgeshire;</li> <li>• More needs to be made of the exceptional heritage of the city and protecting historic buildings;</li> <li>• Jobs growth needs to be concentrated elsewhere and the vision for the city should be based on that approach;</li> <li>• The Local Plans and Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire should be fully integrated for consultation and decision-making;</li> <li>• Need for more provision for all modes of transport, including road and car parking infrastructure;</li> </ul>
<b>NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint Vision for Cambridge's Quarter to Six Quadrant submitted by the parish councils of Barton, Coton and Madingley (Rep. 17053).</li> </ul>	

<b>SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT</b>
<b>Option Number 1</b>
<p>This Option should result in significant positive effects across the majority of sustainability topics. The Option's strong support for an environmentally sustainable and successful economy, which builds on the City's strengths in the fields of higher education and research and the knowledge based economy should help address the key economic issue to maintain and capitalise on Cambridge's position as one of the UK's most competitive cities. The Option's vision to become a low carbon city and recognition of the need to deliver a city where sustainable transport choices are the norm will also contribute significantly to improving the local environment and making Cambridge a destination of choice to live, work and visit.</p> <p>This Option should ensure the protection and enhancement of the historic environment and promote the character and distinctiveness of the conservation areas, which are two key landscape, townscape and cultural heritage sustainability issues. The option will thus contribute to maintaining the attractiveness of Cambridge as a tourist destination.</p> <p>The Option should help address identified sustainability issues relating to deprivation and inequality across the whole of the city. Its focus on socially mixed and inclusive communities also recognises the value that the City's ethnic diversity contributes to the City's vibrancy and cosmopolitan feel.</p> <p>The extent to which this Option fully addresses water scarcity in the region is unclear, particularly given the anticipated significant growth in housing and employment provision. Furthermore, the extent to which the Option recognises the threat posed by climate change and the need to both mitigate and adapt to its effects could be more clearly stated.</p>

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- Not applicable

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Paragraph 2.1 of Cambridge Local Plan 2006

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The Vision sets out high level aspirations for the city. The current vision in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 has served us well, but it needs to be updated to reflect the changing needs and aspirations of the city. Whilst the level of support for parts of the Vision is noted, the Vision will need to reflect policies being taken forward. In relation to the wide-ranging representations made about the Vision, changes to the Vision will need to incorporate reference to the Cambridge Green Belt, the city's exceptional heritage and the protection of historic buildings, and high quality sustainable transport infrastructure.

**Housing Need and Jobs Growth**

In terms of reflecting housing need and jobs growth, the Council needs to address objectively assessed need for the growth of the city in respect of both issues. Chapters within the Local Plan will set out policies addressing both of these needs.

**Health and Wellbeing**

The wording of the Vision as currently drafted, does not exclude the need for residents to have a good standard of health and well being (penultimate bullet point of Option 1) and to address social inequalities, with particular reference to housing (5<sup>th</sup> and penultimate bullet points).

**Sustainability and Nature Conservation**

The Council is considering the introduction of a number of policies on sustainability and water efficiency, which could be at the forefront in planning policy nationally. In terms of problems faced such as energy supply, climate change, traffic congestion and food security, the Vision is positively worded and mentions the need to have a more environmentally sustainable and successful low carbon economy (2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point), an uncongested and clean city (9<sup>th</sup> bullet point) and a city where green spaces are protected and enhanced and new green spaces are established (7<sup>th</sup> bullet point). The term 'green spaces' within the Vision does not exclude the need to provide for a diverse natural environment or for wildlife. Furthermore, a range of policies are proposed to protect and enhance the natural environment, including specific policy protection of nature conservation sites.

**Existing Development**

In relation to making more references to existing development as well as new development, the Local Plan considers the relationship of new development with existing development. Planning policies seek to address planning applications affecting existing developments.

**Integration of the Local Transport Strategy and Local Plans**

With reference to concerns raised about the need to integrate the Local Plans and the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, the Council has long history of successful joint working with South Cambridgeshire District Council and the County Council. The Localism Act introduced a duty to cooperate with South Cambridgeshire District Council, the County Council, other districts and public bodies as part of preparing the new Local Plan. This requirement requires the Council to engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis on 'strategic matters' regarding sustainable development or use of land that has or would have a significant impact on at least two planning areas. The NPPF says that Councils should work collaboratively with other bodies to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual Local Plans. The Councils have joint arrangements in place and have already worked together effectively over a number of years to deliver development on the edges of Cambridge and to produce a number of evidence base studies and Development Plan Documents such as the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan.

The Council will be expected to demonstrate evidence of having effectively cooperated to plan for cross boundary impacts when the Local Plan is submitted for examination, as will South Cambridgeshire District Council. The on-going approach to joint working is therefore now a specific legal requirement and it will be necessary to provide formal evidence of the cooperation as part of the plan making process. However, the NPPF is not prescriptive about how Councils work together or how evidence of co-operation should be presented.

Whilst Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council are preparing separate plans, this does not prevent a comprehensive approach being developed and sound arrangements have been put in place in order to ensure this. Given the close functional relationship between Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, the Councils are working jointly to ensure that cross boundary issues and relevant wider matters are addressed in a consistent and joined up manner. The Councils have been working together throughout the preparation of the Issues and Options consultations on the Local Plans, and also the parallel consultation on issues for a new Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.

Joint working arrangements have already been established. At a member level, previous joint working groups have been replaced this year by two new member groups: the Joint Strategic Planning and Transport Member Group and also this Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group specifically to address issues affecting Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. Work is on-going at an officer level, steered by regular meetings of senior officers: Chief Planning Officers for county-wide issues and from the three Councils for more Cambridge-focused issues.

In addition, the Council has constructively responded to South Cambridgeshire's Issues and Options consultation and consultation on the Transport Strategy. Both of the responses were agreed at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee on 11 September 2012. The report can be accessed at:

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/democracy/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=184&MId=68>

[6&Ver=4](#)).

It is recognised that there is a close link between planning for growth and development and for transport and accessibility to ensure that growth can be accommodated in the most sustainable way and that people can access the services and facilities they need in an efficient and affordable way. A key part of developing and delivering a sustainable development strategy for this area involves the preparation of a long-term transport strategy which takes into account planned growth. An important aspect of identifying the preferred development strategy will be testing the transport implications by modelling using the Cambridgeshire Sub Regional Model to assess likely implications of development in terms of impact on network, journey time, commuting patterns and impacts on accessibility. This will also consider what measures and enhancements might be put in place to help mitigate impacts of development and enhance accessibility. This work will take place as part of the preparation of the Transport Strategy and will form part of the evidence base to the new Local Plans.

#### **Quarter to Six Quadrant submission**

The Joint Vision for Cambridge's Quarter to Six Quadrant submitted by the parish councils of Barton, Coton and Madingley only provides a vision for one part of the city and adjacent areas in South Cambridgeshire. The submission will be considered in drawing up policies affecting the south-west of the city and will be the subject of joint discussions with South Cambridgeshire District Council.

#### **RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommended approach is to pursue the approach taken in the proposed Option 1 – Cambridge 2031 Vision. The Vision and all comments received have been carefully assessed and the Vision is considered to remain appropriate at this stage. However, as part of working through each topic and developing policies, it may be that the Vision requires amendment. The Vision and all strategic objectives will need to reflect policies being taken forward.

#### **ISSUE: STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1**

(Page 17 of the Issues and Options Report)

**Total representations: 12**

**Objections: 5**

**Support: 7**

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Strategic objective 1 - To ensure that all new development contributes to the vision of Cambridge as an environmentally sustainable city,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Use urban form and new development to reinforce existing demand for sustainable transport;</li><li>• New development should be zero carbon, where possible;</li><li>• Further growth of Cambridge should be limited;</li><li>• The term 'sustainable' should be more clearly defined;</li><li>• Retrofitting existing development should be a central element of planning for the future.</li></ul>

where it is easy for people to make the transition to a lifestyle that results in lower carbon dioxide emissions	
--	--

<b>NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b>
--

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A new strategic objective 1 was put forward, incorporating objectives 1 and 18, which reads: “To promote a safe, healthy and stimulating environment, in which all development activity is objectively demonstrated to enhance the three strands of sustainable development together.” (Rep: 18279)</li></ul> |
|---|

<b>SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT</b>
---

The Local Plan seeks to guide development in Cambridge in a sustainable way, balancing social, economic and environmental issues and trying to maximise benefits where possible and minimise any adverse impacts. All strategic objectives were considered to contribute to the overall vision towards 2031, which was subject to sustainability appraisal as Option 1 of the Issues and Options Report.
--

<b>KEY EVIDENCE</b>
---------------------

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Not applicable</li></ul> |
|--|

<b>CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED</b>
--------------------------------------

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Paragraph 2.2 – 2.11 in Cambridge Local Plan 2006.</li></ul> |
|--|

<b>ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE</b>
--

The strategic objective represents a high level objective for development within the city. It is not considered that the strategic objective, as currently drafted, explicitly excludes the matters raised during consultation. The suggested alternative objective makes valid points that may be suited to inclusion within more detailed policies.
---

<b>Urban Form Reinforcing Sustainable Transport Usage</b>
---

The Council agrees that the use of urban form and new development to reinforce sustainable transport usage is vital. In order to support this, the Council has proposed a number of options, which would encourage this approach, including policies on sustainable transport, urban design and sustainable development.
--

<b>Zero Carbon Development</b>
--------------------------------

New development should be zero carbon, where possible; The Council notes that from 2016 all new homes will be required to be zero carbon, with non-residential development needing to be zero carbon from 2019 onwards.
---

<b>Limiting Future Growth</b>
-------------------------------

In terms of future growth of the city being limited, the Council needs to address objectively assessed need for the growth of the city, whilst addressing the challenges posed by climate change. New development also presents opportunities for greater
---

deployment of renewable and low carbon energy, water efficiency and other sustainability measures to help the city make a transition to a low carbon future.

**Defining Sustainable Development**

In the Issues and Options consultation, the Council asked how people defined ‘sustainable development’ in Question 1.1. The Council will use the responses made to Question 1.1 to help define what this term means for Cambridge.

**Retrofitting Existing Development**

The Council recognises that retrofitting development to deal with climate change is a key area for development and is seeking to introduce policy on retrofitting existing homes as well as guidance on climate change and the historic environment. It should be noted, however, that the Local Plan’s remit in this area is limited to dealing with planning issues. Other departments within the Council also have a role to play, for example, in helping to implement the Green Deal.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

Strategic objective 1 and all comments received have all been carefully assessed and the objective is considered to be appropriate at this stage. However as a part of working through each topic and developing policies, it may be that future amendments need to be made to strategic objective 1 as a result. This is to ensure that the strategic objective will reflect the policies being taken forward.

**ISSUE: STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2**

<b>Total representations: 11</b>	
<b>Objections: 4</b>	<b>Support: 7</b>

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Strategic objective 2 - To ensure that all new developments have a neutral impact on water, contribute to an overall flood risk reduction and help improve the quality of the River Cam and other water features in the city.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water neutrality for large developments would require unsustainable levels of energy usage;</li> <li>• Need for a holistic approach to development across the region to deal with flooding issues;</li> <li>• New development should only be permitted if the region’s water supplies are sufficient to meet the additional demand;</li> <li>• Local infrastructure cannot accommodate further growth.</li> </ul>

#### **NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

- A new strategic objective 2 was put forward, incorporating objectives 6 and 7, which read “To create and maintain environmentally sustainable communities, especially through
  - ensuring that all new developments are carbon - neutral or better;
  - have a neutral or beneficial impact on water quality, and contribute to an overall flood risk reduction and help improve the quality of the River Cam and other water features in the city;
  - have a neutral or beneficial effect on air quality, e.g. by minimising vehicle movements;
  - embody innovative ways of reducing environmental impacts – e.g . CHP, shared waste disposal and composting, car-sharing schemes instead of car parking;
  - protecting and enhancing the landscape setting of the city, the green corridors penetrating the urban area, and the network of green spaces in the city.” (Rep 18285)

#### **SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

The Local Plan seeks to guide development in Cambridge in a sustainable way, balancing social, economic and environmental issues and trying to maximise benefits where possible and minimise any adverse impacts. All strategic objectives were considered to contribute to the overall vision towards 2031, which was subject to sustainability appraisal as Option 1 of the Issues and Options Report.

#### **KEY EVIDENCE**

- Not applicable

#### **CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Paragraph 2.2 – 2.11 in Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

#### **ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The strategic objective represents a high level objective for development within the city. It is not considered that the strategic objective, as currently drafted, explicitly excludes the matters raised during consultation. The suggested alternative objective makes valid points that may be suited to inclusion within more detailed policies.

##### **Water Usage**

Whilst it is recognised that there may be additional energy usage associated with technologies such as grey water recycling being used to deliver improved water management, it is considered that, given the considerable water stress experienced in this region, the Local Plan must be ambitious in addressing water usage.

##### **Flood Risk Management**

Although the need to consider flood risk management on a regional basis is recognised, the Local Plan can only address the management of flooding in Cambridge. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities and the Environment Agency to address flood risk across a wider area.



**Water Efficiency**

The Council recognises that new development should only be permitted if water supplies are sufficient to meet the additional demand. As such, the Council is proposing the introduction of policies within the Local Plan to require high levels of water efficiency in new developments. Consideration is also given to retrofitting developments to improve water efficiency.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

Strategic objective 2 and all comments received have all been carefully assessed and the objective is considered to be appropriate at this stage. However as a part of working through each topic and developing policies, it may be that future amendments need to be made to strategic objective 2 as a result. This is to ensure that the strategic objective will reflect the policies being taken forward.

**ISSUE: STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3**

<b>Total representations: 8</b>
---------------------------------

<b>Objections: 2</b>
----------------------

<b>Support: 6</b>
-------------------

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Strategic objective 3 - To ensure that all building development is of the highest quality standard, both in terms of its design and any impact upon its surroundings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to see higher standards and greater variation in design;</li> <li>• Needs to be implemented across Cambridge as a whole;</li> <li>• Need to be more explicit about the linkages with energy efficiency and environmental impact.</li> </ul>

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

- A new strategic objective 3 was put forward, incorporating strategic objectives 4 and 5, which read "To promote and maintain the highest quality built environment, ensuring in particular that
  - new building development is of the highest quality standard, in terms of both its design and its impact upon its surroundings. The aim should be to go beyond the regulatory requirements reflected in building regulations;
  - all new development contributes to the positive management of change in the historic environment, protecting, enhancing and maintaining the unique qualities and character of the city;
  - the character and quality of the appearance of the Cambridge skyline are enhanced." (Rep: 18284).

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

The Local Plan seeks to guide development in Cambridge in a sustainable way, balancing social, economic and environmental issues and trying to maximise benefits where possible and minimise any adverse impacts. All strategic objectives were considered to contribute to the overall vision towards 2031, which was subject to sustainability appraisal as Option 1 of the Issues and Options Report.

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- Not applicable

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Paragraph 2.2 – 2.11 in Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The strategic objective represents a high level objective for development within the city. In relation to concerns raised by respondents regarding the need to be consistent in the development of high quality buildings across the city and a strong focus on energy efficiency, it is considered that these matters will be given detailed coverage in policies on the delivery of high quality places and sustainability and climate change. It is not considered that the strategic objective, as currently drafted, explicitly excludes these matters. The suggested alternative objective makes valid points that may be suited to inclusion within more detailed policies.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

Strategic objective 3 and all comments received have all been carefully assessed and the objective is considered to be appropriate at this stage. However as a part of working through each topic and developing policies, it may be that future amendments need to be made to strategic objective 3 as a result. This is to ensure that the strategic objective will reflect the policies being taken forward.

**ISSUE: STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 4**

**Total representations: 11**

**Objections: 4**

**Support: 7**

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Strategic objective 4 - To ensure that all new development contributes to the positive management of change in the historic environment, protecting,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally supported;</li> <li>• Needs strengthening, with particular reference to Conservation Areas and Buildings of Local Interest.</li> </ul>

enhancing and maintaining the unique qualities and character of the city for the future.	
--	--

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

- A new strategic objective 3 was put forward, incorporating strategic objectives 4 and 5, which read “To promote and maintain the highest quality built environment, ensuring in particular that
  - new building development is of the highest quality standard, in terms of both its design and its impact upon its surroundings. The aim should be to go beyond the regulatory requirements reflected in building regulations;
  - all new development contributes to the positive management of change in the historic environment, protecting, enhancing and maintaining the unique qualities and character of the city;
  - the character and quality of the appearance of the Cambridge skyline are enhanced.” (Rep: 18284).

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

The Local Plan seeks to guide development in Cambridge in a sustainable way, balancing social, economic and environmental issues and trying to maximise benefits where possible and minimise any adverse impacts. All strategic objectives were considered to contribute to the overall vision towards 2031, which was subject to sustainability appraisal as Option 1 of the Issues and Options Report.

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- Not applicable

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Paragraph 2.2 – 2.11 in Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The strategic objective represents a high level objective for development within the city. In relation to concerns raised by respondents regarding the need to include reference to Conservation Areas and Buildings of Local Interest, it is considered that these matters will be given detailed coverage in policies on the historic environment. It is not considered that the strategic objective, as currently drafted, explicitly excludes these matters. The suggested alternative objective makes valid points that may be suited to inclusion within more detailed policies.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

Strategic objective 4 and all comments received have all been carefully assessed and the objective is considered to be appropriate at this stage. However as a part of working through each topic and developing policies, it may be that future amendments need to be made to strategic objective 4 as a result. This is to ensure that the strategic objective will reflect the policies being taken forward.

**ISSUE: STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 5**

<b>Total representations: 10</b>	
<b>Objections: 4</b>	<b>Support: 6</b>

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Strategic objective 5 - - To protect and, where appropriate, enhance the character and quality of the appearance of the Cambridge skyline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally supported;</li> <li>• Some concerns expressed about existing tall buildings.</li> </ul>

<b>NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new strategic objective 3 was put forward, incorporating strategic objectives 4 and 5, which read “To promote and maintain the highest quality built environment, ensuring in particular that               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- new building development is of the highest quality standard, in terms of both its design and its impact upon its surroundings. The aim should be to go beyond the regulatory requirements reflected in building regulations;</li> <li>- all new development contributes to the positive management of change in the historic environment, protecting, enhancing and maintaining the unique qualities and character of the city;</li> <li>- the character and quality of the appearance of the Cambridge skyline are enhanced.” (Rep: 18284).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT</b>
The Local Plan seeks to guide development in Cambridge in a sustainable way, balancing social, economic and environmental issues and trying to maximise benefits where possible and minimise any adverse impacts. All strategic objectives were considered to contribute to the overall vision towards 2031, which was subject to sustainability appraisal as Option 1 of the Issues and Options Report.

<b>KEY EVIDENCE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul>

<b>CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 2.2 – 2.11 in Cambridge Local Plan 2006.</li> </ul>

<b>ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE</b>

The strategic objective represents a high level objective for development within the city. In relation to concerns regarding tall buildings, it is considered that these matters will be given detailed coverage in a specific policy on building heights. It is not considered that the strategic objective, as currently drafted, explicitly excludes this matter. The suggested alternative objective makes valid points that may be suited to inclusion within more detailed policies.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

Strategic objective 5 and all comments received have all been carefully assessed and the objective is considered to be appropriate at this stage. However as a part of working through each topic and developing policies, it may be that future amendments need to be made to strategic objective 5 as a result. This is to ensure that the strategic objective will reflect the policies being taken forward.

**ISSUE: STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 6**

<b>Total representations: 12</b>	
<b>Objections: 1</b>	<b>Support: 11</b>

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Strategic objective 6 - To protect and enhance the landscape setting of the city and the green corridors penetrating the urban area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong support for this objective;</li> <li>• Need for new tree planting throughout the city;</li> <li>• Need for proactive plan to develop and augment the green corridors.</li> </ul>

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

- A new strategic objective 2 was put forward, incorporating objectives 6 and 7 which read “To create and maintain environmentally sustainable communities, especially through
  - ensuring that all new developments are carbon - neutral or better;
  - have a neutral or beneficial impact on water quality, and contribute to an overall flood risk reduction and help improve the quality of the River Cam and other water features in the city;
  - have a neutral or beneficial effect on air quality, e.g. by minimising vehicle movements;
  - embody innovative ways of reducing environmental impacts – e.g . CHP, shared waste disposal and composting, car-sharing schemes instead of car parking;
  - protecting and enhancing the landscape setting of the city, the green corridors penetrating the urban area, and the network of green spaces in the city.” (Rep 18285)

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

The Local Plan seeks to guide development in Cambridge in a sustainable way, balancing social, economic and environmental issues and trying to maximise benefits where possible and minimise any adverse impacts. All strategic objectives were considered to contribute to the overall vision towards 2031, which was subject to sustainability appraisal as Option 1 of the Issues and Options Report.

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- Not applicable

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Paragraph 2.2 – 2.11 in Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The strategic objective represents a high level objective for development within the city. It is not considered that the strategic objective, as currently drafted, explicitly excludes the matters raised regarding tree planting and augmentation of green corridors. The suggested alternative objective makes valid points that may be suited to inclusion within more detailed policies.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

Strategic objective 6 and all comments received have all been carefully assessed and the objective is considered to be appropriate at this stage. However as a part of working through each topic and developing policies, it may be that future amendments need to be made to strategic objective 6 as a result. This is to ensure that the strategic objective will reflect the policies being taken forward.

**ISSUE: STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 7**

**Total representations: 14**

**Objections: 6**

**Support: 8**

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Strategic objective 7 - To protect and enhance the network of green spaces in the city.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for protection and enhancement of open spaces;</li> <li>• Need to make more reference to wildlife habitats;</li> <li>• More green spaces should be provided.</li> </ul>

#### **NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

- A new strategic objective 2 was put forward, incorporating objectives 6 and 7 which read “To create and maintain environmentally sustainable communities, especially through
  - ensuring that all new developments are carbon - neutral or better;
  - have a neutral or beneficial impact on water quality, and contribute to an overall flood risk reduction and help improve the quality of the River Cam and other water features in the city;
  - have a neutral or beneficial effect on air quality, e.g. by minimising vehicle movements;
  - embody innovative ways of reducing environmental impacts – e.g . CHP, shared waste disposal and composting, car-sharing schemes instead of car parking;
  - protecting and enhancing the landscape setting of the city, the green corridors penetrating the urban area, and the network of green spaces in the city.” (Rep 18285)

#### **SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

The Local Plan seeks to guide development in Cambridge in a sustainable way, balancing social, economic and environmental issues and trying to maximise benefits where possible and minimise any adverse impacts. All strategic objectives were considered to contribute to the overall vision towards 2031, which was subject to sustainability appraisal as Option 1 of the Issues and Options Report.

#### **KEY EVIDENCE**

- Not applicable

#### **CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Paragraph 2.2 – 2.11 in Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

#### **ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The strategic objective represents a high level objective for development within the city. In relation to the need to include reference to wildlife habitat, it is considered that these matters will be given detailed coverage in policies on the protection, enhancement and delivery of open spaces. It is not considered that the strategic objective, as currently drafted, explicitly excludes this matter. Furthermore, the Council will produce a detailed policy setting out its expectations for the provision of open space through new development. The suggested alternative objective makes valid points that may be suited to inclusion within more detailed policies.

#### **RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

Strategic objective 7 and all comments received have all been carefully assessed and the objective is considered to be appropriate at this stage. However as a part of working through each topic and developing policies, it may be that future amendments need to be made to strategic objective 7 as a result. This is to ensure that the strategic objective will reflect the policies being taken forward.

## ISSUE: STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 8

<b>Total representations: 18</b>	
<b>Objections: 13</b>	<b>Support: 5</b>

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Strategic objective 8 - To provide new housing to meet the needs of the city and contribute towards meeting the needs of the Cambridge Sub-region.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Need to define that housing should be for people working in Cambridge and the surrounding area, not for commuters;</li><li>• Definition needed for Cambridge Sub-Region;</li><li>• New housing at odds with the definition of the compact city.</li></ul>
<b>NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A new strategic objective 8 was put forward, merging objectives 8 and 9, which reads “To provide new housing that meets the needs of the city, enhancing the three strands of sustainable development, and contributes to meeting the needs of the Cambridge Sub-region; and to ensure an appropriate mix of housing types, sizes and tenures to meet existing and future needs.” (Rep: 18281)</li></ul>	

### **SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

The Local Plan seeks to guide development in Cambridge in a sustainable way, balancing social, economic and environmental issues and trying to maximise benefits where possible and minimise any adverse impacts. All strategic objectives were considered to contribute to the overall vision towards 2031, which was subject to sustainability appraisal as Option 1 of the Issues and Options Report.

### **KEY EVIDENCE**

- Not applicable

### **CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Paragraph 2.2 – 2.11 in Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

### **ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The strategic objective represents a high level objective for development within the city. In relation to concerns raised by respondents regarding the delivery of new housing being contrary to the aim of having a compact city, it is considered that a balance needs to be struck between meeting recognised housing need in the city and allowing further development which may harm the essential characteristics of Cambridge. In relation to providing student housing and other forms of housing, it is not considered that the strategic objective, as currently drafted, explicitly excludes these matters. The Council’s strategy aims to reduce commuting. The Council will continue to work with Cambridgeshire County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council to address the issues presented by commuting. The suggested alternative objective makes valid points that may be suited to inclusion within more



detailed policies.

#### **RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

Strategic objective 8 and all comments received have all been carefully assessed and the objective is considered to be appropriate at this stage. However as a part of working through each topic and developing policies, it may be that future amendments need to be made to strategic objective 8 as a result. This is to ensure that the strategic objective will reflect the policies being taken forward.

#### **ISSUE: STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 9**

**Total representations: 9**

**Objections: 0**

**Support: 9**

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Strategic objective 9 - To provide an appropriate mix of housing types, sizes and tenures to meet existing and future needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Strongly supported;</li><li>• Need for a balance between housing for students and permanent residents;</li><li>• Need to consider the housing cooperative model.</li></ul>
<b>NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A new strategic objective 8 was put forward, merging objectives 8 and 9, which reads "To provide new housing that meets the needs of the city, enhancing the three strands of sustainable development, and contributes to meeting the needs of the Cambridge Sub-region; and to ensure an appropriate mix of housing types, sizes and tenures to meet existing and future needs." (Rep: 18281)</li></ul>	

#### **SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

The Local Plan seeks to guide development in Cambridge in a sustainable way, balancing social, economic and environmental issues and trying to maximise benefits where possible and minimise any adverse impacts. All strategic objectives were considered to contribute to the overall vision towards 2031, which was subject to sustainability appraisal as Option 1 of the Issues and Options Report.

#### **KEY EVIDENCE**

- Not applicable

<b>CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 2.2 – 2.11 in Cambridge Local Plan 2006.</li> </ul>

<b>ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE</b>
<p>The strategic objective represents a high level objective for development within the city. In relation to concerns raised by respondents regarding the need to balance the housing needs of students and permanent residents and address the possibility of housing cooperatives, it is considered that these matters will be given detailed coverage in policies on the delivery of housing. It is not considered that the strategic objective, as currently drafted, explicitly excludes these matters. The suggested alternative objective makes valid points that may be suited to inclusion within more detailed policies.</p>

<b>RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH</b>
<p>Strategic objective 9 and all comments received have all been carefully assessed and the objective is considered to be appropriate at this stage. However as a part of working through each topic and developing policies, it may be that future amendments need to be made to strategic objective 9 as a result. This is to ensure that the strategic objective will reflect the policies being taken forward.</p>

**ISSUE: STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 10**

<b>Total representations: 4</b>		
<table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>Objections: 1</b></td> <td><b>Support: 3</b></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Objections: 1</b>	<b>Support: 3</b>
<b>Objections: 1</b>	<b>Support: 3</b>	

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Strategic objective 10 - To assist the creation and maintenance of environmentally sustainable communities, where everyone feels included.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally supported;</li> <li>• Need to maintain distinct villages surrounding Cambridge.</li> </ul>

<b>NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul>

<b>SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT</b>
<p>The Local Plan seeks to guide development in Cambridge in a sustainable way, balancing social, economic and environmental issues and trying to maximise benefits where possible and minimise any adverse impacts. All strategic objectives were considered to contribute to the overall vision towards 2031, which was subject to sustainability appraisal as Option 1 of the Issues and Options Report.</p>

<b>KEY EVIDENCE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul>

<b>CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 2.2 – 2.11 in Cambridge Local Plan 2006.</li> </ul>

<b>ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE</b>
<p>The strategic objective represents a high level objective for development within the city. The need to maintain distinct villages outside Cambridge is recognised in the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. The development of the wider area, including a range of broad locations on the edge of Cambridge, is currently being assessed jointly with South Cambridgeshire District Council, with consideration given to the purposes of the Green Belt. All strategic objectives will need to reflect policies being taken forward.</p>

<b>RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH</b>
<p>Strategic objective 10 and all comments received have all been carefully assessed and the objective is considered to be appropriate at this stage. However as a part of working through each topic and developing policies, it may be that future amendments need to be made to strategic objective 10 as a result. This is to ensure that the strategic objective will reflect the policies being taken forward.</p>

**ISSUE: STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 11**

<b>Total representations: 12</b>	
<b>Objections: 8</b>	<b>Support: 4</b>

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Strategic objective 11 - To promote and support economic growth in environmentally sustainable and accessible locations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to justify the need for further economic growth in Cambridge.</li> </ul>

<b>NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new strategic objective 11 was put forward, merging objectives 11 and 12, which reads: “To promote and support economic growth in accessible locations, facilitating innovation, supporting Cambridge's role as a world leader in higher education, research, and knowledge-based industries, and ensuring that economic growth enhances all three strands of sustainable development. This enhancement need not always be direct, provided that any adverse impact should be fully, demonstrably and quantifiably offset elsewhere.” (Rep: 18282)</li> </ul>

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

The Local Plan seeks to guide development in Cambridge in a sustainable way, balancing social, economic and environmental issues and trying to maximise benefits where possible and minimise any adverse impacts. All strategic objectives were considered to contribute to the overall vision towards 2031, which was subject to sustainability appraisal as Option 1 of the Issues and Options Report.

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- Not applicable

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Paragraph 2.2 – 2.11 in Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The strategic objective represents a high level objective for development within the city. The Council is required under the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework to objectively assess and meet the needs of business. The suggested alternative objective makes valid points that may be suited to inclusion within more detailed policies.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

Strategic objective 11 and all comments received have all been carefully assessed and the objective is considered to be appropriate at this stage. However as a part of working through each topic and developing policies, it may be that future amendments need to be made to strategic objective 11 as a result. This is to ensure that the strategic objective will reflect the policies being taken forward.

**ISSUE: STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 12**

**Total representations: 7**

**Objections: 3**

**Support: 4**

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Strategic objective 12 - To recognise innovation and enable Cambridge's role as a world leader in higher education, research, and knowledge-based industries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to define innovation;</li> <li>• Need to consider when industries have reached a size which can no longer be accommodated in Cambridge itself.</li> </ul>

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

- A new strategic objective 11 was put forward, merging objectives 11 and 12, which reads: “To promote and support economic growth in accessible locations, facilitating innovation, supporting Cambridge's role as a world leader in higher education, research, and knowledge-based industries, and ensuring that economic growth enhances all three strands of sustainable development. This enhancement need not always be direct, provided that any adverse impact should be fully, demonstrably and quantifiably offset elsewhere.” (Rep: 18282)

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

The Local Plan seeks to guide development in Cambridge in a sustainable way, balancing social, economic and environmental issues and trying to maximise benefits where possible and minimise any adverse impacts. All strategic objectives were considered to contribute to the overall vision towards 2031, which was subject to sustainability appraisal as Option 1 of the Issues and Options Report.

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- Not applicable

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Paragraph 2.2 – 2.11 in Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The strategic objective represents a high level objective for development within the city. In relation to the definition of innovation, it is considered that it is not appropriate to define this term within the strategic objective. In terms of industries outgrowing the Cambridge area, the Council supports the continued growth of such businesses, wherever possible, within Cambridge and within the wider area. The suggested alternative objective makes valid points that may be suited to inclusion within more detailed policies.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

Strategic objective 12 and all comments received have all been carefully assessed and the objective is considered to be appropriate at this stage. However as a part of working through each topic and developing policies, it may be that future amendments need to be made to strategic objective 12 as a result. This is to ensure that the strategic objective will reflect the policies being taken forward.

**ISSUE: STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 13**

**Total representations: 5**

**Objections: 2**

**Support: 3**

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Strategic objective 13 - To ensure that	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community shops outside Mill Road and the City Centre should be supported.</li> </ul>

Cambridge is a vibrant and thriving city with a varied range of shopping facilities in accessible locations that meet the needs of people living, working and studying in, or visiting, the city.

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

A new strategic objective 13 was put forward, which reads: “To provide a varied range of shopping facilities in accessible locations that meet the needs of people living, working and studying in, or visiting, the city.” (Rep: 18283)

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

The Local Plan seeks to guide development in Cambridge in a sustainable way, balancing social, economic and environmental issues and trying to maximise benefits where possible and minimise any adverse impacts. All strategic objectives were considered to contribute to the overall vision towards 2031, which was subject to sustainability appraisal as Option 1 of the Issues and Options Report.

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- Not applicable

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Paragraph 2.2 – 2.11 in Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The strategic objective represents a high level objective for development within the city. In relation to the inclusion of references to the protection of community shops outside the City Centre and Mill Road, it is considered that these matters will be given detailed consideration in drafting policies on retail provision within the Local Plan. It is not considered that the strategic objective, as currently drafted, explicitly excludes this matter as it supports a varied range of retail provision. The suggested alternative objective makes valid points that may be suited to inclusion within more detailed policies.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

Strategic objective 13 and all comments received have all been carefully assessed and the objective is considered to be appropriate at this stage. However as a part of working through each topic and developing policies, it may be that future amendments need to be made to strategic objective 13 as a result. This is to ensure that the strategic objective will reflect the policies being taken forward.

**ISSUE: STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 14**

<b>Total representations: 6</b>	
<b>Objections: 3</b>	<b>Support: 3</b>

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
<p>Strategic objective 14 - To maintain a high quality of life by maintaining and enhancing provision for open space, sports and recreation as well as ensuring that the city has a broad range of community facilities and leisure activities, including arts and cultural venues that serve Cambridge and the Sub-region.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to include minimising noise and light pollution;</li> <li>• Health facilities should also be included.</li> </ul>
<b>NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new strategic objective 14 was put forward, incorporating objectives 14, 15, 16, which reads “To promote social cohesion and sustainability, where everyone feels included, including through             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- maintaining and enhancing provision for open space, sports and recreation as well as ensuring that the city has a broad range of community facilities and leisure activities, including arts and cultural venues that serve need Cambridge and the Sub region;</li> <li>- minimising the distance people to travel to work, and making it easy for everyone to move around the city to access jobs and essential services;</li> <li>- to ensure that all development positively favours travelling primarily by foot, bicycle or public transport, through traffic management measures in partnership with residents and the County Council and through a consistent requirement that all development should provide improved facilities for walkers and cyclists;</li> <li>- to provide for citizens audit of the achievement of all the strategic objectives.”</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>(Rep: 18286)</p>	

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

The Local Plan seeks to guide development in Cambridge in a sustainable way, balancing social, economic and environmental issues and trying to maximise benefits where possible and minimise any adverse impacts. All strategic objectives were considered to contribute to the overall vision towards 2031, which was subject to sustainability appraisal as Option 1 of the Issues and Options Report.

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- Not applicable

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Paragraph 2.2 – 2.11 in Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The strategic objective represents a high level objective for development within the city. In relation to the inclusion of references to health facilities and pollution issues, it is considered that these matters will be given detailed coverage in policies on the delivery of community facilities and pollution. It is not considered that the strategic objectives, as currently drafted, explicitly exclude these matters. The suggested alternative objective makes valid points that may be suited to inclusion within more detailed policies.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

Strategic objective 14 and all comments received have all been carefully assessed and the objective is considered to be appropriate at this stage. However as a part of working through each topic and developing policies, it may be that future amendments need to be made to strategic objective 14 as a result. This is to ensure that the strategic objective will reflect the policies being taken forward.

**ISSUE: STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 15**

**Total representations: 17**

**Objections: 8**

**Support: 9**

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Strategic objective 15 - To minimise the distance people need to travel, and to make walking and cycling the first choices of travel.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public transport needs to be included at the top of the hierarchy;</li> <li>• Walking and cycling cannot be the first choice for some people;</li> <li>• Stronger deterrents needed to prevent people from driving into Cambridge.</li> </ul>



#### **NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

- A new strategic objective 14 was put forward, incorporating objectives 14, 15, 16, which reads “To promote social cohesion and sustainability, where everyone feels included, including through
  - maintaining and enhancing provision for open space, sports and recreation as well as ensuring that the city has a broad range of community facilities and leisure activities, including arts and cultural venues that serve need Cambridge and the Sub region;
  - minimising the distance people to travel to work, and making it easy for everyone to move around the city to access jobs and essential services;
  - to ensure that all development positively favours travelling primarily by foot, bicycle or public transport, through traffic management measures in partnership with residents and the County Council and through a consistent requirement that all development should provide improved facilities for walkers and cyclists;
  - to provide for citizens audit of the achievement of all the strategic objectives.”(Rep: 18286)

#### **SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

The Local Plan seeks to guide development in Cambridge in a sustainable way, balancing social, economic and environmental issues and trying to maximise benefits where possible and minimise any adverse impacts. All strategic objectives were considered to contribute to the overall vision towards 2031, which was subject to sustainability appraisal as Option 1 of the Issues and Options Report.

#### **KEY EVIDENCE**

- Not applicable

#### **CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Paragraph 2.2 – 2.11 in Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

#### **ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The strategic objective represents a high level objective for development within the city. In relation to the need for public transport to be at the top of the hierarchy, walking and cycling is considered by national guidance to be situated at the top of the user hierarchy, with public transport as the next most sustainable transport mode. The Council recognises that some people may not be able to walk or cycle and therefore supports improvements to public and community transport schemes. The Council also supports reducing access to the city by car, by encouraging use of sustainable modes of transport. It is considered that these matters will be given detailed coverage in policies on transport within the Local Plan and/or Cambridgeshire County Council’s Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. It is not considered that the strategic objective, as currently drafted, explicitly excludes these matters. The suggested alternative objective makes valid points that may be suited to inclusion within more detailed policies.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

Strategic objective 15 and all comments received have all been carefully assessed and the objective is considered to be appropriate at this stage. However as a part of working through each topic and developing policies, it may be that future amendments need to be made to strategic objective 15 as a result. This is to ensure that the strategic objective will reflect the policies being taken forward.

**ISSUE: STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 16**

<b>Total representations: 4</b>
---------------------------------

<b>Objections: 2</b>
----------------------

<b>Support: 2</b>
-------------------

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Strategic objective 16 - To make it easy for everyone to move around the city, and in particular to be able to access jobs and essential services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to consider faster internet access to reduce work travel;</li> <li>• Need to have shuttle buses and a one ticket transit system.</li> </ul>

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

- A new strategic objective 14 was put forward, incorporating objectives 14, 15, 16, which reads "To promote social cohesion and sustainability, where everyone feels included, including through
  - maintaining and enhancing provision for open space, sports and recreation as well as ensuring that the city has a broad range of community facilities and leisure activities, including arts and cultural venues that serve need Cambridge and the Sub region;
  - minimising the distance people to travel to work, and making it easy for everyone to move around the city to access jobs and essential services;
  - to ensure that all development positively favours travelling primarily by foot, bicycle or public transport, through traffic management measures in partnership with residents and the County Council and through a consistent requirement that all development should provide improved facilities for walkers and cyclists;
  - to provide for citizens audit of the achievement of all the strategic objectives."
 (Rep: 18286)

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

The Local Plan seeks to guide development in Cambridge in a sustainable way, balancing social, economic and environmental issues and trying to maximise benefits where possible and minimise any adverse impacts. All strategic objectives were considered to contribute to the overall vision towards 2031, which was subject to sustainability appraisal as Option 1 of the Issues and Options Report.

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- Not applicable

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Paragraph 2.2 – 2.11 in Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The strategic objective represents a high level objective for development within the city. In relation to the need to include reference to shuttle buses and single ticketing systems, it is not considered that these matters can be given coverage in policies that support the delivery of high quality transport as they would not fall within the remit of the Local Plan to deliver. Whilst recognising the value of single ticketing systems, this would be a matter for Cambridgeshire County Council and the relevant transport operators, but is one that the Local Plan could encourage as part of a high quality public transport network. It is not considered that the strategic objectives, as currently drafted, explicitly exclude the matter of ultrafast broadband as this is a form of infrastructure provision. However, this will be dealt with in the detailed policies on infrastructure provision. The suggested alternative objective makes valid points that may be suited to inclusion within more detailed policies.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

Strategic objective 16 and all comments received have all been carefully assessed and the objective is considered to be appropriate at this stage. However as a part of working through each topic and developing policies, it may be that future amendments need to be made to strategic objective 16 as a result. This is to ensure that the strategic objective will reflect the policies being taken forward.

**ISSUE: STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 17**

<b>Total representations: 4</b>	
<b>Objections: 1</b>	<b>Support: 3</b>

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Strategic objective 17 - To ensure adequate provision of environmentally sustainable forms of infrastructure to support the demands of the city.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for a new hospice to meet the needs of the 21<sup>st</sup> century;</li> <li>• Need to consider ultrafast broadband.</li> </ul>

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

- A new strategic objective 17 was put forward, which reads: “To reject any development which does not embody, or is not accompanied by, adequate provision of environmentally sustainable infrastructure to meet the demands of the city.” (Rep: 18287)

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

The Local Plan seeks to guide development in Cambridge in a sustainable way, balancing social, economic and environmental issues and trying to maximise benefits where possible and minimise any adverse impacts. All strategic objectives were considered to contribute to the overall vision towards 2031, which was subject to sustainability appraisal as Option 1 of the Issues and Options Report.

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- Not applicable

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Paragraph 2.2 – 2.11 in Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The strategic objective represents a high level objective for development within the city. In relation to concerns raised about the provision of a new hospice, it is considered that the provision of a new hospice would be considered to be a community facility, which would be addressed by policies within the Local Plan. Broadband infrastructure will be addressed through the detail infrastructure policies. It is not considered that the strategic objective, as currently drafted, explicitly excludes the provision of a hospice or ultrafast broadband. The suggested alternative objective makes points that may be suited to inclusion within more detailed policies. It should be noted, however, that the alternative objective is very strongly and negatively worded and may prevent development from coming forward. In line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Local Plan's strategic objectives are positively worded in order to promote the sustainable growth of the city. All strategic objectives will need to reflect policies being taken forward.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

Strategic objective 17 and all comments received have all been carefully assessed and the objective is considered to be appropriate at this stage. However as a part of working through each topic and developing policies, it may be that future amendments need to be made to strategic objective 17 as a result. This is to ensure that the strategic objective will reflect the policies being taken forward.

**ISSUE: STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 18**

**Total representations: 4**

**Objections: 2**

**Support: 2**

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Strategic objective 18 - To promote a safe and healthy environment,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to consider the social environment in addition to the built environment;</li> <li>• Need to consider noise and light pollution.</li> </ul>

minimising the impacts of development.	
--	--

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

- A new strategic objective 1 was put forward, incorporating objectives 1 and 18, which reads: “To promote a safe, healthy and stimulating environment, in which all development activity is objectively demonstrated to enhance the three strands of sustainable development together.” (Rep: 18279)

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

The Local Plan seeks to guide development in Cambridge in a sustainable way, balancing social, economic and environmental issues and trying to maximise benefits where possible and minimise any adverse impacts. All strategic objectives were considered to contribute to the overall vision towards 2031, which was subject to sustainability appraisal as Option 1 of the Issues and Options Report.

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- Not applicable

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Paragraph 2.2 – 2.11 in Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The strategic objective represents a high level objective for development within the city. In relation to concerns raised by respondents regarding the need to include reference to the social environment and pollution issues, it is considered that these matters will be given detailed coverage in policies on the delivery of high quality places and pollution. It is not considered that the strategic objective, as currently drafted, explicitly excludes these matters. The suggested alternative objective makes valid points that may be suited to inclusion within more detailed policies.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

Strategic objective 18 and all comments received have all been carefully assessed and the objective is considered to be appropriate at this stage. However as a part of working through each topic and developing policies, it may be that future amendments need to be made to strategic objective 18 as a result. This is to ensure that the strategic objective will reflect the policies being taken forward.

## CHAPTER: 2 - Vision

2.1

---

### 9891 Support

Summary: agree

---

## CHAPTER: 2 - Vision

2.2

---

### 9123 Object

Summary: Cambridge is a city that relies increasingly on using all educational facilities around the year as well as specialist english language schools, EFL, TeSOL as such this industry is a discrete and vital part of the local economy

### 14326 Object

Summary: The changes brought with the NPPF document require that the Local Plan is more rigorous than before. The Local Plan must provide clear policies that favour appropriate sustainable development. There is great economic benefit in preserving the heritage and aesthetic quality of Cambridge through a vigorous planning system. Conversely there is great potential for damage by an over relaxed planning control which favours commercial interest over the heritage needs of a unique city such as Cambridge.

**7259 Object**

Summary: Include:

\* A city that uses planned growth to address socio-economic inequalities

\* A City that does not encroach on its green belt unless an exceptionally strong case is made

**7405 Object**

Summary: Bullet point 1. i.e. develop within city rather than expand at its edges?  
Bullet point 2. needs much stronger wording and application to existing buildings

**8182 Object**

Summary: Although we broadly support this vision we do not believe (bullet point 4) that it is possible to accommodate the needs of all. We suggest that this statement should end at the word 'employment' thus

"A city where there is a diverse range of employment"

**9360 Object**

Summary: Most of us are concerned about certain underlying assumptions behind the Issues and Options document:

(i) The concept of continuing economic growth for Cambridge which does not take into account finite natural resources and individual wellbeing. Replace with an underlying principle of dynamic equilibrium i.e. balanced, sustainable change without overall growth and increase in size;

(ii) The potential destruction of the things that make Cambridge so special;

(iii) A tendency for circular arguments, especially in relation to housing and employment;

(iv) Emphasis on proposals for "new developments" and only limited consideration of proposals benefiting existing Cambridge residents.

**9695 Object**

Summary: There is absolutely no mention of the diverse natural environment and wildlife present within the city which goes way beyond "green spaces and trees", which suggest merely formal open spaces.

We therefore suggest that bullet point 7 is amended to read;

"A city where green spaces, trees, wildlife habitats and the River Cam are protected and enhanced and where new green spaces, wildlife habitats and trees are established for the benefit of residents and the natural environment."

**9819 Object**

Summary: Vision doesn't mention the protection of the historic setting as integral part of its heritage. Strongly support need to protect green spaces and trees. This should also refer to maintenance of green corridors. reference to a 'clean' city - this should refer to freedom from pollution, including light and noise pollution. Emphasis on 'sensitive' (as well as sustainable) growth in the 2006 plan was important. For the sake of those who cannot readily walk very far or cycle (considerable group?), public transport might need to be improved rather a lot if this norm is to be achieved without undue disadvantage.

**10069 Object**

Summary: Highlight preservation of what makes Cambridge special, e.g. vision doesn't mention protection of historic setting as integral part of its heritage.

Strongly support the need to protect green spaces and trees. This should also refer to maintenance of green corridors.

Reference to a 'clean' city: include freedom from pollution, including light and noise pollution.

The emphasis on 'sensitive' (as well as sustainable) growth in the 2006 plan was important.

For those who cannot readily walk very far or cycle (considerable group?), public transport might need to be improved a lot if this norm is to be achieved without undue disadvantage.

**10427 Object**

Summary: Bullet point 1. i.e. develop within city rather than expand at its edges? Bullet point 2. needs much stronger wording and application to existing buildings

**10527 Object**

Summary: Although I support most of this vision statement, it is decidedly over the top in places. There is no way that a place the size of Cambridge can provide for ALL employment needs or ALL community needs. This language could be used to justify overdevelopment if it provides a facility not presently available.

**10625 Object**

Summary: This is a very rosy, almost Utopian vision. It has a business as usual flavour which plays down the very real problems we face in energy supply, climate change, traffic congestion and food security. The vision is a sugar coating to disguise the bitter pill beneath.

It skillfully avoids reference to economic growth and to the present financial crisis. Although we are looking at a long timescale to 2031, the Prime Minister said recently that these problems will not be resolved before 2020. A vision needs to be based in reality, not simply a distant dream.

## 10839 Object

Summary: Support in principle, but object to bullet point 9.  
The city is large and public transport will always be subject to commercial pressures. For many people, for many reasons, the car will remain a key form of transport which needs to be properly accommodated within the plan.

## 11166 Object

Summary: Vision should reflect the priorities for healthy and active lifestyles as set out in the City Council's Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) and the Improving Health Partnership, and in particular the need

- \* tackle rising obesity; and
- \* to get more people participating sport or active recreation

We consider that the vision should reflect the key priorities for health and should explicitly refer to the need for a healthy city and to improve opportunity for participation in sport. We suggest a bullet is added as follows:

"A healthy city which provides opportunities for active and healthy lifestyles and for increased participation in sport;"

## 11274 Object

Summary: Should not wildlife be captured in here somewhere?

## 11604 Object

Summary: I object to the vision for Cambridge as being a "world class city that is compact...". This is because I disagree with the word 'compact'. Its meaning is compressed, squashed, packed in, dense, squeezed together etc. This does not sound good at all - we are already squashed together enough in Cambridge, with little enough green space as it is. If we were to be compacted any further it would have even more severe consequences for our quality of life and thus our mental health - we should not strive to be compact.

## 13086 Object

Summary: This should include a summary policy on the city's green belt. This should be along the following lines:

A city that preserves its green belt, only taking such land in very exceptional cases.

## 13544 Object

Summary: Object that "new development" is singled out as the basis for helping the City's transition to a more environmentally sustainable economy.

## 13742 Object

Summary: Suggesting clarifying "affordable housing"; adding world class telecoms infrastructure to the vision, and also adding a cohesive city, ie. without town/gown family/sharer divisions or even hatred.

## 14394 Object

Summary: "WORLD CLASS CITY" is a meaningless phrase. delete.

"Anglia Ruskin University" - should be deleted as it dilutes the importance of Cambridge University

"good social mix". There is no measure of "good" - delete

## 14658 Object

Summary: Support in principle, but suggest addition of the following:  
\* A city that values and preserves its Green Belt.  
\* A city that promotes the availability of high quality digital technology for business and personal use.  
\* A city that provides for efficient business, leisure and student travel to other parts of the UK and overseas.

## 15218 Object

Summary: Before these houses are built we want to see Dutch quality cycle infrastructure put in place. As more people move into the city more traffic will be created and it's important, if we wish to reduce any possible congestion, that we encourage people as much as possible to choose sustainable modes of transport such as the bicycle. Our definition of Dutch quality is outlined in our full response.

## 15304 Object

Summary: The Vision has not ventured beyond the commonplace view that our future success depends on "growth". We are now using up the resources of the planet at one-and-a-half times the rate the planet can sustain. If all are to have the basic human rights of easy access to nature, and at the same time to decent housing, the answer is not to despoil the Green Belt. To do so may be in the interests of a short-term "gold rush", but it is against the interests of imaginative thinking for more critical and longer-lasting benefits for all.

## 15799 Object

Summary: Good vision but could do with expansion to include: historic setting; green corridors (bringing wildlife into the Backs) as well as green spaces (including gardens and playing fields) and trees; low levels of air, noise and light pollution; sensitive development planning; world-class public transport to complement walking and cycling routes.

## 16122 Object

Summary: Cambridge is unique as a world leading academic city that is compact and dynamic. We agree with a vision that preserves and enhances green spaces, and that creates an uncongested and clean City where travelling by foot, bicycle and public transport is the norm. We believe that:  
1) The City should provide a range of employment focussed on the service sector;  
2) Much of the housing and employment should be created in 'centres' within the City and in surrounding villages, and that any City Plan should be linked to SCDC plans;  
3) The vision should promote efficient and sustainable commuting, beyond 'local centres' to nearby villages and science parks. 'Accessibility' should focus on public transport and cycleways, as congestion must be reduced inside the City while protecting surrounding villages from becoming 'rat runs'.



## 16182 Object

Summary: It sounds good but is it achievable. Query the need for more development over and above the 2006 Local Plan agreement.

## 16446 Object

Summary: No more housing development on Green Belt land (Option 1) until the space allocated for housing under the last Plan has been used up.

More housing development would take out more Green Belt and I am aware of the importance of the Green Belt for biodiversity and green space. Planned green spaces should include community gardens and fruit and nut orchards as these are far better habitats for wildlife than playing fields and other forms of monoculture, which are currently considered as green spaces.

## 16495 Object

Summary: The vision should be augmented by the following

- it should seek to meet the objectively assessed housing needs of the area (NPPF para. 17)
- it should better balance the size of the local (City and South Cambs.) workforce to the anticipated growth in jobs
- it should commit to the permanence of the current Green Belt boundaries.

Without these additional elements the vision will fail to provide adequate guidance and would be unsound.

## 17099 Object

Summary: I strongly believe that the local plan should speak about the Greening of the City not just Green Spaces.

## 17217 Object

Summary: Agree with most of these points, except

I don't want a "world class city that is dynamic..." if you actually mean "more dynamic". I am happy with it as it is.

"A city that builds on the city's reputation...". the reputation as a leader is fine as it is. Why do we have to build upon it? residents don't benefit from growth

"A city where there is enough good quality housing..." amend this to include " for the existing population and residents"

"A city that encourages innovation and requires design..." This is way outside the council's brief.

## 17638 Object

Summary: Firstly I agree with the sentiments in the Vision for Cambridge as set out in the 2006 Plan and the version of this Vision as set out in Option 1. However, I believe that it is misleading to view the City in isolation from the surrounding areas, since this distorts the options available to the Council to achieve the goals set out in Option 1. There are major developments taking place in S. Cambs which will have a major impact on the City and must be taken into account in the Local Plan.

## 17673 Object

Summary: I like the objectives - maintaining or enhancing biodiversity omitted but it is mentioned in the fourth bullet point under 2.3

## 18502 Object

Summary: We strongly support the concept of a compact city of limited size and that the Green Belt should be protected and there should be no major new housing or infrastructure developments in the inner Green Belt close to the city. It is vital that the already agreed housing developments in the Southern Fringe are successfully incorporated into the existing community. There needs to be continued work to improve the quality of the environment within and around the city.

## 10836 Support

Summary: These are all laudable aims

## 10891 Support

Summary: The Vision for Cambridge should continue to support its role as world leader in higher education and research. It is important that policies are put in place in the local plan which support the growth of the universities and the economy, and ensure sufficient new homes, both market and affordable housing, are delivered to sustain the sub-region's economy.

## 11144 Support

Summary: support the Vision as set out in Local Plan 2006. This plan needs to build on that strategy and continue to support Cambridge as World Leader in research and technology and support economic recovery. Since the plan was adopted issues of tackling climate change, addressing affordability and the provision of affordable housing, and the need to secure economic recovery have become even more significant owing to the recession, the continued increase in house prices in the area, the lack of delivery of market and affordable housing, and the increased urgency of needing to tackle climate change.

## 13038 Support

Summary: I agree

## 13107 Support

Summary: We write on behalf of our client Threadneedle Investment Services in relation to the redevelopment of the Compass House site. We support the vision of Cambridge to 2031. Development of sites such as Compass House can help to contribute to the vision for Cambridge through high quality design, sustainable construction, energy efficiency/carbon reducing technology and which helps improve the local economy.

## **14561 Support**

Summary: Support these objectives.

The key thing is not to lose sight of the fact that what makes Cambridge such a successful economy, as well as the knowledge economy, is the fact that it is such a great place to live. The council's role should largely be to ensure that it continues to be a great place to live. A narrowly economic approach would be extremely damaging to the city in the long-term. I think these objectives get that.

## **15582 Support**

Summary: We support the Council's vision for Cambridge to become "a world city that is compact, dynamic and has a thriving City Centre" and in particular the Council's strategic objective 11 "To promote and support economic growth in environmentally sustainable and accessible locations".

## **17631 Support**

Summary: The Property Services Department at the City Council supports the Vision and Strategic Objectives contained in the Issues and Options report, which we consider represent a fair indication of where it is hoped the City will have got to by 2031 in respect of matters such as housing, economy, community and retail facilities, green infrastructure and transport infrastructure.

## **17662 Support**

Summary: We welcome the proposed elements of the Vision for Cambridge 2031, particularly:

- A place where new development helps to support the city's transition to a more environmentally sustainable and successful low carbon economy;
- A city where green spaces, trees, the River Cam and other water features are protected and enhanced and where new green spaces and trees are established for the benefit of residents and the environment;
- An uncongested and clean city, where travelling primarily by foot, bicycle or public transport is the norm.

**6863 Object**

Summary: In summary, you should stop trying to pretend that it is possible to simultaneously satisfy contradictory goals. More jobs in the city, low carbon emission, and continued "compactness" of Cambridge as a city are NOT compatible. My preference is to have more jobs elsewhere rather than in Cambridge.

**7037 Object**

Summary: It is difficult to argue with this vision for the city, but I would contend that it cannot be achieved without also having a clear vision for those parts of the surrounding district which come directly within the city's influence. The new Local Plan for South Cambridgeshire District should be compatible with and complimentary to the city plan. Better still the plan for the city and the South Cambs plan should be combined by invoking the statutory duty on local planning authorities to co-operate.

**7153 Object**

Summary: The policy on transport should be to maintain freedom of movement for all classes of traffic, not just of a minority interest, with proper engineering for 'flow'.

The evasion of the needs of a majority, enjoying the single most important democratic achievement of the twentieth century, which enables modern living is undemocratic, unsound (there will be unpolluting fuels), is not future proof (in a document which will run until 2031) and ignores: transport infrastructure is a concomitant of a Modern Economy'. It is a requirement of the Growth Equation'. The policy should be reversed.

**7251 Object**

Summary: Include using planned growth to address socio-economic inequalities.

**7406 Object**

Summary: An admirable 'wish list', but no mention of the major improvement in public transport or how to deal with commuter traffic - fundamental to continued success of the city. There is a separate county transport plan, but the city should set out its own vision on this issue. The uniqueness of the city's conservation areas, compactness, city core and green spaces should be stressed much more with emphasis on providing REAL protection and the retention of those elements that make them unique e.g. in Newtown the terraces and green spaces. MUST ensure that growth does not adversely affect this

**7422 Object**

Summary: The main priority is to keep Cambridge as an attractive smallish city but the shortage of affordable housing and provision in decent housing has to be dealt with much quicker than now.

**7767 Object**

Summary: The objectives are all good but by covering all aspects fall short of setting a direction in which to prioritise.

A concrete vision is required for how an enlarged city might look meeting these objectives.

**8287 Object**

Summary: This 'vision' is dominated by an unanalysed idea of 'economic growth'. Cambridge will anyway remain an exceptionally prosperous area for a long time to come; what is needed is a vision of how to make this prosperity compatible with protecting the quality of life and the natural and built environment. The present 'vision' quite wrongly favours forms of 'growth' which will be damaging to these more important values.

**8582 Object**

Summary: The Trumpington Residents' Association has specific comments on a number of the bullet points.

**8676 Object**

Summary: The Vision is so all-encompassing that it lacks clarity and sharpness - it's just a statement of motherhood and apple-pie. What gives Cambridge international status is its heritage and its great University. The Vision must give greater prominence to protecting Cambridge as a compact city, to protecting its heritage and culture, and to promoting the University of Cambridge as a world-class institution.

**9282 Object**

Summary: Small, compact city great - but how to do it with endless growth targets. Can't we move away from the 'unending growth' model?

**9362 Object**

Summary: The vision has many good points but the assumptions about economic development are in danger of damaging quality of life. The city's future should be based around research and a core of high-tech industries, preserving green space and the Green Belt, and it definitely should not base its hopes of prosperity on becoming a housing project for the 'M11 corridor' or a shopping hub.

**9426 Object**

Summary: The 'elements' do not clarify what is meant by compact. Suggest adding "A city which is approximately the same size as in 2012, in terms of the population of the city and that of the surrounding area.

The transport objectives ignore the valid needs of the motorist. Suggest it should read "An uncongested and clean city, where all modes of transport are supported and where sufficient road and parking infrastructure is provided for the city population (even if this means that growth has to be restricted)."

## 9820 Object

Summary: Should include preservation of what makes Cambridge special, e.g. vision doesn't mention protection of historic setting as an integral part of heritage.  
Strongly support need to protect green spaces and trees. This should also refer to maintenance of green corridors.  
Reference to a 'clean' city: should refer to freedom from pollution, including light pollution.  
Emphasis on 'sensitive' (as well as sustainable) growth in the 2006 plan was important.  
For the sake of those who cannot readily walk very far or cycle (considerable group?), public transport needs to be improved a lot if this norm is to be achieved without undue disadvantage.

## 9988 Object

Summary: Please let us only have developments that build UP the city's reputation.

## 10075 Object

Summary: Should highlight preservation of what makes Cambridge special, e.g. vision doesn't mention protection of historic setting as integral part of its heritage.  
Strongly support the need to protect green spaces and trees. This should also refer to maintenance of green corridors.  
Reference to a 'clean' city: include freedom from pollution, including light and noise pollution  
The emphasis on 'sensitive' (as well as sustainable) growth in the 2006 plan was important.  
For those who cannot readily walk very far or cycle (considerable group?), public transport might need to be improved a lot if this norm is to be achieved without undue disadvantage.

## 10139 Object

Summary: The vision should include a reference to the importance of vocational training (ie trades and technicians) not just higher education. This is important because they are needed for a vibrant, diverse local economy

Also the vision should mention the importance of making best use of local resources to satisfy local needs wherever appropriate - such as local sustainable food provision.

## 10185 Object

Summary: Retain the vision of the 2006 Local Plan.

## 10357 Object

Summary: The vision by limiting itself to 2031 does not look far enough ahead. We need to plan for our children's children etc. in such a historic and marvellous place as Cambridge.

## 10419 Object

Summary: In order for the city to continue to grow economically, housing must also be provided in neighbouring towns & villages, such as Northstowe, Royston, Waterbeach, etc. Therefore the plan must also include a goal of providing public transport and good cycling links to these other developments.

## 10429 Object

Summary: An admirable 'wish list', but no mention of the major improvement in public transport or how to deal with commuter traffic - fundamental to continued success of the city. There is a separate county transport plan, but the city should set out its own vision on this issue.

The uniqueness of the city's conservation areas, compactness, city core and green spaces should be stressed much more, with emphasis on providing REAL protection and the retention of those elements that make them unique e.g. in Newtown the terraces and green spaces. MUST ensure that growth does not adversely affect this

## 10510 Object

Summary: There is only so much growth that can be accommodated in Cambridge without destroying what makes it special. Caring passionately that Cambridge should not be destroyed is not Nimbyism, as is sometimes claimed.

## 10633 Object

Summary: Our world class city also has a world class footprint. Higher education and tourism attract international traffic so the city must take responsibility for the air miles it generates. This is just one example of our impact beyond the city boundary.

There can be no doubt that economic growth causes climate change. The New Economics Foundation has collated evidence that growth is not making us happier and promotes an alternative emphasis on well-being. This would include the idea of a 21 hour working week, greater leisure and more time for community. A vision of Cambridge - City of Well-being.

## 10972 Object

Summary: There is no explicit statement to maintain a Green Belt.

## 11043 Object

Summary: The city does not need to PROVIDE the housing, it needs to provide ACCESS to housing which could be in feeder areas such as Northstowe, Bar Hill, Cambourne and new developments outside the city.

## 11063 Object

Summary: The Vision as currently drafted does not adequately address the NPPF guidance on economic growth. The development needs of business should be referred to within any Vision.

## 11384 Object

Summary: Option 1 is a good first draft at describing the vision for Cambridge. It is important that we recognise that Cambridge is based on a 'knowledge' economy. My view on affordability of housing is to reintroduce rent caps to drive the price of housing down. Increasing supply will only ever be a temporary solution until demand overtakes again. Tackling the root cause is a much better long term solution.

## 11565 Object

Summary: Needs to say "A city with a strong commitment to providing plentiful social rented housing as a way to provide housing for the many people who work in the city thereby cutting the need to commute from outside the city as a way to reduce the city's carbon footprint"

## 11689 Object

Summary: The draft Vision includes 'A city that builds on the city's reputation as a leader in higher education and research, recognising the importance of the University of Cambridge, the Colleges and Anglia Ruskin University.' That part of the Vision is weaker than the equivalent part of the 2006 Local Plan version, for Cambridge to 'continue to develop as a centre of excellence and world leader in the fields of higher education and research, and it will foster dynamism, prosperity and further expansion of the knowledge-based economy.' The 2006 version better reflects the University's aspirations, and should be retained.

## 12023 Object

Summary: The vision is adequate but the 5th bullet point should be amended to read as follows:

\* "A city where there is a range of good quality housing of different types and sizes that is affordable to people on average incomes, with balanced and integrated communities of all household types;"

## 12911 Object

Summary: Ensure that the city continues to enjoy an enviable quality of life and prevent the creeping urbanisation and progressive density of development as in the station area.

## 13117 Object

Summary: We agree with the Council's housing vision for 'A City where there is enough good quality housing of different types and sizes including affordable housing, with balanced and integrated communities of all household types.' Additional wording emphasising that current housing needs should be met and future housing needs should be planned for, should be added to strengthen this part of the Council's vision.

## 13464 Object

Summary: It is right to have these aspirations but always with a view to those who cannot access the prosperity. It is lovely to walk through the Grand Arcade but where are those smaller shops which give a city character (eg Norwich lanes)? Sort out the transport issues especially for cars.  
Demand better bus services, not more frequent - just more reliable and to serve the wider community better.  
Make more attractive affordable housing.  
Support sports facilities.

## 13578 Object

Summary: "Support/Object" does not apply here. I welcome several aspects of the Vision, such as the aim to protect green spaces and to enhance quality of life. As noted in another section, I question the implication in the Vision that this should necessarily be linked to "new development".

## 14411 Object

Summary: Although these aims are worthy there must be a clear vision to enhance what makes Cambridge special - for example its heritage, cultural and innovative activities and varying communities. To improve our quality of life the city must be well connected with transport and other links and it must have culture at its heart. Good design of public spaces and buildings is vital and must be required in the Local Plan. Key cultural buildings such as arts and archives centres and others could provide an opportunity to showcase innovation in design. A long term vision is needed.

## 14515 Object

Summary: Cambridge risks losing its amenities and quality of life from the overcrowding currently in train. It is saturated by cars, so that people—including businesses—cannot move. This plan presupposes expansion which is deleterious and it skews the discussion by beginning from a harmful premise. Everything that follows in this plan is prejudiced by the expectation that there ought to be something that there ought not to be.

## 14818 Object

Summary: Please add something about encouraging electric vehicles/hybrids/smaller low-emission vehicles.

## 15199 Object

Summary: Though this is a listing of all the measures which an enlightened city would wish to promote, it reads as a statement of where we are at present, and satisfied. It needs to be more visionary, emphasising the need to become more sustainable in all fields, and especially that of transport. Cambridge may have levels of cycling which are high by UK standards, but it could and must do better, taking Dutch practice as its model. A city is not made "thriving" by having high levels of traffic, but by being enjoyed by many people.

## 15410 Object

Summary: Paragraph 2.2 implies a restricted definition of sustainable development rather than that set out in the NPPF. The historic environment should be a central part of the vision. It is important that the vision is closely related to Cambridge and is not simply generic. In this respect, bullet 8 seems hardly adequate for an ancient university city with nationally and internationally significant built heritage. We suggest the following changes:  
-Bullet 1 'A world class city that is compact, dynamic and where the architectural riches of the University and cultural vitality enhance the city centre.'  
- Bullet 6 'A city that encourages innovation and requires design excellence, embracing design that contributes positively to Cambridge's distinctive identity and acknowledges the scale and massing of the city townscape'.  
- Bullet 8 'A city defined by the exceptional heritage at its core, which positively conserves and enhances all heritage assets, including their settings, and the character of the wider townscape'

## 15695 Object

Summary: Public Health responsibilities are moving into local government and the City Council has many levers and ways to improve the health and wellbeing of residents, and can work with the County Council on this as well - please can this be reflected more clearly in the Vision and throughout the Council's work.

## 15953 Object

Summary: One can but dream, anyway, and here's what I dream of Cambridge becoming.  
A more forgiving, less frantic place.  
A calmer, less traffic-clogged environment in which the car is no longer king.  
A city that has greatly improved public transport and many more cycle routes.  
A more socially integrated conurbation that values community spirit more highly than it seems to at the moment, and that offers both better facilities for local communities as well as voluntary and residents' groups and much better public provision for sports.  
A city that has delivered a much higher percentage of affordable housing for the families who need it.  
A city that has belatedly recognised that bigger does not always mean better.  
A city that has much more of a sense of itself.  
Above all, a city that concentrates a great deal more on ensuring the welfare and wellbeing of its current residents rather than always seeking to pursue yet further over-ambitious and often illconsidered expansion.

## 16093 Object

Summary: Regarding the longer-term goals of the Local Plan, the Council no doubt has to decide on a balance between commercial development in the city, and the unique status that it has as a university city attracting visitors from many countries. Its architectural beauty and distinctiveness draws visitors to an extent shared by only a handful of other cities. This latter quality of uniqueness of the city as the visible embodiment of an ancient university - which is currently ranked, in terms of its achievements, as one of the top two universities of the entire world - has to be safeguarded.

## 16181 Object

Summary: The vision is incompatible with the proposed growth agenda.

## 16183 Object

Summary: It sounds good but is it achievable. Query the need for more development over and above the 2006 Local Plan agreement.

## 16741 Object

Summary: Pressures for development are just not discussed in the "Issues and Options Report". Continued growth is assumed to be inevitable. There is an inherent assumption in the "Issues and Options Report" that growth can be directed only by the planning authorities. We beg to differ. Development in South Cambridgeshire is outside the scope of a City Council report - and the possibility of cooperation with South Cambridgeshire has recently been repudiated by Councillor Tim Ward. But we feel, like the group "Cambridge Past, Present and Future", that we need a strategy for the whole sub region. If all three councils do not work together, we may be defeated in detail.

## 16879 Object

Summary: We consider that the Local Plan must be taken as an opportunity to continue to foster and support the city's position as an historic, world class university city, with a local economy, tourist industry and knowledge based industry of national and international significance. As such, the vision for Cambridge must reflect this. The vision should also specifically recognise the importance of Cambridge University and its Colleges. The Collegiate University of Cambridge is a key, if not, the single most important driver of the Cambridge economy.

## 16995 Object

Summary: The Local Plan needs to promote a pro- growth strategy for the Cambridge area that is based upon exploiting its key economic strengths and opportunities. This strategy should be supported by an economic vision and objectives /KPI's which seek to meet the needs of existing and future businesses and communities. The Cambridge area and its continued growth are critical to Cambridge and also to the wider UK economy. Currently, the Cambridge area has an economic value approaching £7.5bn while GVA per job is about £40k compared to the UK average of £37k. According to the 2010 UK Competitiveness Index, Cambridge is one of the most competitive cities in the UK.

## 17053 Object

Summary: We have submitted "A Joint vision for Cambridge's Quarter to Six Quadrant" (QTSQ) document to South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City Council.

This sets out in detail what sustainable development means for the QTSQ part of Cambridgein line with the present development plans of South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge

We ask that it be considered as a material planning consideration in context of local development frameworks for the period 2016-31

The vision has been developed in line with Localism Act

If necessary, we will put the vision through the referendum process to have it adopted as neighbourhood plan but the preference would be to have vision fully reflected in Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire local plans

## 17251 Object

Summary: We object to the lack of planning integration for the Cambridge Sub-region, as effective planning requires an additional 'Joint Major Sites Plan', to ensure:

- (a) fully integrated consultation processes and strategies by the three councils;
- (b) publication of quality joint evidence base of core projections for housing, employment and wider needs for the area to 2025 and 2031;
- (c) transparent and publicly scrutinized elements including proposed major sites and assumptions appearing in plans and strategies;
- (d) decisions on all major sites made after the drafting of a sub-region strategy and a single and objective set of major site assessment criteria;
- (e) decisions and assessment of all the possible fringe Cambridge major sites made simultaneously with decisions made by South Cambridgeshire plans on its major sites on the fringe and at other locations;
- (f) integrated major decisions on spatial and transport planning.

We are particularly concerned that the current process could result in inadequate and unsound documents; inadequate housing supply; failure to meet the NPPF requirement of a 5 year housing buffer plus 20% through the plan period, and failure to meet duty to co-operate requirements.

We are particularly concerned that the county transport strategy must catch up with the Local Plan timetable by Autumn, and ensure integrated transport proposals and assessments for all proposed new housing and jobs locations, particularly for public transport.

## 17377 Object

Summary: The elements proposed for inclusion at the heart of the 2031 Vision for Cambridge are agreed to be generally appropriate. This should additionally refer to the protection of the Green Belt and specifically the retention of the existing boundary. This is consistent with the references to a compact city (Bullet 1) and the protection of green infrastructure (Bullet 7) but should be an important statement of the Vision in its own right. Direct reference should also be made to the importance of rail as a key element of public transport in the city.

## 17422 Object

Summary: The vision is too ambitious, it does not take into account the finite water resources available.

## 17578 Object

Summary: Most people would support the vision.  
We would like to see a requirement for more sensitive development outlined in the vision to be transformed into action. Some new developments are not up to standard.  
We support the desire to encourage people to cycle and walk, but this is not enforceable, car spaces need to be incorporated into new developments.  
there needs to be a traffic management policy.  
Need to see new developments completed before starting new ones, in order to assess the impact on infrastructure.  
Need to balance growth with preserving the character of cambridge and protect green belt.

## 17588 Object

Summary: I welcome all 12 "bullet points" describing the Cambridge 2031 Vision. However, I question whether the spirit of this vision is matched in the subsequent report. I cannot see that sufficient creativity has been applied in the overall and detailed proposals. If it were, then the "Transport Strategy" would not have been the last chapter. A clever, laterally thought through approach would have started with a "Transport Strategy" and worked out from this. The proposed vision does not grip this with anything like the boldness that is essential for Cambridge to rise to its current challenges let alone those in 20 years time.

## 18005 Object

Summary: The overriding concern expressed by CAA members is the lack of a clear policy vision and a coherent spatial plan in the Issues and Options Report. The report appears re-active rather than pro-active in stance, holding back from adopting clear strategic visions for any of the key areas of the city. We hope that further engagement with the CAA and various local academic, commercial and voluntary groups working in these areas will impact positively on the shape, content and vision of future planning policy documentation.

## 18277 Object

Summary: The ideas in Chapter 2 on vision need to be sharpened up to reflect the implications of sustainable development. The suggested vision covered in 2.1 and includes a lot of material which is not really visionary. A vision statement needs to be brief, bold, translatable into specific objectives, and to reflect stretching but realistic ambition. Councillors and officials need to be able to rally to it. Given the central importance of sustainable development, Cambridge's already strong foundations in each of the three development strands and its worldwide reputation, something on the following lines looks right;  
Cambridge aims to be an international beacon for sustainable development for the benefit of its present and future citizens, with an approach to planning which rejects unsustainable approaches, and implementation arrangements which use all the available levers to ensure effective delivery.

## 18504 Object

Summary: We have specific comments on a number of the bullet points (see full text).

## 6883 Support

Summary: Balanced housing is important, if this includes 2-5 bedroom houses with modest gardens for families besides flats and studios, which are increasingly dominant. Good social mix must mean not only 'social' housing but also stock that average and wealthier people can afford. Improving public transport is vital - however, it is necessary to remember that there will be an ongoing need for car usage too, including by residents. If you have poor health, limited mobility, hordes of children, bulky or heavy shopping etc. being able to park in town on occasion will remain crucial.

## 7275 Support

Summary: Excellent overall statement. Some of the objectives may conflict with one another, but that is in the nature of the issues at stake. Best to spell them all out, even if very ambitious.

## 7321 Support

Summary: This vision encompasses the aspects of Cambridge that I appreciate. The implication is one of low to steady growth in housing and employment and protection of open spaces.

## 7514 Support

Summary: however, although the aim of travel by foot/bicycle/public transport is a laudable one, there must be better roads. Most cars in Cambridge are squeezed into limited, inadequate, winding narrow and congested streets, so that even those passing through, skirting or trying to get out contribute massively and unnecessarily to the constant congestion. Cambridge needs a proper ring road, easy and good roads out of town and effective and sustainable infrastructure that makes the alternative to the car viable. None of this exists at the moment.

## 7610 Support

Summary: An inclusive, innovative, and green city captures my vision for the city.

## 8144 Support

Summary: Key words are Compact, Green spaces and trees and water features are protected, and public transport is the norm.

## 8362 Support

Summary: The vision is fine but how can it be executed?

## 8794 Support

Summary: The vision contains the key elements to ensure a healthy and thriving community. From a Public Health perspective it is important to emphasise the importance of creating an environment which provides opportunities for all and that strives to narrow health inequalities.

## 9895 Support

Summary: A good though very demanding vision statement. Some minor suggestions

1. point 3 suggest global leader
2. point 7 new open green spaces must also be accessible (we don't want to encourage gated communities)

some phrases need to be more sharply defined

eg what does 'an enviable quality of life' mean in point 10

If we just have undefined generalisations we won't ever know what we are aiming for or whether we have achieved it

## 10322 Support

Summary: In agreement with all the points, but missing any reference to food. For a fully sustainable city, we need to be thinking of protecting local farming and food production, encouraging people and communities to grow their own food, and supporting local food enterprises.

## 10425 Support

Summary: We note no explicit commitment to grow Cambridge PHYSICALLY anywhere in this chapter. We welcome this absence of commitment to physical growth. Yet elsewhere in this Doc there does seem to be some implied commitment to physical growth?

## 10690 Support

Summary: Basically sound

## 10893 Support

Summary: The Vision for Cambridge should continue to support its role as world leader in higher education and research. It is important that policies are put in place in the local plan which support the growth of the universities and the economy, and ensure sufficient new homes, both market and affordable housing, are delivered to sustain the sub-region's economy.

## 11138 Support

Summary: We support the Vision for Cambridge as set out in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. Since the local plan was adopted the issues of tackling climate change, addressing affordability and the provision of affordable housing, and the need to secure economic recovery have become even more significant as a result of the recession, the continued increase in house prices in the area, the lack of delivery of market and affordable housing, and the increased urgency of needing to tackle climate change.

## 11469 Support

Summary: Absolutely agree!

Key points:

Good quality housing of varied types and sizes- all recent new-builds seem to have been flats- please do not continue to build Cambridge up- as this is not sensitive to its history.

Uncongested city with most people travelling on foot, by bike or public transport- the current transport systems need a radical overhaul to achieve this and to maintain that very high quality of life that we have here.



## 11832 Support

Summary: Cambridge is unique as a world leading academic city that is compact and dynamic. We agree with a vision that preserves and enhances green spaces and that creates an uncongested and clean city where travelling by foot, bicycle and public transport is the norm. We believe that:  
The city should provide a range of employment focussed on the service sector  
Much of the housing and employment should be created in centres within the city and surrounding villages and should link to the SCDC Plan.  
The vision should promote efficient and sustainable commuting beyond local centres to nearby villages and science parks.

## 11900 Support

Summary: Will anyone say no to this vision? The devil is in the detail and I wish to make the following comments.

- (a) We need not only to protect and enhance our green spaces but to enable people to use them in the course of their daily lives for walking and (in some cases) cycling journeys.
- (b) Sustainable transport should be the norm for people entering the city from outside (whether daily commuters, people on shopping trips, tourists or whatever) as well as local residents.
- (c) The City Centre no longer seems to have shops that provide for my needs.

## 12068 Support

Summary: More emphasis on current buildings and their retrofit to help the city's transition to a successful low carbon economy. 80% of present housing stock will still be with us in 2050, so most of the carbon reduction associated with housing will have to come from retrofitting older buildings

Add: "protecting biodiversity" - to protect the natural environment and people's enjoyment and connection with it.

Add: "food sustainability" - to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, encourage local employment, enable residents to feel confident in the provenance of their food and to build resilience in relation to food.

## 12432 Support

Summary: Who could disagree, BUT such a vision is not compatible with much development beyond that already approved.

## 13306 Support

Summary: I'd like to stress the importance of good design, in all its shape and forms - architecture, urban design, green spaces. Good design is sustainable, inclusive, innovative and provides value for money.

## 13807 Support

Summary: I support the vision generally especially the preference for foot and bike public transport but would also like to emphasise the need for green spaces to be available to all residents (including children) within walking distance

## 13982 Support

Summary: support

## 14261 Support

Summary: The vision is too small.  
We need to address the greater issues of population growth and climate change with more imagination, as well as preserving our compact city.  
High rise development is essential.  
Cambridge should become a beacon for urban design that can lead the world in the search for solutions to our looming problems

## 14358 Support

Summary: Support compact city and transport strategy not based on private car use, wish to see public transport further emphasised. Concern that 'enough' housing is too vague a term -- not possible for all housing to be provided within city and still remain compact. Ditto local centres; final point ambiguous.

## 14412 Support

Summary: In general terms, the Cambridge 2031 Vision is supported subject to a number of caveats which are detailed in our full written justification.

## 14569 Support

Summary: Broadly acceptable

## 14890 Support

Summary: We are delighted to see 'the River Cam' included in the overall Vision.

## 15334 Support

Summary: Cambridge is unique as a world leading academic city that is compact and dynamic. We agree with a vision that preserves and enhances green spaces, and that creates an uncongested and clean City where travelling by foot, bicycle and public transport is the norm. We believe that:  
1) The City should provide a range of employment focussed on the service sector;  
2) Much of the housing and employment should be created in 'centres' within the City and in surrounding villages, and that any City Plan should be linked to SCDC plans;  
3) The vision should promote efficient and sustainable commuting, beyond 'local centres' to nearby villages and science parks. 'Accessibility' should focus on public transport and cycleways, as congestion must be reduced inside the City while protecting surrounding villages from becoming 'rat runs'.

## 15459 Support

Summary: The vision of Cambridge in the 2006 Plan as a compact dynamic city with a thriving historic core surrounded by attractive and accessible green spaces should be retained. The City must continue to develop as a centre of excellence and world leader in the fields of higher education and research. The Green Belt surrounding the City must now be fully protected for the city to remain compact with a clearly defined boundary.

## 15628 Support

Summary: The elements identified in Option 1 are generally supported. We concur with the need to retain the vision of Cambridge as a compact city. We would emphasise that the seventh bullet point.

## 15938 Support

Summary: Agree with the vision. With reference to Petersfield particularly regarding:  
"..good quality housing.." - Presently Petersfield is in danger of becoming bedsit land/buy-to-let/student accommodation - there is a danger of losing any sense of community if this is not actioned.  
"..where green spaces, trees..." There is a great opportunity in Petersfield to take a step towards fulfilling this aim with the reclamation of land currently occupied by the Howard Mallett Club and returning it to a green public open space for the local residents.  
"...where residents feel a part of a community..." As a resident of Petersfield for over 20 years I feel increasingly that we have no voice at all. It is dispiriting to witness the power of the developer and powerlessness of the local people.

## 16031 Support

Summary: In order to adopt and continue applying the components of the Vision successfully, there must be a clear understanding that Cambridge must remain a compact city in a pleasant green setting. Too much expansion is unnecessary and unwelcome. Pressure from politicians and developers to exploit the geographical position of the city must be resisted at all costs.

## 16121 Support

Summary: Cambridge is unique as a world leading academic city that is compact and dynamic. We agree with a vision that preserves and enhances green spaces, and that creates an uncongested and clean City where travelling by foot, bicycle and public transport is the norm. We believe that:  
1) The City should provide a range of employment focussed on the service sector;  
2) Much of the housing and employment should be created in 'centres' within the City and in surrounding villages, and that any City Plan should be linked to SCDC plans;  
3) The vision should promote efficient and sustainable commuting, beyond 'local centres' to nearby villages and science parks. 'Accessibility' should focus on public transport and cycleways, as congestion must be reduced inside the City while protecting surrounding villages from becoming 'rat runs'.

## 16164 Support

Summary: We are supportive of the proposed vision for Cambridge City to 2031. The vision combines environmental sustainability with the desire and intention to continue the economic, social and physical growth of the city.

## 16691 Support

Summary: I have lived in Cambridge on and off all my life and have become increasingly dismayed by what is happening to our lovely City. We live in a beautiful city, if unimaginative building is allowed and old terraces and houses are destroyed then it will not be anymore.

## 18341 Support

Summary: The Cambridge area already has a world class reputation as a leader in education, research, and innovation, all of which are fundamental to maintaining the momentum of economic growth so significant for Cambridge itself and the UK economy as a whole.

The Local Plan should aim to support the competitive edge that Cambridge currently enjoys as this is vital in attracting further inward investment in strategic infrastructure and in supporting projects/proposals which enhance the quality of life in our communities, and particularly for those who require additional support.

## 18344 Support

Summary: Support the aim to move to a more environmentally sustainable economy (2nd bullet) and provide enough housing (4th bullet) with a view to securing sustainable development.

**8183 Object**

Summary: We agree with most of these but wish to raise objections to points 8 and 11.

**9794 Object**

Summary: There should be a mention of ensuring that the Rights of Way network receives good funding levels to ensure it is well maintained and where possible expanded. It is important to promote access on foot and by cycle. The network itself should be enhanced.  
Links should be enhanced.

The Plan should be far-sighted and designed to enhance opportunities for the public to access riversides, brooks and lakes in the City .

It should also formally recognise the importance of enhancing links by foot and cycle between the City and open spaces for recreation in neighbouring districts.

**10180 Object**

Summary: Strategic objectives. We fear that developers may pick and choose from this list, selecting those that would appear to be met by their proposals while ignoring those that are not. Should the new Local Plan state that developers must, for every proposal, show the extent to which what they propose meets or fails to meet each and every one of the 18 strategic objectives?

**13590 Object**

Summary: As elsewhere noted, there appears to be a presumption that the Vision for Cambridge must be based on "new development". This is particularly noticeable in the Strategic Objectives, which focus much more heavily on such development than the Vision does. As such, there is a mis-match between the two.

**16497 Object**

Summary: It is a matter of concern that whilst eighteen objectives are set out, none relate to the Green Belt which is a critically important long term determinant of the spatial structure of the City and protecting the unique setting of the City. There should be an additional objective which commits the City Council to the long term maintenance of the Green Belt boundaries around Cambridge, and clearly undertakes that no amendments will be proposed to the current Green Belt boundaries in this Local Plan, thus ensuring their permanence as set out in paragraph 83 of the NPPF.

**16998 Object**

Summary: The economic vision and objectives in the Local Plan should support the economic importance of the Cambridge Area and support and sustain the broad functions for Cambridge including:

- The distinct competitive advantage and international recognition provided by its research and development businesses and institutions
- Its wider research communities including the continued global strength of its universities and colleges
- Its importance in terms of its technology based business community
- Sustaining the existing manufacturing base
- The sub regional function of Cambridge as a city centre economy including its retail and leisure offer
- The sub regional function as a location for public and health services
- Its tourism and visitor economy and particularly its role as an international visitor destination.

**18278 Object**

Summary: Turning to strategic objectives, and the request for views in chapter 2.3, there are probably too many of these proposed in the document, and taken together they may have little operational effect. The strategic objectives need to provide clear guidance on the high level actions that will be needed to achieve the vision. They need to be specific enough to provide criteria against which individual proposals and decisions can be measured. This will provide a clear line of sight from vision to implementation.

**11146 Support**

Summary: We support the strategic objectives. We consider it is critical that to achieve a sustainable future for the city and sub-region that its economic vitality is supported, substantially more new market and affordable homes are delivered than have been built over the last 10 year, that development is of a high quality and new community facilities, including for sport and recreation are delivered to provide for healthy lifestyles.

**13366 Support**

Summary: The Consortium supports the proposed strategic objectives for the City of Cambridge towards 2031. The objectives must result in a positive outcome. The basis for many of the objectives is sustainability which will deliver economic, social and environmental enhancements. The Consortium agrees with 'Strategic Objective 8' which states that new housing for Cambridge should also serve the needs of the sub-region. The Consortium agrees with this approach on the basis that development in, and on the edge of Cambridge represents the most sustainable option for future growth required in both Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire DC.

**13717 Support**

Summary: We support the proposed strategic objectives for the place Cambridge should be in 2031. In essence, the objectives must result in a positive outcome. We agree that the basis for many of the objectives should be sustainability with the Plan seeking to deliver Economic, Social and Environmental enhancements. For example, we agree with strategic objective 8 that new housing for Cambridge should also serve the needs of the sub-region as development in and on the edge of Cambridge represents the most sustainable solution for a proportion of the housing for SCDC.

(See separate planning submission)

## **17228 Support**

Summary: Agree with most, but 3 of the points seem to suggest needs of future residents more important than current ones, and that future needs should influence what Cambridge becomes - this should not be the case.

Also, why do we need economic growth at all?

## **17663 Support**

Summary: Natural England welcomes the proposed Strategic Objectives including to ensure that all new development contributes to the vision of Cambridge as an environmentally sustainable city, where it is easy for people to make the transition to a lifestyle that results in lower carbon dioxide emissions, water quality and flood risk, high quality design, protection and enhancement of landscape and green infrastructure and promotion of sustainable transport. We would suggest that an additional strategic objective should be to ensure that development positively contributes to climate change mitigation and adaptation, addressed through Chapter 6 and Strategic Priority Option 41, and Option 42, for example.

## **17822 Support**

Summary: FCHH endorses the following strategic objectives listed in Issues & Options Report (chapter 2):

- 2.
- 6.
- 7.
- 14.

**9432 Object**

Summary: It is growth which will be the principal cause of increased carbon dioxide emissions ( and consumption of the region's and the planet's finite resources). Cambridge is large enough already - further growth should be limited.

**10431 Object**

Summary: How is sustainable being defined by the city? Too ambiguous to leave it without clearer definition locally? It should unambiguously assert sustainable development is for PUBLIC benefit and not for DEVELOPER benefit, and give this a clear priority.

NPPF on pp2-3 says: "The presumption in favour of sustainable development 11. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise." A clear statement in the city plan should specify exactly what the limits of these 'material circumstances' will be.

**10635 Object**

Summary: Not just new developments. The existing stock of buildings waste enormous amounts of energy so that the Cambridge Retrofit project should be a central element of planning.

**16682 Object**

Summary: Objective 1. I am opposed to the need to produce lower carbon dioxide emissions as a strategic objective of planning. I believe that many of the fundamentals upon which this is based are questionable.

**18279 Object**

Summary: The proposed strategic objectives cover most of the ground, but need to be more focused, particularly so as to embrace effective implementation. We suggest the following. For the most part this is a reorganisation of the existing text, with changes of emphasis to make the objectives tighter and more operational.

"1. To promote a safe, healthy and stimulating environment, in which all development activity is objectively demonstrated to enhance the three strands of sustainable development together."

**7612 Support**

Summary: We have the potential to use urban form and new growth to reinforce our existing demand for biking and public transit. Sensitive new development can reinforce this.

**7728 Support**

Summary: Absolutely agree but should specify new built environment to be zero carbon where possible, utilising renewable energy wherever possible.

**9896 Support**

Summary: Agree the need for a policy/objective.

**10522 Support**

Summary: Being sustainable is not just about providing facilities for householders to recycle. It also should refer to the city's infrastructure - in particular roads, water and drainage.

**11569 Support**

Summary: The link to reducing carbon footprint and other environmental degradation needs to be made explicit: eg by saying "the highest quality energy efficiency standard with the lowest possible carbon footprint and environmental impact"

**13005 Support**

Summary: Its essential we keep and enhance the sustainability of Cambridge and work together in the transition to a different type of economic and energy climate nationally as oil gets rarer/less affordable.

**14570 Support**

Summary: Sustainable means being able to do the day to day things locally, increasingly difficult in Cambridge

**11744 Object**

Summary: Cambridgeshire is one of the driest parts of Britain. It hasn't the water to cover the new development. At the same time the water run off from new development to the south of Cambridge all has to flow through the heart of the city - increasing the risk of flooding quite considerably - it is the planned flooding of Cambridge

**13759 Object**

Summary: "To ensure that all new developments have a neutral impact on water" sounds like nonsense to me. I suggest spinning out a separate objective that the region's water supplies need to be sufficient to provide for the needs of new developments. New developments should not be permitted if the extent of their demands would be expected to result in demand for water in the region to exceed supply. I agree with the elements of the current objective on water quality and flood risk.

**14516 Object**

Summary: Once again the presupposition is that there will be expansion. The infrastructure cannot cope: destruction of green belt, of flood plains--as if it were never going to flood again--, of wildlife-encouraging coverts and fields. Once gone, none of these green spaces can be recovered.

**18285 Object**

Summary: 7. To create and maintain environmentally sustainable communities, especially through

- ensuring that all new developments
- are carbon - neutral or better;
- have a neutral or beneficial impact on water quality, and contribute to an overall flood risk reduction and help improve the quality of the River Cam and other water features in the city;
- have a neutral or beneficial effect on air quality, eg by minimising vehicle movements
- embody innovative ways of reducing environmental impacts - eg CHP, shared waste disposal and composting, car-sharing schemes instead of car parking...
- protecting and enhancing the landscape setting of the city, the green corridors penetrating the urban area, and the network of green spaces in the city.

**7038 Support**

Summary: Whilst it is vital to conserve water supplies water neutrality for large scale developments can surely only be achieved by using large amounts of energy, e.g. on pumping, which could be regarded as environmentally unsustainable

**9528 Support**

Summary: Very strongly support the objective "all new developments contribute to an overall flood risk reduction". The remaining parts of this Local Plan do not have such strong policies for new developments and so the policies statements should be strengthened to match this phrasing. Furthermore, there should be a holistic approach to development in the region. Flooding does not respect council boundaries. Without strong and enforced policies, developers will take low-cost options as they do not incur the risk to property. Even when damage can be avoided, there will be a problem with securing property insurance.

**9897 Support**

Summary: agree

**10536 Support**

Summary: Planners are not currently trained in providing and disposing of water sustainably (an area that needs attention nationally).

How exactly can new developments 'contribute to flood risk reduction'? The water company should be required to improve its existing drainage provision, which is currently aging inadequate, before there is any thought of the impact of new developments on flood risk.

**11676 Support**

Summary: Very important given that this region is exceedingly prone to both drought and flooding! Not building on floodplains, taking into account increased risk of flooding due to global warming and making sure local water table can support projecting new housing should all be a matter of course. Also maybe subsidies/encouragement for water recycling (baths, grey water reuse, efficient taps/toilets/showers etc) being built into new build?

**12174 Support**

Summary: (This questionnaire does not seem to permit proper comment.) How can any development have a neutral impact on water? More people, more usage. That is not 'neutral'; it gives Anglia Water more to cope with.

**13008 Support**

Summary: Flooding control and water supply will be key areas to emphasise as climate change causes increasingly extreme weather events.

**14517 Object**

Summary: It goes without saying that quality is important. But it must be said that there should not be massive building development now.

**18284 Object**

Summary: 6. To promote and maintain the highest quality built environment, ensuring in particular that

- new building development is of the highest quality standard, in terms of both its design and its impact upon its surroundings. The aim should be to go beyond the regulatory requirements reflected in building regulations;
- all new development contributes to the positive management of change in the historic environment, protecting, enhancing and maintaining the unique qualities and character of the city;
- the character and quality of the appearance of the Cambridge skyline are enhanced.

**7613 Support**

Summary: I would really love to see higher standards (and more variation in) design. The Brookland Ave housing shows what can be done with good design, but much of what we see built seems cheap and nasty. I'd also like to see a requirement for more tree planting to accompany all new growth.

**9124 Support**

Summary: This means for all parts of Cambridge whether it is Newmarket Road, Mill Road, Perne Avenue or Kings Parade

**9898 Support**

Summary: agree

**13501 Support**

Summary: There has been too much poor quality development and standards need to be tightened.

**14078 Support**

Summary: And that all building development is maintained at the highest quality standard.

**15939 Support**

Summary: An objective I would like to see put into practice in Petersfield!

**10081 Object**

Summary: support because this is what makes Cambridge special - but if order of numbers = priority, then should have higher priority

**10434 Object**

Summary: Too woolly! 'Contribute' is not strong enough! Add specific references to Conservation Areas and Buildings of Local Interest. Suggest: To ensure that all new development protects, enhances and maintains the unique qualities and character of the city, its conservation areas and Buildings of Local Interest for the future;

**14518 Object**

Summary: New development in Cambridge means more cars. Can Cambridge cope with the 4500 cars in the new site near Addenbrooke's Hospital or with the hundreds of cars implied by Trumpington Meadows? It cannot. 'Positive' management also entails accepting that there is a limit and that the city has reached it.

**15801 Object**

Summary: Give high priority to this as essential to character of the city but replace 'protecting' with 'preserving' and insert 'where appropriate' before 'enhancing'

**8147 Support**

Summary: With less emphasis on "change" more on "maintaining" the historic environment.

**8294 Support**

Summary: This should be the first priority. But 'positive management' of change does not entail encouraging new building and accelerated population growth. To enhance and maintain the unique qualities of the city requires a much more cautious policy which does begin with a presumption in favour of 'growth'.

**8678 Support**

Summary: This is the key objective: should be positioned first and given priority

**9822 Support**

Summary: because this is what makes Cambridge special. if order of numbers = priority, this should have higher priority

**9899 Support**

Summary: agree

**10524 Support**

Summary: Cambridge would just be Basingstoke if it were not for its historic centre, so this should be defended at all costs.

**15415 Support**

Summary: We welcome strategic objectives 4, 5 and 6.



**10085 Object**

Summary: this is under threat and is part of what makes Cambridge special. So this should have higher priority, if numbering gives order of importance

**12073 Object**

Summary: I agree that the skyline and character of Cambridge should be protected but I do not have much confidence in this happening if the planning department can approve carbuncles on the cityscape such as Botanic House

**14519 Object**

Summary: Another skewed assertion: tall buildings on fens? Let us by all means protect the quality and appearance of the Cambridge skyline: that means leaving it alone.

**15802 Object**

Summary: High priority; iconic feature of the city; but any 'enhancement' should not only be positive in itself but should not overshadow, detract or distract from, existing historic skyline features

**8304 Support**

Summary: This is very important, but tall modern buildings detract from the skyline of Cambridge: they do not 'enhance' it. This goal is particularly important when considering the appearance of Cambridge from the South and West, where its historic skyline is most precious and most easily viewed (and very easily damaged).

**9823 Support**

Summary: because this is under threat and is part of what makes Cambridge special

**9900 Support**

Summary: agree

**12183 Support**

Summary: To be achieved by demolishing certain tall buildings? I hope so. You are a bit late with this one.

**15416 Support**

Summary: We welcome strategic objectives 4, 5 and 6.

**16683 Support**

Summary: Objective 5: I am very much in favour of the strategic objective of protecting the Cambridge skyline.

**10087 Object**

Summary: Because it is part of what makes Cambridge special, as a compact University town, this should have higher priority, if numbering gives order of importance.

**7614 Support**

Summary: I'd love to see a wave of new tree planting in the city -- not just in existing green spaces, but along our urban streets. The tree planting they did in the Chesterton High Street 10 years ago seemed very successful and changed the street for the better. I'd like to see Histon Road and Cherry Hinton Road (between Hills Road and Cherry Hinton Hall) get a similar treatment.

**7729 Support**

Summary: Green corridors are crucial but need more emphasis on trees in the urban landscape too.

**7769 Support**

Summary: To do this while meeting the other objectives in particular for housing requires a proactive plan for how the setting and the green corridors should be developed and augmented.

**8145 Support**

Summary: Cambridge must remain a defined compact city surrounded by open green areas, where the unique skyline of the historic buildings are viewed in a beautiful setting.

**8679 Support**

Summary: Keeping Cambridge compact and protecting the setting of the historic city is a top priority

**9824 Support**

Summary: Because it is part of what makes Cambridge special, as a compact University town

**9825 Support**

Summary: because this is an important part of Cambridge's contribution to the quality of life of its inhabitants = should have even higher priority

Because it is part of what makes Cambridge special, as a compact University town

**9902 Support**

Summary: agree

**10641 Support**

Summary: Essential to the character of the place.

**14090 Support**

Summary: Essential for Cambridge to maintain enhance its identity. The green corridors are used by so many so enhancing them is very important.

**15418 Support**

Summary: We welcome strategic objectives 4, 5 and 6.

**15803 Support**

Summary: Very high priority as such a special - integral - feature of Cambridge; vital for its rich wildlife; suggest replace 'protect' with 'preserve' and add 'where appropriate' before 'enhance'

**9125 Object**

Summary: Green space and open space must be freely accessible to all at all times.

**9722 Object**

Summary: "Green spaces" suggests only formal playing fields. Amend objective to read,

"To protect and enhance the network of green spaces and wildlife habitats in the city"

**9826 Object**

Summary: These are essential for people's quality of life. The pattern of playing fields on the West, from the backs to the Coton footpath, are also part of the historic fabric of the city and what makes it special.

**10088 Object**

Summary: because these are an important part of Cambridge's contribution to the quality of life of its inhabitants = should have even higher priority.

These are essential for people's quality of life. The pattern of playing fields on the West, from the backs to the Coton footpath, also are part of the historic fabric of the city and what makes it special - therefore give higher priority

**14520 Object**

Summary: Same objection to 6 and 7. You say 'enhance', which skews the discussion. Enhancing green spaces and green belt means protecting, not building or pretending that those spaces can be moved or changed.

**15746 Object**

Summary: This doesn't go far enough. We need to manage expansion of green spaces. The principle of green corridors is not working as well as it should. Farmland is not very \*useful\* green space when it comes to benefiting residents. Nor are expanses of fens and grassy fields. More consideration should go to reserving a large space of land for a park. This can contain many of the features commonly found in parks in cities, including lakes networks of paths, and wooded areas. Milton Country Park is good but too far away for most city residents.

**8308 Support**

Summary: Protecting the existing green spaces in the city is vital. They do not need to be 'enhanced' by means of more leisure facilities being installed on them; leaving them as far as possible in their natural state is the right goal.

**9286 Support**

Summary: Support

**9903 Support**

Summary: agree

**10525 Support**

Summary: At all costs the green spaces should be protected.

**10647 Support**

Summary: Places such as Christ's Pieces and the Alexandra Gardens are vital in maintaining a civilised environment.

**11677 Support**

Summary: Green spaces are a fundamental part of what makes Cambridge the place it is, and maintaining that is essential to preserving the character of the city.

**15804 Support**

Summary: Very high priority; the green spaces add to quality of life and historic city character; suggest adding 'where appropriate' before 'enhance'

**15940 Support**

Summary: The land on which the Howard Mallet Club stands was originally given to the local community as public open space. With the demise of the Howard Mallet Club the land on which it stands, and its environs, should be protected and returned to the community as much needed green open space.

**7039 Object**

Summary: I suggest that this sub-para be amended to read (inter alia) "...to meet the needs of those people who live and/or work in the city and its immediate environs."

**7593 Object**

Summary: A definition is needed of the Cambridge sub-region. Reference is made in the I&O document to co-operation with S.Cambs. I would like to know that there is similar co-operation with East Cambs and perhaps Huntingdonshire. There is scope for only very limited growth within the city boundary and it is necessary to look at the wider Cambridge area when considering the needs of both housing and employment.

**7766 Object**

Summary: The need for housing should be to support those who work within Cambridge and the surrounding villages and not to encourage wide commuting.

**8184 Object**

Summary: Point 8 We believe a definition is needed of 'Cambridge Sub-region'. We note that there is close co-operation with South Cambs over the development of Local Plans but would like to know that there is similar co-operation with East Cambs, parts of which we would suggest belong in the 'sub-region'. We believe that there is a need to look at the sub-region as a whole when considering the needs of both housing and employment, as the City has such a limited scope for further expansion.

**8310 Object**

Summary: The character of Cambridge will be fatally damaged by more building. We have to accept that housing cannot be provided in and around Cambridge for all the people who may at present want to live here. An intelligent regional policy would direct expansion elsewhere, where it is needed.

**9288 Object**

Summary: After the massive development at Trumpington and with pressure on city services and amenities from other developments outside the city, I think it's time to stop building houses. At some point, we need to assess the benefit of providing more homes versus the detriment to the quality of life. It seems insane that Cambridge should just endlessly grow. Clearly other regions of the country need to have development and growth, and that should be incentivized. Our aim in Cambridge should be enhanced quality of life, better conservation, not more, more, more.

**9904 Object**

Summary: Yes to the latter part of the statement but object to the first half. What are the city's needs. Cannot be taken in isolation from South Cambs. Between us we must meet the needs but the balance between within and without the city needs more consideration. So keep the last part of the sentence only..

**10435 Object**

Summary: Unclear what this means? Why only new housing? What is the Cambridge Sub-region - does it include London - define and justify.

**10692 Object**

Summary: New housing is at odds with the ambition for a compact city. While the Accordia development gives an example of dense design it has no mixed use and its streets are very narrow canyons. It seems the requirement for 30% affordable housing is too low to satisfy the demand.

This issue is at the heart of the Cambridge dilemma - how to cope with success. I don't know what the answer is, but the local plan must offer credible solutions.

**11047 Object**

Summary: Again, provide ACCESS to housing, it need not be IN the city.

**14521 Object**

Summary: There are multiple problems about housing in Cambridge. That is not in doubt. But there is nowhere now to put new housing which does not encroach on green spaces OR destroy the environment by adding new cars. There cannot be new housing unless it is rental housing, because it immediately is sold on at a profit, making the lack of housing worse. Sometimes we have to recognize that a global vision of East Anglia includes encouraging 'growth' elsewhere than Cambridge itself.

**15807 Object**

Summary: Could be putting the cart before the horse, depending on the definition of 'needs' - needs of city and region for housing are not independent of scope for development elsewhere, e.g. regional policy might aim to reduce overheating in the south-east.

**18281 Object**

Summary: The proposed strategic objectives cover most of the ground, but need to be more focused, particularly so as to embrace effective implementation.

We suggest the following. For the most part this is a reorganisation of the existing text, with changes of emphasis to make the objectives tighter and more operational.

3. To provide new housing that meets the needs of the city, enhancing the three strands of sustainable development, and contributes to meeting the needs of the Cambridge Sub-region; and to ensure an appropriate mix of housing types, sizes and tenures to meet existing and future needs.

## 10897 Support

Summary: Providing more market and affordable homes at Cambridge is critical to supporting the city's continued role as a World Leader in education and its knowledge-based economy. The objective is supported, although what is critical will be how that objective is translated into policies and levels of growth in this plan and that of South Cambridgeshire.

## 12451 Support

Summary: Yes, but that means more houses with green children-friendly space for close by, unlike the NIAB development or the dense development near the station.

## 14396 Support

Summary: Most important to ensure that housing is built outside the city to ensure that city housing is not taken up by London and other commuters who do not work in the sub-region. Most important to ensure the sub-region is not filled up with commuters

## 14562 Support

Summary: Support this aim. The social consequences of not building more housing would be very severe and socially regressive.

## 15581 Support

Summary: What is key here is that such housing needs are specific to Cambridge and its sub-region and not to London commuters. Such commuters do much to impact house prices and render the housing market unbalanced, and may therefore undermine the draft vision in the Plan. One obvious way to ensure that new houses are targeted appropriately would be to locate them in areas which are not in the immediate vicinity of the station.

---

## CHAPTER: 2 - Vision

## 2.3, 9

---

## 7726 Support

Summary: New development should not focus on the 4&5 bedroom detached homes that seem to predominate along with 1 and 2 bedroom flats. More mixed housing with greater numbers of more modest 2, 3 & 4 bedroom houses (not flats).

## 9905 Support

Summary: agree

## 10437 Support

Summary: Add the need to ensure a balance between the transient student populations (university, foreign language, crammers etc) and the permanent residents for city as a whole and within each area of city.

## 10847 Support

Summary: Support in principle. Policy should also incorporate residential requirements for the elderly.

## 11678 Support

Summary: Urgent: Cambridge is sadly lacking in affordable housing for low-paid workers. The council housing list is so over-subscribed it's rather frightening, and the Council's determination to close group homes for adults who need supported living is only increasing the problem. Need to ensure that the current overwhelming focus on student and commuter living space is balanced out, and think much more carefully about the effect that decommissioning care homes is having on the people who've lived in them for decades and who have nowhere else to go.

## 13517 Support

Summary: Think particularly about green areas and parking areas around new developments. They should be larger than the current projects.e.g. off Milton Road new developments have fully paved areas between with little green space, meagre car parking allocation, tiny allocation for cycle parking in very small designated bike sheds. The whole gives the impression of penny pinching (or developer greed). Consequently every one has to compromise.

## 13765 Support

Summary: I think this is important; and is one of the key ways the planning policy can ensure homes people can afford are available. I think recent developments have lacked diversity in terms of property values and sizes at various points on the spectrum.

## 14114 Support

Summary: A better mix of housing types is much needed. For too long the emphasis has been on providing 1 or 2 bedroom apartments at the expense of families who require houses 2, 3 and 4 bedroom houses. Additionally, housing for the elderly with suitable accessibility should be given more consideration.

## 14563 Support

Summary: I would like the council to investigate housing co-operatives as a model. These cut landlords out of the picture, reducing rents for young people who cannot afford mortgages. This is the predominant housing model in some European countries. It also gives people a stake in their living environment, which rented housing does not. Obviously there are difficulties in terms of the financing, but I would like the council to seriously explore this option.

**10439 Object**

Summary: how does an environmentally sustainable community make everyone feel included? Delete or clarify this rider?  
Too loose at moment! Does this refer to community facilities? If so say so.

**8148 Support**

Summary: Including the maintenance of distinct villages surrounding Cambridge with public transport to the City centre.

**9906 Support**

Summary: yes, definitely. We have not, to date, really addressed this important issue.

**13525 Support**

Summary: People with learning disabilities are especially vulnerable and need to live in communities that are welcoming, stable and safe, with good local facilities and public transport.

**7594 Object**

Summary: It is necessary to justify the need for economic growth before stating that such growth should be promoted and supported. There must be a limit to growth and there needs to be a conscious effort to assess just how near to that limit we are already.

**8185 Object**

Summary: Point 11 We believe it is necessary here to justify the need for economic growth before stating that such growth should be promoted and supported. There is a limit to growth in a closed system, and it may be sensible to stop growing before the limit is imposed by intolerable stresses.

**8314 Object**

Summary: Although this goal may be neutrally phrased here, in practice it always turns out to be an endorsement of 'growth', expansion, and more building. Cambridge does not need such 'growth'.

**10539 Object**

Summary: The UK as a whole may need growth, but Cambridge does not, and should not be expected to bear the burden of the country as a whole. Far better to offer incentives to business to establish themselves in depressed areas that need growth, rather than here.

**10707 Object**

Summary: It is the obsession with economic growth that drives climate change. A Local Plan can not legislate against growth, but it could promote Well-being as an alternative.

The following quotation gives some intellectual foundation to the concept.

"The day is not far off when the economic problem will take the back seat where it belongs, and the arena of the heart and the head will be occupied or reoccupied, by our real problems — the problems of life and of human relations, of creation and behaviour and religion."

John Maynard Keynes

First Annual Report of the Arts Council (1945-1946)

**12448 Object**

Summary: The presumption here is that economic growth is the good to be sought, but what is meant by 'economic' here? University research facilities. more coffee bars and shops for tourists, small R&D units?

**15810 Object**

Summary: Only if such growth is sustainable for the city as a whole, not undermining its unique character or overloading its historic streets, not putting too great a stress on water resources, and so on. It is not necessarily best for the country as a whole, for the region or for the city for Cambridge to 'go for growth' - its international magnetism may partly result from its compact character and market town ambience.

**18282 Object**

Summary: The proposed strategic objectives cover most of the ground, but need to be more focused, particularly so as to embrace effective implementation. We suggest the following. For the most part this is a reorganisation of the existing text, with changes of emphasis to make the objectives tighter and more operational.

4. To promote and support economic growth in accessible locations, facilitating innovation, supporting Cambridge's role as a world leader in higher education, research, and knowledge-based industries, and ensuring that economic growth enhances all three strands of sustainable development. This enhancement need not always be direct, provided that any adverse impact should be fully, demonstrably and quantifiably offset elsewhere.

**9907 Support**

Summary: this really ought to be much higher up the list - vital for our continued prosperity.

**10899 Support**

Summary: We support the need to foster the knowledge-based economy and support its growth.

**15586 Support**

Summary: We support the Council's vision for Cambridge to become "a world city that is compact, dynamic and has a thriving City Centre" and in particular the Council's strategic objective 11 "To promote and support economic growth in environmentally sustainable and accessible locations".

**18389 Support**

Summary: Support this objective.

**8319 Object**

Summary: 'To recognise innovation' is a meaningless phrase, used as a cover for encouraging the development of hi-tech industries. Cambridge's world-wide reputation derives from the intellectual standing of the university; this is something that the council can do little to affect, other than ensuring that Cambridge remains an attractive city, and the council can not and should not attempt to expand 'research industries' on the back of this reputation.

**9909 Object**

Summary: this is clumsily expressed. Suggest

To stimulate innovation and its translation into practical outcomes thus enhancing Cambridge's role ....'

let us be proactive not passive, and we must do more than have bright ideas, they need translating into practical outcomes - lots of examples of this eg ARM, Addenbrookes and medical science

**10526 Object**

Summary: Yes - Cambridge is a great place for new ideas to be incubated. It does not however need to be the place where the market growth that turns them into world class products takes place. For example, if ARM has now grown sufficiently that it needs bigger premises, it would be better for it to move to another town than be allowed to erode the Green Belt.

**10903 Support**

Summary: We support the need to foster the knowledge-based economy and the local plan should facilitate its continued growth.

**11275 Support**

Summary: But also to expand upon this knowledge-based industry too?

**11680 Support**

Summary: Important both for city and for country; innovation and intellectual development are to my mind things the nation as a whole should be focussing on to try and pick up the state of the economy.

**18390 Support**

Summary: Support this objective.

---

**10712 Object**

Summary: I am very uneasy that the Local Plan should support consumerism as a policy. A visit to the recycling centre will show that products quickly turn into waste, bringing pleasure to no-one.

**18283 Object**

Summary: The proposed strategic objectives cover most of the ground, but need to be more focused, particularly so as to embrace effective implementation. We suggest the following. For the most part this is a reorganisation of the existing text, with changes of emphasis to make the objectives tighter and more operational.

5. To provide a varied range of shopping facilities in accessible locations that meet the needs of people living, working and studying in, or visiting, the city.

**7615 Support**

Summary: I'd like to see the community shops outside of Mill Road and the City Centre supported!

**9910 Support**

Summary: agree

**15845 Support**

Summary: Support CCC's aspiration to ensure that Cambridge has a varied range of shopping facilities in accessible locations that meet identified needs.



**9828 Object**

Summary: mention also minimising noise and light pollution which can so much reduce the quality of life.

**10090 Object**

Summary: mention also minimising noise and light pollution which can so much reduce the quality of life.

**18286 Object**

Summary: Alternative strategic Objective:

8. To promote social cohesion and sustainability, where everyone feels included, including through

- maintaining and enhancing provision for open space, sports and recreation as well as ensuring that the city has a broad range of community facilities and leisure activities, including arts and cultural venues that serve need Cambridge and the Sub region;

- minimising the distance people to travel to work, and making it easy for everyone to move around the city to access jobs and essential services;

- to ensure that all development positively favours travelling primarily by foot, bicycle or public transport, through traffic management measures in partnership with residents and the County Council and through a consistent requirement that all development should provide improved facilities for walkers and cyclists;

- to provide for citizen audit of the achievement of all the strategic objectives.

**9911 Support**

Summary: agree

**10402 Support**

Summary: Objective 14 - Health facilities should also be included in this description.

**11148 Support**

Summary: We support the strategic objectives. We consider it is critical that to achieve a sustainable future for the city and sub-region that its economic vitality is supported, substantially more new market and affordable homes are delivered than have been built over the last 10 year, that development is of a high quality and new community facilities, including for sport and recreation are delivered to provide for healthy lifestyles.

**8146 Object**

Summary: The key is to provide public transport from surrounding villages and Cambridge itself to the areas where employment is found, whether it is on the various science parks or the colleges or the hospital.

**9435 Object**

Summary: The city is already too large to make walking and cycling the first choices of travel for many people.

There should be an additional objective about minimising the need for travel through use of new communications technology. In a city with such a significant knowledge economy, the internet is already having a significant impact on the need for physical travel.

**9912 Object**

Summary: don't really agree here. Should it be a strategic objective if, for example we agree Northstowe and Waterbeach are to be 2 significant new towns. Are we talking about travel to work, to shop for leisure ??

Cycling and walking are only objectives for the fit and able. We must also include public transport. Why not revert to the accepted hierarchy of walk, cycle, public transport, private transport

**10091 Object**

Summary: this objective, while rightly discouraging unnecessary vehicle use, might need to recognise that walking and cycling by themselves cannot be the first choices for some

**10441 Object**

Summary: Want to minimize REQUIREMENT for people to travel for work - as well as DISTANCE

**10861 Object**

Summary: Don't know what this means. You can't legislate for people's movements. Whilst accepting that cycling is becoming an ever more popular means of transport, policy also needs to consider how to accommodate greater peace of mind for pedestrians - e.g. by more segregation of walkers from cyclists and/or by better education of cyclists.

**11051 Object**

Summary: This policy is discriminatory against aged, infirm, disabled persons who have difficulty walking or cycling. Provision of reliable and effective public transport should be included here.

**15806 Object**

Summary: In favour of the broad aim but object to making walking and cycling first choices for everyone: this overlooks the considerable number of residents who cannot ride a bike or cannot walk very far (not just some of the elderly: includes younger, otherwise able, residents with particular conditions such as labyrinthitis or mild arthritis); need to include ensuring really good vehicular provision, whether public or private, for these groups.

**7616 Support**

Summary: We already have the cycling culture. We can make Cambridge an exciting national model of making the bike work. Together with cycling and public transit -- this makes our city work in a unique way.

**7727 Support**

Summary: Agree should make walking and cycling as easy as possible for all.

**8149 Support**

Summary: Including bus and train transport.

**10515 Support**

Summary: Better provision of cycling and public transport is vital. Private cars should be discouraged, as they just cannot be accommodated in the quantities that there now are. This should also apply to people living in the centre. At the moment, residents can obtain multiple residents parking permits. If you live in the centre, one car should be more than enough.

**11514 Support**

Summary: We need much stronger deterrents for people to drive into Cambridge- it is far too easy for people currently, especially at weekends. Cost of park and ride should be per car, not per person to really tip the balance and make this a much better option than parking in the city. If we could encourage people to use the buses to get in from the fringes this could drastically reduce the congestion on the main arteries into Cambridge.

**11679 Support**

Summary: Making the city as cycle-friendly as possible is a very good idea. More cycle racks would be a good start. Maybe encourage bike-shops to give out map of city cycle paths with each new bike sold so people are easily able to identify and use safe routes that encourage them to cycle seriously?

**13009 Support**

Summary: We have a great cycling culture already - we need to continue to improve cycleways and cycle parking.

**15188 Support**

Summary: Walking and cycling can only be made the natural and obvious choices for local journeys if new developments, small and large, are designed to make them so for the people who use and visit them. Thus not only to create spacious walking and cycling routes which are more direct than motor vehicle routes, and which provide segregation of pedestrians and cyclists where volumes will be high, but to make it easier for people to get their cycle out and moving than their car, at home, shops, places of entertainment and workplaces.

## 15745 Support

Summary: Minimising distance is an important point: at present some cycle routes are shoved out of the way and made more circuitous so that the direct routes can be focussed on motor traffic. This culture of road design and cycle provision needs to change. At the same time we shouldn't ignore the needs of those too infirm to travel (for whom improved public transport should be the next best solution), or for the need to ferry goods around town. Also, integrated transport, such as allowing a limited number of cyclists on buses, space permitting, without needing to have fold-up bikes.

---

## CHAPTER: 2 - Vision

2.3, 16

---

## 10443 Object

Summary: No specific provision for network of fast internet access to reduce work travel etc

## 11611 Object

Summary: Subsection 7 is good in that it stipulates protection and enhancement green space around the City. But we should go a step further and add 'access to green space' to subsection 16 as well - we need people to be able to get around the City and access green areas, for their own health, well being and quality of life.

## 9913 Support

Summary: agree

## 11054 Support

Summary: Agreed, city shuttle buses, one ticket transport system, etc

---

## CHAPTER: 2 - Vision

2.3, 17

---

## 18287 Object

Summary: Reword:  
9. To reject any development which does not embody, or is not accompanied by, adequate provision of environmentally sustainable infrastructure to meet the demands of the city.

## 9790 Support

Summary: However it is very important that this infrastructure includes the provision of a new hospice which is fit for the 21st century. The current hospice, whilst offering excellent care, is inadequate in terms of facilities, location and energy efficiency. A new hospice is essential

## 9914 Support

Summary: agree

## 14564 Support

Summary: Martin Johnson (Rep No. 10443) makes a good point in relation to the previous priority (Priority 16). Infrastructure refers to more than transport infrastructure. Ultrafast broadband is also a form of sustainable infrastructure. What else?

---

## CHAPTER: 2 - Vision

2.3, 18

---

## 15809 Object

Summary: Support, but add specifically, including noise and light pollution

## 18280 Object

Summary: The proposed strategic objectives cover most of the ground, but need to be more focused, particularly so as to embrace effective implementation.  
We suggest the following. For the most part this is a reorganisation of the existing text, with changes of emphasis to make the objectives tighter and more operational.

2. To ensure robust implementation, including
  - the use of all available leverage to ensure that developers deliver their commitments;
  - rejection of departures from the vision, standards, detail and phasing of agreed plans unless these can be shown to enhance their delivery of sustainable development objectives;
  - innovative mechanisms to promote partnerships between Council, developers and residents and measure fulfilment;
  - the development of measures of performance for all the strategic objectives.

## 8804 Support

Summary: An important element of providing a safe and healthy environment (objective 18) is to give attention to the social environment as well as the built environment in new developments. This can be overlooked but it is just as vital to provide 'people' resources or social infrastructure to ensure the wellbeing of new communities. See Chapter on Social Environment in JSNA New Communities 2010.

## 9915 Support

Summary: agree

**10445 Object**

Summary: locally set priorities are much better than orders from on high from central government, if truly set locally within communities. BUT no priorities within a long list of priorities, which seems to give loopholes for developers and too much discretion to council officials.

**14522 Object**

Summary: Another presupposition: all the way through this report you use 'enhance'. 'Enhance' is a euphemism for more building, more cars, without provision of public transport, schools and other public services.

**17003 Object**

Summary: Specifically, the vision and objectives should support the following actions:

- Make it here: Better connecting the success in generating ideas and innovations in our area into manufacturing activities and jobs. Provision should be made specifically for manufacturing space in the Cambridge area. It is therefore important that there is a clear understanding between the offer of Cambridge employment sites and those key employment sites in and around Cambridge including the new Enterprise Zone at Alconbury.
- Innovation adoption: Capturing local business benefits from innovation for regional, national and international advantage.
- Promoting our world-leading capabilities and track record: Campaigning on the importance of our innovation strengths and specialisms to HM Government and internationally.
- Using our international reputation to capture quality foreign direct investment: Better promoting and marketing the science and innovation base in terms of the assets, businesses and institutions for general and tailored promotion and to attract quality investment.

**13524 Support**

Summary: An additional priority should be for the closer working of town and gown. In particular: 1 - use of Cambridge for pilot-scale studies of low-carbon energy and energy efficient buildings. 2. potential new concert hall. 3. What to do with the partners of the graduates and postdocs that come with the expansion of Cambridge U. These people have so much to give. They are generally young, highly qualified, competent and motivated individuals. They will come from diverse backgrounds. Surely an opportunity that Cambridge and the UK should not waste.

---

**7040 Object**

Summary: I reiterate the need for the Local Plan for the city to be integrated with that for South Cambridgeshire District. A Spatial Strategy for the city without regard for its environs cannot make sense.

**11057 Object**

Summary: "what type of development" could read "what type of development, if any"

**13778 Object**

Summary: The Council has not addressed how the Local Plan will meet housing need, including affordable homes for local people.  
Based upon technical work the housing requirement should be in excess of Option 5.  
The local housing market demonstrates homes are successfully being delivered on the Cambridge fringe. This strategy should continue. These represent the most sustainable growth areas.  
Effective masterplanning will ensure quality and provide social, economic and environmental gains. This is required by the NPPF.  
The Council is urged to re-examine its evidence base and make it sound prior to the submission draft stage.

**16500 Object**

Summary: It has long been recognised that the spatial strategies of the City Council and South Cambs. are inextricably linked and it is necessary to take a sub regional perspective which can disregard local authority boundaries. The 'Duty to Co-operate' in the Localism Act enshrines in statute what should be good practice and common sense. It is considered that the two Councils should follow this requirement to its logical conclusions and to jointly produce a single Local Plan for the sub region.

**16878 Object**

Summary: Growth of Cambridge must be supported to maintain its position as an historic, world class university city. However, this growth must occur within environmental and infrastructure constraints and that suitable mitigation is in place to address unacceptable impacts where these occur.

**8329 Support**

Summary: 20 years, however, is not 'the long-term view'. A properly long-term view would recognize that the university and colleges and the compact size of Cambridge are overwhelmingly its most important and distinctive characteristics and would do everything to protect these. Cambridge with another 30 or 40,000 new homes built around it will no longer be a 'special place'.

**9990 Support**

Summary: Yes. Cambridge is a special place. It would be easy to damage it by allowing too much undesirable growth. Predictions for growth are based on nothing more than speculated extensions of the recent past.

## Appendix B - Analysis, responses and preferred approach to the Climate Change section, plus summaries of representations received.

The Local Plan will seek to ensure that Cambridge develops in the most sustainable way possible. This means delivering our social and economic aspirations without compromising the environmental limits of the city for current and future generations. The vision for Cambridge is for it to become a low carbon, water sensitive city with a thriving economy. For this to be achieved, a holistic approach to sustainable development should be embedded within all development proposals from the outset.

Chapter 6 of the Issues and Options Report focussed on how the Local Plan will contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. It looked at how the Local Plan will address the challenges of mitigating and adapting to our changing climate.

### ISSUE: STRATEGIC PRIORITY – INNOVATIVE AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

(Page 112 of the Issues and Options Report)

<b>Total representations: 19</b>	
<b>Objections: 2</b>	<b>Supports: 17</b>

OPTION NUMBER/OTHER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 41: Innovative and sustainable communities – This option seeks to deliver truly sustainable communities that balance environmental, social and economic goals and minimise environmental impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong support - Should be fundamental approach to all new development;</li> <li>• Cambridge should lead by example;</li> <li>• Recent unpredictable weather patterns confirm the need for extreme caution. New development should not make the situation (re: flooding) worse.</li> <li>• Welcome the reference to innovative solutions, which may required some flexibility in the way that other policies are interpreted and put into effect.</li> </ul>
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make reference to the need for local communities to become more self-sufficient by producing their own energy;</li> <li>• Make reference to the role of sustainable transport, notably cycling, in reducing carbon emissions.</li> </ul>	

### **SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

The Sustainability Appraisal concluded that this option should result in positive effects across the majority of sustainability topics. In particular, specific reference to efficient use of energy, water and natural resources should ensure improved water efficiency and reduced carbon emissions from all aspects of new developments. This would have subsequent benefits in terms of enhancing the public realm and improving the health and wellbeing of Cambridge residents. This option should also have beneficial effects on maintaining Cambridge's position as an economically competitive City now and in the future.

### **KEY EVIDENCE**

- DEFRA (2011) Mainstreaming sustainable development;
- ODPM (2005) Securing the future: The UK Sustainable Development Strategy;
- Cambridge City Council Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan (2008);
- Cambridge City Council (2007) Sustainable Design and Construction SPD;
- [Stern \(2006\). Stern review on the economics of climate change](#)

### **CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Not applicable

### **ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The Stern Review (2006) identified that climate change will have profound and rising costs for global and national prosperity, peoples health and the natural environment. Option 41 seeks to respond to the threats, and opportunities, presented by our changing climate, putting Cambridge at the forefront of the low carbon economy, and the wide level of support for this option is welcomed. This approach is in keeping with the requirements of the NPPF, which at paragraph 17 sets out an objective for planning to support the transition to a low carbon future, encouraging the reuse of existing resources and the use of renewable resources. Planning should play a key role in shaping places to secure radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimising vulnerability and providing resilience to the impacts of climate change, supporting the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure.

As recognised by the Interim Sustainability Appraisal, Option 41 should have beneficial effects on maintaining Cambridge's position as an economically competitive City now and in the future, building on the city's expertise in the CleanTech sector, and helping to ensure the city's economy is resilient in the face of concerns over energy security and climate change impacts. Through requiring high levels of sustainable construction and energy efficiency in both new and existing homes, the Local Plan will also help to reduce fuel poverty and increase energy security amongst Cambridge residents, giving everyone access to decent homes that are affordable to run both now and in the future in the light of rising energy costs. This will have wider social and health benefits for Cambridge residents. Planning also has a wider role to play in ensuring the sustainability of new developments,

including helping to promote and enhance sustainable modes of transport.

#### **RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommendation is to pursue option 41 and develop a strategic objective focussed on innovative and sustainable communities. Additional reference will be made to support for community energy schemes and the role of sustainable modes of transport in reducing carbon emissions.

#### **ISSUE: OBJECTIVES**

(Page 114 of the Issues and Options Report)

Five objectives were included within Chapter 6 of the Issues and Options Report but representations were only received to one of these objectives, which related to flood risk.

**Total representations: 1**

**Objections: 1**

**Supports: 0**

<b>OPTION NUMBER/OTHER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Objective 3: To ensure development is safe and is undertaken in areas of least flood risk and ensuring flood risk is not increased elsewhere	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The wording is insufficiently strong and inconsistent with Strategic Objective 2 (to ensure that all new developments have a neutral impact on water, contribute to an overall flood risk reduction and help improve the quality of the River Cam and other water features in the city).</li></ul>
<b>NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b>	
Not applicable	

#### **SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

Not subject to appraisal

#### **KEY EVIDENCE**

- Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan (2011);
- Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2010);
- Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy (2011);
- Great Ouse Catchment Flood Management Plan (2010);
- Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England (2011)

#### **CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Not applicable

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The Council has a statutory duty to manage flood risk under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010. In line with national planning policy, flood risk needs to be taken into account at all stages in the planning process in order to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding, and to direct flooding away from areas of highest risk. It will also be important to ensure that development does not increase the risk of flooding to neighbouring communities. At the same time as managing the risk of flooding, planning has an important role to play in ensuring that new development does not compound the severe water stress experienced in Cambridge, through the application of high standards of water efficiency. The proposed objectives are intended to supplement the detailed wording contained within policies, but it is agreed that given the aspirations contained within the Issues and Options Report in relation to flooding and water efficiency that the wording of this objective should be strengthened.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommendation is to pursue this objective subject to the strengthening of wording in relation to reducing flood risk and managing water stress in line with the wording of Strategic Objective 2.

**ISSUE: A HOLISTIC APPROACH TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

(Page 115 of the Issues and Options Report)

**Total representations: 93**

**Objections: 25**

**Supports: 68**

OPTION NUMBER/OTHER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 42: this option seeks to develop a comprehensive sustainable development policy in order that its principles can be embedded into all development proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong support for development of this policy;</li> <li>• Learn from the best examples in Europe where this approach is much further advanced;</li> <li>• Policy needs to cover existing communities, infrastructure and buildings as well as new development. Existing communities should be offered opportunities to upgrade their homes as a way of being given a stake in the new more sustainable community;</li> <li>• A clear policy integral to the Local Plan will help assist with the design of development proposals;</li> <li>• Should place emphasis on smarter use of land, especially public realm;</li> <li>• Should include conservation and enhancement of the historic environment;</li> <li>• Promote local food production. Policy should specify</li> </ul>



	<p>amount of land to be set aside for allotment provision and local food growing;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to consider behavioural change;</li> <li>• There is a need for a definition of sustainable development, which should then be fed through to all other policies;</li> <li>• Consider the role of local materials and products or even local skills and services;</li> <li>• Need to build in locations that encourage sustainable lifestyle choices;</li> <li>• Sustainability should mean a building that has not consumed too much by way of energy or raw materials in its construction as well as its use;</li> <li>• Need for a policy that allows for the adaptation of existing buildings so that building owners can manage and maintain their properties and operate systems in a more sustainable way.</li> </ul>
--	--

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

- Green spaces could also be included as part of this policy as this would ensure a more integrated approach than a standalone policy;
- Policy needs to reflect economic and social considerations if it is to be properly considered as a comprehensive sustainable development policy;
- Provide support for communal meeting places to strengthen local communities;
- Should include policies to encourage and support mixed-use development;
- The plan should include a short waste section, recognising that growth and development will impact on waste arisings and may lead to a need for further infrastructure;
- It would be worth considering Hackney’s proposals for a Wood First Policy.

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

This option is likely to contribute positively across all sustainability topics. Embedding sustainability principles into all development proposals in Cambridge may have beneficial effects on maintaining Cambridge’s position as a competitive city, if it is a leader in sustainability. Positive effects are likely to occur with regards to climate change adaptation and mitigation as the option seeks to incorporate sustainable drainage systems, reductions in carbon emissions and considerations of building design and adaptability.

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- Element Energy for Cambridge City Council. Decarbonising Cambridge Study (2010);
- Cambridge City Council (2007) Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Policy 3/1 (Sustainable Development)

## **ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The NPPF states that “The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to sustainable development”. Sustainable development is key to tackling the linked challenges of climate change, resource use, economic prosperity and social well-being, and cannot be achieved without sustainable buildings and communities. The principles of sustainable design and construction, which option 42 seeks to integrate into all development proposals through a comprehensive sustainable development policy, seeks to implement sustainable development at the scale of individual sites and buildings. The general support for this option is therefore welcomed. This policy approach would build upon the Council’s current sustainability checklist and requirement for the submission of Sustainability Statements, helping developers to clearly demonstrate how their development meets the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’, which lies at the heart of the NPPF. While policy 3/1 has been successful in securing sustainable development across the city, parts of the current sustainable checklist require updating, particularly in relation to climate change adaptation, which is often overlooked in development proposals, and the integration of water management into all development proposals.

As recognised by the Interim Sustainability Appraisal, this option should contribute positively across all sustainability topics, helping to maintain Cambridge’s position as a competitive city and a leader in sustainability. The Decarbonising Cambridge study recognised that much can be done to improve the sustainability, and indeed reduce demand for energy and other resources, through good design and intelligent materials selection. This is best achieved, both in terms of cost and ease of integration, at the design stage. The design stage represents a unique opportunity to influence how a building, and indeed a development as a whole, will perform throughout its lifetime, and good design principles and sustainable construction practices should therefore be encouraged from the earliest stage in new development projects. The specification of materials with low embedded energy, and the sourcing of local materials will be encouraged through the policy.

While the focus of Option 42 is on physical measures that can be implemented through development, this option should also have positive benefits for the social and environmental aspects of sustainable development. For example, by ensuring that all new development has access to open space, this will enable new, and existing residents to engage in recreation, which will help improve health and well-being. It is the Council’s intention that sustainability/sustainable development will be a common theme running throughout the new Local Plan, and it will be important that this policy is considered in light of other policy options. These include the Council’s revised open space standards, which will include requirements in relation to allotment and wider open space provision, requirements for community facilities, and the Council’s revised car and cycle parking requirements. This policy will also link to the proposed policy on Climate Change and the Historic Environment, which seeks to provide a balanced approach between protecting the heritage assets of Cambridge while ensuring that they contribute to tackling climate change and

reducing carbon emissions. The conservation and enhancement of the city's historic environment is an integral element of sustainable development.

The same can be said of the role of the Local Plan in terms of waste infrastructure provision. The Council recognises the importance of waste provision to meet the needs of the local area. Option 42 makes reference to the consideration of provision for recycling and waste facilities in designing new developments, as well as minimising construction waste, which will be expanded on as the policy is developed. Further detail will be added in the Draft Plan, however it is not the role of the Local Plan to make policy for waste, which is the responsibility of Cambridgeshire County Council as the waste planning authority. The Local Plan will form part of the Development Plan for Cambridge and as such will need to be read in conjunction with policies and proposals elsewhere in the development plan, which includes the Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework. To include a short section on waste in the Local Plan would merely duplicate the policies and proposals in the Minerals and Waste LDF, which is not considered appropriate. The Local Plan will of course make reference to the wider Development Plan for Cambridge within its introductory text.

An additional element to include within this policy will be a definition of what sustainable development means for Cambridge. As part of the Issues and Options consultation we asked people what they considered sustainable development to mean. Some of the representations received included:

- Encouraging growth that is symbiotic with South Cambridgeshire and encouraging economic development that is in character with the historic/academic heritage of the city;
- Maintain the green and compact nature of the city;
- Ensuring that there is a well thought out transport policy and infrastructure with significant investment in public transport and provision for cyclists and pedestrians;
- Balancing housing/employment needs without sacrificing the quality of life and tranquillity of residents and resource availability in the city (notably water);
- Ensuring that the historic qualities and character of the city, from individual heritage assets to the wider appreciation of townscape and landscape, and the interaction between them, is conserved and enhanced for future generations;
- Use the Brundtland definition of sustainable development as a starting point;
- That existing buildings, brownfield sites and infrastructure need to be optimised and retrofitted to meet future needs using high quality sustainable based design;
- Invest in high speed digital links to enable home working and a reduction in commuter and business travel;
- Supporting communities and individuals in community life – provision of social infrastructure for all ages.

The representations received to this question will be used to define what sustainable development means for Cambridge.

#### **RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommendation is to pursue Option 42 with emphasis placed on the importance of ensure that the principles of sustainable design and construction is integrated in the design of all new developments. Reference will be added to the need to make efficient use of land, and the encouragement of mixed-use development, as well as promoting the use of materials with low embodied energy and the promotion of local skills development. This policy area will also include a local definition of sustainable development, either as part of the supporting text or policy wording itself.

**ISSUE: SETTING TARGETS FOR SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION**

(Page 116 of the Issues and Options Report)

<b>Total representations: 56</b>	
<b>Objections: 18</b>	<b>Supports: 38</b>

<b>OPTION NUMBER/OTHER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
<p>Option 43: Sustainable construction standards. This policy considers setting specific standards of construction to be applied to new development, based on the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for the policy – Cambridge should lead by example;</li> <li>• Standards should rise over time and higher standards should be sought from large scale development;</li> <li>• Concern surrounding how such an approach can be achieved where development incorporates historic buildings and redevelopment of existing buildings;</li> <li>• Sustainable construction standards should be achieved through Building Regulations as opposed to criteria set locally. The planning and building regulations regimes should not duplicate each other;</li> <li>• Need to reserve the right to raise our standards should higher national standards be introduced;</li> <li>• Need to give consideration to impact on viability and alignment with Building Regulations and zero carbon policy;</li> <li>• Consider alternatives to the Code and BREEAM, as these are not perfect methodologies;</li> <li>• Look to include some flexibility in the application of the policy standards if site specific circumstances necessitate it;</li> <li>• Set out a requirement for appropriate assessment of sustainable construction in the comprehensive sustainable development policy, with guidance on methodologies set out in an SPD.</li> <li>• Need to better understand the health implications of building to Code Level 4 and above before a policy requirement can be justified;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On small developments, these requirements would be too burdensome in terms of costs.</li> </ul>
--	--

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

- Develop a policy requiring a minimum level of the Code for Sustainable Homes (at least level 4 rising over the period), and BREEAM (very good rising to excellent);
- Set out a requirement for appropriate assessment of sustainable construction in the comprehensive sustainable development policy, with guidance on methodologies set out in an SPD.

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

This option is likely to ensure the delivery of sustainable buildings and contributes to reduced emissions from buildings in both construction and operation. This option should result in positive effects across the majority of sustainability topics. For example, new homes will have to meet the needs to both the existing and future population helping to directly address a key ‘communities and wellbeing’ issue. In addition the requirement for cycle storage should help contribute to improving the modal share of cycling in the City.

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- Element Energy for Cambridge City Council. Decarbonising Cambridge Study (2010)

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Not applicable

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

Planning has an important role in encouraging and facilitating buildings that meet high standards of sustainability, as part of its objective to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The Climate Change Act (2008) contains a statutory target of reducing carbon emissions by 80% below 1990 levels by 2050, with an interim target of 34% reduction by 2020. Given that half of the country’s carbon emissions come from energy used in constructing, occupying and operating buildings, a high standard of construction is vital in achieving these targets.

The NPPF is supportive of using local planning policy to set requirements for building sustainably, as long as this is consistent with the governments zero carbon policy and utilises nationally described standards. For new homes, this means the use of the Code for Sustainable Homes, and for non-residential buildings, the BREEAM standard should be used. Both the Code and BREEAM consider a range of categories that form a measure of a buildings sustainability, including energy and water, as well as issues such as biodiversity enhancement and health and well-being of building

occupants. While national standards should be used in policy, this does not, however, rule out the use of construction methods such as Passivhaus<sup>1</sup>, which can form part of the strategy for achieving a required Code for Sustainable Homes or BREEAM rating. Flexibility could also be written into the policy so that if a development were to come forward using a different construction methodology that could be demonstrated as being equivalent to the Code for Sustainable Homes or BREEAM standard sought through policy this approach could be accepted. Flexibility will also be required should national standards change in the future.

With regards to BREEAM requirements for non-residential development, the Decarbonising Cambridge study suggested that BREEAM 'very good' be the minimum standard required by policy. As such, it is suggested that a policy be developed that sets a minimum requirement for BREEAM 'very good' and that officers explore the potential impact of raising this to BREEAM 'excellent' from 2016, in light of uplift in energy requirements required through Building Regulations.

With regards to consistency with the Governments zero carbon policy and changes to Building Regulations, amendments to Part L were always intended to provide a step change in sustainable construction, leading house building towards the introduction of the zero carbon standard by 2016. As part of the original proposals for changes to Part L in 2013, this included introducing the energy/carbon reduction requirements of Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, which is the level of construction suggested within Option 43 and supported by the City Council's evidence base. Indeed this option remained within the recent consultation on changes to Part L in 2013. It should also be noted that standards such as the Code for Sustainable Homes, while taking account of Building Regulations and zero carbon policy, cover a significantly wider range of issues that is covered by regulation and the Governments zero carbon policy. As such its application to new development is considered appropriate and in keeping with the Vision of the Local Plan for development to help support the city's transition to a more environmentally sustainable and successful low carbon economy. There have been recent press reports surrounding the future of national planning and housing standards, with the Government announcing in September that it would be carrying out a review of local and national housing standards. As such there may be some risks in taking such a policy approach if current standards are swept away, in terms of implementation of the policy. However, it is considered that should there be a change to national housing standards, there is a stronger argument for the introduction of local policy requirements for sustainable construction. Flexibility could be written into the policy that should national standards be removed, other sustainable construction standards will be considered.

The impact of requiring Code Level 4 on the viability of development was considered as part of the Decarbonising Cambridge Study, which also considered the viability of requiring higher levels of the Code. In addition to assessing the extra-over costs

---

<sup>1</sup> The Passivhaus standard was developed in Germany in the early 1990s. Buildings have excellent thermal performance, exceptional air tightness with mechanical ventilation. The use of Passivhaus can eliminate the need for traditional heating systems.

associated with achieving these standards, the study also considered the energy strategies that could be employed to meet the carbon reduction requirements of these standards and the acceptability of these strategies in planning terms. This study concluded that Code Level 4 would be a viable standard to target through policy for all scales of development, with extra over costs ranging between 1% and 4.5%, with these costs reducing further with subsequent amendments to Building Regulations as part of the introduction of national zero carbon policy. Many developments within Cambridge are already coming forward at Code Level 4, and as such the construction industry has considerable experience of building to this level. A policy requirement for higher levels of the Code on small and medium scale development was considered to be difficult to achieve, partly due to the increase in costs and in part due to restrictions on the use of biomass in Cambridge due to the presence of the Air Quality Management Area, which represents one of the most cost effective ways in which to achieve these higher levels of the Code. However, the policy will be expressed as a minimum so as not to discount higher standards coming forward where possible, and the Council will also investigate the potential to set higher standards for larger sites, where viable.

A number of representations raised concerns about the application of this policy to the refurbishment of existing buildings. Given that the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM standard have been designed specifically for the new build sector, the requirement of this option would only apply to new build development. That is not to say that the redevelopment of existing buildings should not contribute to sustainable development, and these types of development should still adhere to the principles outlined in Option 42 (comprehensive sustainable development policy), as well as requirements of Part L of the Building Regulations. The Council will be supportive of attempts to develop assessment methodologies for redevelopment proposals, particularly where these can be applied to wider estates. It is therefore considered that Code Level 4 represents a viable step between current Building Regulations and the 2016 requirement for all new homes to be 'zero carbon'.

While concerns surrounding the health implications of Building to Code Level 4 are noted, as mentioned above many developers have considerable experience of delivering new homes to this standard. Code Level 4 does not require the same levels of mechanical ventilation as higher levels of the Code, and ventilation requirements, which are also considered further under Part F of Building Regulations, can be met with natural ventilation. There are additional benefits of building to Code Level 4 and higher that will have wider health benefits, including helping to reduce fuel poverty through efficient design and building services. Links to other policies such as integration of climate change adaptation into the design of new developments will also help to address health problems due to issues such as summertime overheating. As such, it is felt that Code Level 4 is an appropriate target to implement through planning policy.

#### **RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommendation is to pursue Option 43, with a minimum of Code Level 4 being

sought for new housing and BREEAM ‘very good’ being sought up to 2016 with the option of BREEAM ‘excellent’ from 2016 onwards being explored. This could form part of an overarching sustainable construction standards and carbon reduction policy, which will also include carbon reduction requirements, water efficiency requirements and links to the development of a Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund. There are some tensions in the light of the national review of housing standards and the impact that this may have on setting local standards, but flexibility could be written into the policy should there be any changes made to national housing standards.

**ISSUE: REDUCTION OF CARBON EMISSIONS FROM NEW DEVELOPMENT**

(Pages 118 – 120 of the Issues and Options Report)

<b>Total representations: 50</b>					
<b>Objections: 12</b>			<b>Supports: 38</b>		
<b>Option 44:</b>	<b>Option 45:</b>	<b>Option 46:</b>	<b>Option 44:</b>	<b>Option 45:</b>	<b>Option 46:</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>OPTION NUMBER/OTHER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Option 44: Detailed targets for on-site carbon reduction that relate to levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes being sought (i.e. 44% for all residential development up to 2016 and ‘zero carbon’ for all residential development post 2016)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for this approach;</li> <li>• Some feeling that this would not be ambitious enough.</li> </ul>
Option 45: Detailed targets for on-site carbon reduction in line with the findings of Decarbonising Cambridge (70% for residential development)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for stronger level of policy intervention – Cambridge should lead by example;</li> <li>• Preferred on the grounds of long-term sustainability;</li> <li>• Based on local evidence base which supports higher level of intervention;</li> <li>• Support for approach for non-residential development being linked to Building Regulations;</li> <li>• Not clear on why the policy is targeting a 70% trajectory.</li> </ul>
Option 46: Leave carbon reduction to Building Regulations and continue to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for this approach;</li> <li>• Concerns over the impact of this approach on the viability of development. Building regulations would be the</li> </ul>



operate a percentage renewable energy policy	<p>preferred method for ensuring that development achieves carbon reductions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On-site renewables are not always the most efficient option – policy should allow for off-site renewables to be taken into account;</li> <li>• Policy should focus on carbon reduction and not on-site renewables. More logical to minimise the necessary use of energy before considering generation.</li> </ul>
<b>NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy could include a sliding scale whereby standards are higher for larger developments, with lower minimum standards for single dwellings and midway for small developments.</li> <li>• Policy should recognise that on-site renewables are not always the most efficient option and should allow for off-site renewables to be taken into account if on-site solutions are not appropriate or viable.</li> </ul>	

<b>SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT</b>	
Option 44	<p>Option 44 would ensure that developments are on the path of meeting zero carbon in 2016 (2019 for non residential). This would result in positive effects on many topics, but it is uncertain the extent to which this would contribute to Cambridge’s economy. The evidence base suggests that higher levels of carbon reduction are possible, and therefore tighter standards than those presented in Option 44 could potentially help Cambridge to achieve its Vision of being a low carbon city, with associated advantages in terms of competitiveness.</p>
Option 45	<p>This option would likely result in positive effects across nearly all of the sustainability themes. This is because a requirement for levels of carbon reduction beyond those required under Building Regulation, and zero carbon homes, would contribute positively to radically reducing carbon emissions across Cambridge. This will benefit Cambridge’s position as a competitive city, would help address concerns surrounding fuel security and national targets for renewable energy generation.</p>
Option 46	<p>This option would likely result in positive effects across most sustainability topics, however using carbon reduction targets set under Part L is likely to result in fewer initiatives to drive to reduce carbon as much as Decarbonising Cambridge suggests is viable. The proposed continued requirement to apply a Merton Rule style policy would ensure opportunities to reduce energy demand through renewable technologies are maximised, however this aspect could be achieved through Option 45.</p>

<b>KEY EVIDENCE</b>
---------------------

- Element Energy for Cambridge City Council. Decarbonising Cambridge Study (2010);
- Climate Works for South Cambridgeshire District Council. Merton Rule Study (2012);
- Cambridge City Council (2007) Sustainable Design and Construction SPD;
- Zero Carbon Hub (2009). Defining a fabric energy efficiency standard for zero carbon homes. Task Group Recommendations;
- Zero Carbon Hub (2011). Carbon compliance: Setting an appropriate limit for zero carbon new homes. Findings and Recommendations.

#### **CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Policy 8/16 (Renewable Energy in Major New Developments)

#### **ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The NPPF recognises the key role that planning has to play in securing radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. As part of the Climate Change Act (2008), the UK has adopted a national target of reducing carbon emissions by 80% by 2050 (compared to 1990 levels), with an interim target of a 50% reduction by 2025. The achievement of these targets will require action across all sectors of energy use. Within Cambridge, this will involve balancing the overall increase in emissions associated with new development with the opportunities that these developments offer for reducing carbon and other greenhouse gas emissions, through measures such as improving energy efficiency and the provision of renewable and low carbon energy generation.

Three carbon reduction options were put forward as part of the Issues and Options consultation. The first of these options (Option 44), suggested a policy approach whereby targets for on-site carbon reduction would relate to the carbon reduction required as part of the Code for Sustainable Homes target being sought through Option 43 (i.e. the 44% level of on-site carbon reduction associated with Code Level 4). From 2016, when national zero carbon policy comes into force, developers would be required to meet a slightly higher level of on-site carbon reduction, which would need to be reflected in the policy, if Option 44 is taken forward into the draft plan. The Code Level from 2016 would remain the same (i.e. Code Level 4) as evidence within the Decarbonising Cambridge study suggests that for the majority of sites in Cambridge, achievement of higher levels of the Code would be unviable for both technical and economic reasons. For non-residential development, the levels of carbon reduction sought would be linked to the national timetable for bringing forward zero carbon non-residential buildings.

Such an approach would be unlikely to have a significant impact on the viability of new development, as it would be in keeping with the current levels of carbon reduction that will ensure that new development is on the path of meeting zero carbon policy by 2016 for new homes and 2019 for non-residential development. Indeed many developments in Cambridge are already being delivered with this level of carbon reduction, and as such developers are already factoring in achievement of this Code Level to their development costs. The viability of Code Level 4 was

considered as part of the Decarbonising Cambridge Study and will also be tested as part of the ongoing viability work being undertaken as part of the Local Plan process. However, this approach would not be fully in keeping with the vision of Cambridge as a low carbon city, and would not take account of the evidence provided by the Decarbonising Cambridge Study, which suggests higher levels of carbon reduction would be viable. Many respondents to the Issues and Options Report also felt that this option was not ambitious enough. The Sustainability Appraisal noted that while such an approach would have many positive benefits, the extent to which it would impact the competitiveness of Cambridge's economy was more uncertain.

The second option presented in the Issues and Options Report (Option 45) suggested a policy approach whereby new homes would have to reduce 70% of their regulated carbon emissions on-site, subject to viability. This approach that would go beyond the levels of on-site carbon reduction that will be brought in through changes to Part L of Building Regulations in 2013 and 2016, when zero carbon policy comes into effect. This would also go beyond the carbon requirement of the Code for Sustainable Home Level being sought through Option 43. The Decarbonising Cambridge Study assessed the viability of a range of carbon reduction levels across all scales of development and concluded that an on-site carbon reduction level of 70%, while ambitious, would be a viable. This figure of 70% came from original work carried out by the Zero Carbon Hub Energy Efficiency Task Force to identify a suitable level of 'carbon compliance', given concerns that it would be unviable to achieve 100% reduction in carbon emissions through on-site measures alone. The Decarbonising Cambridge study noted that this level of on-site carbon reduction could be subject to change but by enshrining the 70% carbon compliance level in local planning policy would provide the opportunity to maintain a high on-site CO<sub>2</sub> reduction requirement, should zero carbon policy be amended to dilute the ambition in terms of on-site reduction.

It is noted that this 2009 Zero Carbon Hub report has been updated by the publication of a 2011 report on Carbon Compliance. This looked at technical considerations, commercial factors and policy issues of requirements related to carbon compliance. Technical feasibility was modelled for a range of standard house types and sizes, with a focus on the use of photovoltaic panels, in light of other technology limitations. While the reasons behind this are understood, the Decarbonising Cambridge study, while implementing a similar methodology, focussed on a greater range of energy strategies for meeting the 70% requirement, while assuming that certain technologies would be restricted, notably biomass due to concerns surrounding air quality, and wind turbines given their efficacy in Cambridge is limited. This was on the basis of the Cambridge specific renewable and low carbon energy resource assessment that formed part of the study. It found that by employing technologies such as gas CHP and district heating, air source heat pumps and photovoltaic panels, a 70% level of carbon compliance could be achieved across a range of development types and scales. The extra-over costs of achieving 70% were up to around a 6.5% increase compared to a Building Regulations compliant scheme. It is noted that these extra costs need to be set against additional development costs that developers might face, such as S106 and CIL costs.

However, due to the high level nature of the Local Plan, and the fact that detailed costings for development sites will not be known until the planning application stages, it is felt that there are too many variables and unknowns that would render any financial viability assessments as an unsound basis for determining policy. That is not to say that viability would not be taken into account in implementing such a policy approach, and where it would not be viable to achieve 70% carbon reduction on-site, developments would be able to revert back to the appropriate level of carbon reduction required for Building Regulations.

The advantages of such a policy approach is that would be in keeping with the vision for a low carbon city, helping to meet the NPPF's aim for planning to secure radical reductions in carbon emissions. This option is supported by the Council's evidence base, which recommends this approach as an ambitious but achievable level of on-site carbon reduction. Many of the respondents to the Issues and options consultation supported this stronger level of policy intervention, and considered that Cambridge should lead by example. Indeed the Sustainability Appraisal noted that taking such an approach would contribute positively to radically reducing carbon emissions across Cambridge. This will benefit Cambridge's economic position as a competitive city, putting it the forefront of the low carbon economy, and would help address concerns surrounding fuel security and national targets for renewable energy generation.

A key concern for developers was the impact of such a policy on the viability of development and consistency with the NPPF, which, at paragraph 95 states that "when setting local requirements for a building's sustainability, do so in a way consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy". This in contrast to the previous Planning Policy Statement 1 Supplement on Climate Change, which enabled local authorities to set standards that went beyond national requirements as long as this was supported by an appropriate evidence base. While the Decarbonising Cambridge Study provides us with this appropriate evidence base, there is a concern that given the wording of the NPPF, this may not be sufficient to justify such a policy approach, which would no doubt be tested at examination. There are other factors that should be taken into consideration in determining the appropriateness of such a policy approach. Part of the reason why the definition of what constitutes a zero carbon home has been amended is due to concerns about the impact of such a policy approach on the viability of house building in light of the current economic climate across the UK, as well as the technical potential to achieve high levels of carbon reduction through on-site measures alone. While it is agreed that viability is a key issue that must be considered as part of developing local planning policy, this blanket approach does not take account of the fact that Cambridge has fared the economic downturn better than other parts of the UK. House builders are attracted to Cambridge as the housing market is still relatively strong, and it is clear from some developments in the City that homes with high levels of sustainability that go beyond the statutory minimum are highly attractive to new home owners. The ambition behind this policy is not to make it more expensive to build in Cambridge, or to say no to development but delivery of high quality housing that will be sustainable in the long term not just the short term. In addition

to the viability work contained within the Decarbonising Cambridge study, the impact of such a carbon reduction requirement will also be tested as part of ongoing viability work.

A common element within both policy options 44 and 45 is that levels of carbon reduction for non-residential buildings should be in line with the proposed national timetable for the introduction of zero carbon non-residential buildings, assuming that this continues as planned. Given that the pathway for zero carbon non-residential buildings is less well defined, it is considered that following the levels of carbon reduction planned for Building Regulations would be the most appropriate approach, which was supported by a number of respondents. Another common element with both options is that they would take a hierarchical approach to carbon reduction. Developers would have a choice in how they met the policy requirements, utilising the fabric first approach, followed by the implementation of energy efficiency measures followed by the use of some on-site renewable or low carbon energy generation.

The third option (Option 46) consulted on at Issues and Options was to leave carbon reduction to Building Regulations and continue to operate a percentage renewable energy policy. Under this option, the levels of carbon reduction to be sought for new homes would link to future changes to Building Regulations in 2013 and 2016. This approach was considered in light of the Government's consultation on changes to the 2013 Part L Regulations, which included an option that would decrease the level of carbon reduction originally intended as part of the transition towards zero carbon policy in 2016. While the outcomes of this consultation are yet to be announced, if the lower level of carbon reduction is implemented in 2013, then it is likely that the utilisation of renewable or low carbon energy generation would no longer form part of a development's carbon reduction strategy. While the hierarchical approach to carbon reduction is supported, it is considered that the incorporation of renewable or low carbon technologies into schemes should still form part of carbon reduction strategies in light of issues such as energy security and national targets for renewable energy generation. Under options 44 and 45, the levels of carbon reduction would be such that energy generation would still need to form part of developments carbon reduction strategies.

To support this option, a study of Cambridgeshire local planning authorities current Merton Rule policies was carried out. This study not only considered the implementation of current policies but also considered the future of Merton Rule policies. It concluded that up to 2016, there is still a role for Merton Rule policies where planning authorities choose to follow levels of on-site carbon reduction set out in Part L of the Building Regulations. Beyond 2016, levels of on-site carbon reduction under zero carbon policy would be such that there would no longer be a need for percentage renewable energy requirements. The study did recognise that if Cambridge was to follow the policy approach suggested by the Decarbonising Cambridge Study then there would not be a need for a percentage renewable energy requirement.

In addition to recommending that Merton Rule continues to 2016, the Study also recommends the introduction of a technology specific policy, referred to as a 'solar first approach'. Under this option, residential developments would be required to utilise either photovoltaic panels or solar thermal systems, while non-residential development would be required to utilise photovoltaic systems. If these systems were not viable, then other forms of renewable or low carbon energy generation would be considered. A more flexible approach is recommended for large estates such as the University of Cambridge, where a site-wide approach to renewable energy generation may be more appropriate. The policy wording could also be flexible in relation to developments with an opportunity to connect to district heating.

The benefits of such an approach are that it would help to deliver renewable energy if the levels of carbon reduction incorporated into Building Regulations in 2013 are reduced. There is a clear need to continue to support the incorporation of renewable energy into new development given concerns surrounding fuel security and national targets for renewable energy generation. The role of such a policy approach in maximising opportunities to utilise renewable energy generation was acknowledged by the interim Sustainability Appraisal, although it also noted that this would be achieved through Option 45. Some of the respondents to the Local Plan raised concerns about the impact of such a policy on the viability of new development, and how such an approach would meet the requirements of the NPPF for any local requirements to be consistent with national zero carbon policy. The Merton Rule study does not provide an assessment of the viability of continuing to operate a 10% renewable energy policy on top of the requirements of Building Regulations, although this is being considered as part of the Viability Assessment, which is currently being carried out for the Council by consultants.

The solar first approach may also be of concern to developers. The arguments in favour of a solar first approach include that these technologies are mature and are relatively simple to monitor and enforce. However, in the past national planning policy has been opposed to the use of policies that are technology specific, and developers tend to be opposed to such an approach. There is no specific wording in the NPPF that would support or object to this approach, and as such it is likely to be tested at examination.

**Conclusions:**

Option 44 would be the least risky approach in terms of compliance with the NPPF. However, it does not take account of the Council's evidence base, which suggests that higher levels of on-site carbon reduction is viable.

Options 45 and 46 both have their risks in terms of conformity with the NPPF. There is a greater level of evidence to support Option 45 in terms of technical and economic viability, and it would be more in keeping with the ambitious approach supported by local residents. The hierarchical approach to reducing carbon emissions would be inherent in this policy option, and it could be more likely that it

would lead to the integration of energy generation into the design of new developments. While some respondents felt that renewable energy generation was a vital element in new developments, and therefore supported continuing with a Merton rule approach, Option 45 would set a level of carbon reduction at a level that would require on-site renewable or low carbon energy generation and therefore Option 46 would not be needed.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

For non-residential development the recommended approach is to develop a carbon reduction policy linked to the timetable for introducing zero carbon non-residential buildings in 2019.

With regards to the approach for residential development, it is recommended that Option 44 is pursued as a minimum, but with flexibility to allow for further investigation of the viability of pursuing Option 45 or Options 46. This flexibility would allow time for the implications of any changes from Government to be taken into account, and for further discussions with the CLG of the appropriateness of setting a higher level of carbon reduction than national zero carbon policy in light of the wording of the NPPF.

This could form part of an overarching sustainable construction standards policy, which will include BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes requirements, water efficiency requirements, and links to the development of a Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund.

**ISSUE: THE ROLE OF COMMUNITY ENERGY FUNDS**

(Page 121 of the Issues and Options Report)

<b>Total representations: 32</b>	
<b>Objections: 17</b>	<b>Supports: 15</b>

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Option 47: Establishment of a Cambridgeshire community energy fund. This option would enable the development of a community energy fund to provide developers with a route to compliance with national zero carbon policy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that this is a way of allowing developers to do something on the cheap. Focus should be on on-site carbon reduction;</li> <li>• Support for the development of a fund particularly where projects for investment include retrofit of existing homes;</li> <li>• Support from some developers for the establishment of such a fund as a way of assisting them with meeting their zero carbon requirements;</li> <li>• Some concern about the extent to which the local benefit of such a fund would extend to City residents in circumstances where developers in the city would be paying into the fund which is then used to fund development elsewhere in the county;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More detail required on how such a fund would be governed and administered.</li> <li>• Developers should still have the choice of different allowable solutions routes, although general principle behind the development of a fund is supported.</li> </ul>
<b>NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b>	
Not applicable	

<b>SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT</b>
<p>Enabling developers to offset remaining issues in their carbon reduction targets through paying into a Community Energy Fund is likely to have a positive effect in ensuring greater deployment of energy efficiency, low carbon and renewable energy technologies across Cambridge. As the fund would look to invest in schemes that have a direct local benefit for Cambridge communities, this could have a significant positive effect in improving the wellbeing of Cambridge residents, for example by improving air quality locally and creating a greater sense of community through shared projects locally.</p>

<b>KEY EVIDENCE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zero Carbon Hub (2011). Allowable Solutions for Tomorrow’s New Homes;</li> <li>• Element Energy (2010). Scoping Report: Feasibility of a Carbon Offset Mechanism for Cambridgeshire;</li> <li>• Element Energy, The Landscape Partnership &amp; Manches (2012). Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund Stage 2 Final Report</li> <li>• Camco (2012). Cambridgeshire Renewables Infrastructure Framework – Baseline Data, Opportunities and Constraints;</li> <li>• Zero Carbon Hub (2012). Allowable Solutions. Evaluating Opportunities and Priorities.</li> </ul>

<b>CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul>

<b>ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE</b>
<p>A number of representations received raised concerns that a Carbon Offset Fund would enable developers to do things on the cheap and that the focus should be on on-site measures to reduce carbon emissions. While the Council agrees that the ideal solution would be for developers to offset all of their carbon emissions on-site, this is unlikely to be feasible on many small and medium scales sites, as evidenced by the findings of the Decarbonising Cambridge Study, and national work carried out by the Zero Carbon Hub. As such the concept of ‘allowable solutions’ has been developed, and it is this concept that gives rise to the possible development of a Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund. Developers would still be required to deliver the majority of carbon reduction on-site but would then have range of opportunities available to them to ‘off-set remaining emissions, including additional on-site measures or paying into a county-wide community energy fund. This approach is consistent with the requirements of the NPPF, which requires local</p>



policy to be consistent with national zero carbon policy, in that it uses the nationally recognised allowable solutions framework, which recognises a policy role for local planning authorities.

The types of projects that could receive investment from the fund range from energy efficiency projects through to large scale renewable and low carbon energy projects. The key element in determining appropriate projects is the idea of 'additionality', i.e. projects that would not otherwise be delivered via existing support mechanisms. Example projects could include improvements to existing properties that would not be eligible for Green Deal funding, for example solid wall insulation, or the investment in energy schemes that are not currently being delivered by the private sector, such as district heating. The development of a Cambridgeshire fund would also present an opportunity to focus on those projects that would have direct benefits for communities in the county, which could include community energy projects. This would be different from the current proposals for allowable solutions, which included reference to a national fund, where money generated from developments in Cambridge could be used to fund projects across the UK. The advantages of local funds were considered in the recent Zero Carbon Hub Report on evaluating opportunities and priorities for Allowable Solutions, which recognised that in line with the Localism Agenda, preference would be for Allowable Solutions to be delivered locally. Developers would still be able to choose their preferred allowable solutions route, even with a policy in place, but there is recognition that local community energy funds represent an effective option, in keeping with the principles of Localism.

With regards to how such a fund would be governed and administered, work carried out by Element Energy in 2012 considered a range of legal structures for the management of the fund. The work concluded that a Company Limited by Guarantee (CLG) would be the most suitable structure as it would be suitable for the community investment mandate of an energy fund. While further work is required to determine the membership of the CLG, it would be likely that this would need to include all the district authorities who would be collecting monies into the fund. The study also considered appropriate collection mechanisms, concluding that a new purpose designed collection mechanism to enable developers to make direct payments into local community energy funds should be established nationally as opposed to utilising existing mechanisms such as S106 agreements and the Community Infrastructure Levy. Further work will need to include ongoing discussions with national government with regards to the timescales and practical arrangements for the establishment of the Allowable Solutions Framework.

The Element Energy study also considered the advantages of a county wide fund compared to a fund only covering Cambridge. Of the £55 million that a county wide fund could have generated by 2026, around £23 million would be generated by developments in the city. The average amount being invested into the fund across the districts would be around £6 million, which is not huge in the context of capital costs of low carbon energy projects. For example, the district heating project in Cambridge city centre has estimated capital costs of around £25 million. The

relatively limited scale of the fund is considered to be a strong argument in favour of the Cambridgeshire authorities partnering in a joint community energy fund that will invest in the most beneficial projects across the county. A fund at a smaller district level scale would be too limited in terms of the funds available to significantly influence development of large-scale strategic infrastructure projects.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommendation is to continue to explore option 47 and the potential to develop a policy to enable the establishment of a Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund and identify of eligible projects. This will be subject to ongoing discussions with national government with regards to the timescales and practical arrangements for the establishment of Allowable Solutions, as well as further discussions about the scale of the fund, be this a county wide fund or a fund focussed on Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. This could form part of an overarching sustainable construction policy, which will include carbon reduction requirements, BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes requirements and water efficiency standards.

**ISSUE: RENEWABLE AND LOW CARBON ENERGY DEVELOPMENT**

(Page 122 of the Issues and Options Report)

<b>Total representations: 32</b>	
<b>Objections: 10</b>	<b>Supports: 10</b>

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Option 48: Renewable and low carbon energy generation. This option would allow for the development of a policy to promote renewable and low carbon energy generation in Cambridge.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for development of a positive approach to renewable and low carbon energy;</li> <li>• A clear local policy will help planning and provision of more renewables;</li> <li>• Some concern from developers about the impact of connecting to district heating on the viability of development (although aspiration is supported);</li> <li>• Support for designation of strategic district heating areas – look to connect existing properties as well as new;</li> <li>• Consider opportunities to work with the local universities to deliver pilot renewable energy projects;</li> <li>• Need to evaluate potential for renewable energy in Cambridge and, if necessary, allocate sites for energy provision;</li> <li>• Could be an opportunity to use the city sewage works to generate energy via anaerobic digestions. The City’s green bin waste could also be added to this energy source;</li> <li>• Should include some indication of how energy is to be generated;</li> <li>• Policy should not solely focus on district heating.</li> </ul>

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

Not applicable

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

This option is likely to have a positive effect on key issues identified under the climate change mitigation and renewable energy theme, such as ensuring the greater deployment of renewable energy technologies, and reducing carbon emissions from new developments. It will also provide opportunities to reduce energy demand as renewable energy technologies are maximised. The impact on the economy is uncertain as a requirement for supporting the development of renewable and low carbon energy projects may affect the viability of schemes. It would, however, also provide a cost effective way for developers to meet their carbon reduction obligations, and could be positive in positioning Cambridge competitively in terms of energy security and leading in low carbon initiatives. There will be a need to balance energy provision against other objectives such as the protection and enhancement of the historic environment.

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- Aecom (2011). East of England Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Capacity Study;
- Element Energy (2010). Decarbonising Cambridge Study;
- Camco (2012). Cambridgeshire Renewables Infrastructure Framework – Baseline Data, Opportunities and Constraints;
- Cambridge City Council (2007) Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Policy 8/17 (Renewable Energy)

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The NPPF requires local planning authorities to recognise the responsibility on all local communities to contribute to energy generation from renewable or low carbon sources. It requires local planning authorities to have a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources while ensuring that any adverse impacts are addressed. Option 48 seeks to provide this positive strategy, and the general level of support shown for this option is welcomed. The option builds upon the energy resource evidence provided by the Decarbonising Cambridge Study and the Cambridgeshire Renewables Infrastructure Framework, which mapped the potential of a range of renewable and low carbon energy sources in the City, including district heating, wind, solar and biomass.

These studies have shown that the opportunities for stand-alone renewable energy schemes within Cambridge are limited and new projects within the city are likely to be relatively small-scale. Even so, the Council wishes to support renewable and low carbon energy projects that will contribute to overall carbon reduction across the city, while at the same time ensuring that there will be no unacceptable impact on the local environment. These considerations will include air quality concerns

associated with proposals utilising biomass combustion, particularly where these fall within or close to the Air Quality Management Area or areas where air pollution levels approach the EU Limit Values, as well as noise issues associated with certain renewable and low carbon technologies. There could be links between identified projects and the proposals to develop a Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund, in that some of these projects may be eligible for funding from the Community Energy Fund. Possible projects would be identified and form part of an energy efficiency and renewable and low carbon energy infrastructure projects list, which would then be used for the basis of allocating developers allowable solutions contributions.

Some representations, while supporting the aspiration for developments to connect to district heating, raised concerns around the impact on the viability of development. The Decarbonising Cambridge study highlights those parts of the city that show potential for heat networks, notably the city centre and the area around Addenbrookes Hospital. Cambridge City Council, working in partnership with other organisations, are actively exploring the potential of developing a district heat network in the city centre. As part of this project, future expansion of the heat network and the connection of new developments to the network are key considerations. Given the constrained nature of many city centre development sites, including redevelopment sites, not many energy options are available to developers to meet their carbon reduction requirements. District heating offers a cost effective solution for these sites, although viability will be an important consideration in any future policy requiring connection, not just economic viability but the ability to connect also. This approach is consistent with the requirements of the NPPF, which at paragraph 97 states that local authorities should “identify opportunities where development can draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy supply systems and for co-locating potential heat customers and suppliers”. As such it is felt that a policy requiring new developments to connect to district heat networks where these are available, subject to the consideration of viability issues, is appropriate. District heating will be the subject of a Local Plan allocation as other renewable energy options for the city are more likely to be small scale approaches such as solar panels and heat pumps, which are more likely to come forward on a case by case basis. District heating represents the best opportunity for large scale energy generation in the city, hence why a Local Plan allocation is considered to be important to help secure implementation of this technology in the city.

#### **RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommendation is to pursue option 48, which will set out the a positive policy approach for supporting renewable and low carbon energy generation proposals, while at the same time ensuring that any adverse impacts are minimised. As part of this policy, a strategic district heating area covering the city centre will be identified, with developments within this area being required to connect to a heat network should one become available.

#### **ISSUE: CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION**

(Page 123 of the Issues and Options Report)

<b>Total representations: 33</b>	
<b>Objections: 12</b>	<b>Supports: 19</b>

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Option 49: Climate change adaptation. This option seeks to develop a policy setting out a broad range of adaptation criteria to be incorporated into all new development proposals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong level of support for policy development;</li> <li>• Urban greening very important, as well as design solutions and urban form, which are fundamental elements of a successful approach. We should be lining pavements with maturing trees, setting back the building line;</li> <li>• Need to consider long-term maintenance requirements for some adaptation measures (e.g. SuDs);</li> <li>• Further detail regarding setting tree canopy requirements needed;</li> <li>• Should be applied to existing communities as well as new development;</li> <li>• The requirement for the inclusion of a climate change adaptation strategy as part of the Design and Access Statement is not currently a national requirement;</li> <li>• Focus on large scale measures, leaving individual building issues to Building Regulations;</li> <li>• There is no need for a separate Local Plan policy but advice could be incorporated into an SPD.</li> </ul>
<b>NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b>	
Not applicable	

<b>SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT</b>
<p>This option should enable new and existing communities to be capable of adapting to climate change. There should be a positive effect on climate change mitigation, as the highest standards in low carbon design and construction will be encouraged. The role of landscaping, such as green roofs and enhanced tree canopies is likely to improve biodiversity and reduce habitat fragmentation. Measures to further urban greening will capitalise on the opportunity for green infrastructure to help Cambridge to adapt to climate change impacts, with subsequent positive effects on reducing flood risk, urban cooling and maintaining communities access to green infrastructure. Urban greening could also have a positive effect on landscape and townscape.</p>

<b>KEY EVIDENCE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK Climate Projections (UKCPO9);</li> <li>• DEFRA (2012). UK Climate Change Risk Assessment;</li> <li>• Element Energy for Cambridge City Council. Decarbonising Cambridge Study (2010);</li> <li>• Cambridge City Council Climate Change Risk Assessment and Management Plan (2009);</li> </ul>

- Cambridge City Council Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan (2008);
- Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy (2011);
- Cambridge City Council (2007) Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
- ADAS (in progress). Analysis and Interpretation of Tree Audit Data for Cambridge City Council.
- DETR (2007). [Trees in Towns II Survey](#)

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Not applicable

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The Stern Review (2006) identified that climate change will have profound and rising costs for global and national prosperity, people’s health and the natural environment. Even with effective policies for reducing emissions in place, the world will still experience significant climate change over the coming decades from emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases already released. The Planning Act (2008) places a legal duty on all local planning authorities to include climate change adaptation policies in their local plans. It is vital that new developments are planned with our changing climate in mind, as well as ensuring that they do not exacerbate climate impacts for neighbouring communities. Indeed, there may also be wider opportunities for climate change adaptation measures to be implemented that will benefit existing communities as well as new, such as urban greening and integrated surface water management.

The integration of climate change adaptation measures into the design of new development will help to reduce costs and will also increase the long-term sustainability and viability of developments. It will also ensure that climate change adaptation becomes an integral part of high quality place making. There are many aspects of climate change adaptation that have implications for the design of developments, and as such it is considered appropriate to require inclusion of climate change adaptation within Design and Access Statements. Such an approach is in keeping with guidance contained within the CLGs Guidance on information requirements and validation (2010), which at paragraph 105 states: “Climate change considerations are integral to the planning system, including the design of new developments... Design and access statements for outline and detailed planning applications should therefore demonstrate how climate change mitigation and adaptation measures have been considered in the design of the proposals. These measures may be of particular relevance under the topic headings of amount, layout, scale, landscaping, context or access, depending on the nature of the proposed development and its anticipated impacts on the surrounding area”.

In relation to the reference in the Issues and Options report regarding the potential to set tree canopy requirements for new developments, research suggests that even moderate increases in canopy cover within cities can help urban environments adapt to some of the adverse effects of climate change. These include direct and indirect cooling effects, for example reduction of the urban heat island effect, shelter from harmful solar radiation, improvement in air quality, reduction of energy

consumption from buildings, increasing soil water storage and absorption of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. The negative effects of climate change are predicted to reach highs in the 2080s, which is the time it takes for many tree species to mature. Tree planting and protection are a relatively cost-effective way of mitigating some of the adverse impacts of climate change, whilst also providing many other benefits, such as enhancement of biodiversity and provision of amenity value for those who live and work in the city.

The “Analysis and Interpretation of Tree Audit Data for Cambridge City Council” study, carried out by ADAS has measured canopy density across the city for various land use classes, using the methodology set out in the DETR “Trees in Towns II” survey (2007). This study suggests that tree canopy targets could be set for different land use types, in order to enhance the canopy cover of the city as a whole. The preference would be for the targets to be met through on-site planting, although where this is not possible, off-site provision could be secured. A second approach that could be adopted is a direct replacement method as used by Bristol City Council and Sefton Borough Council. Under this approach, policy would require a fixed number of replacement trees, determined by the size and number of tree losses proposed for a development site. Again, the preference would be for the replacement of trees within the development site, but where this is not possible, off-site provision would be considered. Work is currently ongoing to determine which approach would be the most appropriate for the city.

Development of a climate change adaptation policy will also give consideration to the long-term maintenance of certain adaptation features such as integrated surface water management and landscaping proposals. The City Council already has guidance in place for the adoption of sustainable drainage systems within public open spaces and would usually look to adopt open spaces where practicable.

#### **RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommendation is to pursue Option 49. This would see the development of a policy requiring the integration of climate change adaptation measures into the overall design of new developments. Compliance with the policy would need to be demonstrated as part of Design and Access Statements submitted with planning applications, which will need to illustrate how climate change adaptation measures have been integrated into areas such as the layout, scale and landscaping of new developments. As identified in the Issues and Options Report, the criteria could include:

- The role of urban form and building orientation in maximising opportunities for natural ventilation strategies;
- The use of ‘cool’ building materials to reduce the impacts of higher temperatures;
- The role of water sensitive urban design in reducing flood risk and aiding urban cooling;
- The role of landscaping and features such as green roofs and the enhancement of tree canopy cover in aiding urban cooling and reducing flood risk;
- Protecting, enhancing and expanding green spaces (urban greening) and giving

consideration to the role of the River Cam and other water infrastructure in aiding urban cooling.

#### **ISSUE: CONSEQUENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS POLICY**

(Page 124 of the Issues and Options Report)

**Total representations: 31**

**Objections: 12**

**Supports: 19**

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Option 50:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Some support for the development of such a policy;</li><li>• Concern over the cost implications for householders and landowners of such a policy;</li><li>• Implementation should not be required but encouraged and long-term financial advantages of implementation should be made clear;</li><li>• Need for care when dealing with heritage assets;</li><li>• Make reference to the Cambridge Retrofit project.</li></ul>
<b>NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b>	
Not applicable	

#### **SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

In the case that Building Regulations are not amended to apply requirements for consequential improvements to all existing domestic buildings that undergo works to increase habitable space, Option 50 would contribute to carbon emission reduction targets. As a result this option should help to secure energy efficiency improvements. Retrofitting water conservation measures to existing buildings, as proposed under this option, should secure positive effects for high standards of water efficiency and reduce pressure on water scarcity in the region. The impact on heritage assets remains uncertain as the appropriate conservation of assets will be dependent on actual implementation of this Option within the historic environment.

#### **KEY EVIDENCE**

- Element Energy for Cambridge City Council. Decarbonising Cambridge Study (2010);
- CLG (2012). 2012 Consultation on changes to the Building Regulations in England. Section two – Part L (Conservation of fuel and power);
- [Committee on Climate Change \(May 2012\). How local authorities can reduce emissions and manage climate risks.](#)

#### **CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Not applicable

#### **ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**



In order for Cambridge to play a role in tackling national targets for carbon reduction, it is important to tackle emissions from existing buildings as well as new. Such an approach is supported by the NPPF, which at paragraph 95 states that local planning authorities should “actively support energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings”. For non-residential buildings there are many drivers for organisations to improve the efficiency of their buildings, but this is not the case for existing houses. At present requirements to improve the energy efficiency of new homes, sought through Building Regulations, only apply to dwellings over 1,000m<sup>2</sup>, and as such many homes within Cambridge would not be required to meet these requirements. The Council’s Housing Stock Survey found that of a total stock of 41,500 dwellings, there was scope for energy efficiency improvements in 95% of properties, including measures such as loft insulation, cavity wall insulation and cylinder insulation. Energy efficiency improvements typically provide relatively cost-effective CO<sub>2</sub> reduction, but can also help reduce energy bills for residents, which will become increasingly important in the face of rising energy costs. It is estimated that fuel poverty affects 14% of households in Cambridge, with this figure likely to rise. A recent report by the Committee on Climate Change recognises the scope for local authorities to require energy efficiency improvements in return for granting planning permission for extensions, citing Uttlesford District Council’s approach as an example of best practice.

The intention behind Option 50 is to introduce a consequential improvements policy, similar to that developed by Uttlesford District Council. Such a policy would apply to planning applications for works such as an extension or loft conversion, and would require the implementation of cost effective measures to improve the energy efficiency of the entire property where such measures had not already been undertaken. Concerns surrounding the expense to homeowners of such a policy are recognised, but the focus of this policy would be on cost effective measures, defined as measures having a simple pay back of seven years or less. The type of measures that will be promoted include upgrading loft insulation, insulating cavity walls, improving draft proofing, heating controls upgrade and the installation of low energy lighting. Many of these measures may also be eligible for funding through the Green Deal, which is due to be implemented in January 2013, and the Energy Company Obligation (ECO). As such, the cost to homeowners would be limited, but they would still benefit from the reduced energy costs as a result of increase the energy efficiency of their home.

Some respondents raised concerns that such an approach would increase ‘red tape’ for those wishing to extend their homes. It is not the intention of the policy to increase red tape, but to encourage residents to take advantage of the opportunities that carrying out works to their homes present, opportunities that should help to reduce energy bills and enhance the comfort of their homes. There could be some risks associated with such a policy approach given the Government’s recent announcements on increasing the size of household extensions that will be considered under permitted development rights. This could reduce the number of applications received for household extensions, thereby reducing the application of this policy, although planning permission would still be required within Conservation

Areas.

The focus of the policy would be on existing homes as opposed to non-residential properties, which are more likely to be covered by existing Building Regulations requirements for consequential improvements. As such, it would not apply to College buildings etc. Care will need to be taken in applying the proposed policy to historic buildings to ensure that they are not damaged by inappropriate interventions. The implementation of the policy will be on a case by case basis, with officers recommending measures that would be suitable for that particular property, bearing in mind its age and type of construction.

#### **RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommendation is to pursue option 50 and introduce a consequential improvements policy, which will look to implement cost-effective energy efficiency measures in homes undergoing improvement works for which planning permission is required. Consideration will also be given to the retrofitting of simple water efficiency measures, such as water metres and low flow appliances. The policy should be linked to the Green Deal and Energy Company Obligation, to help reduce costs for homeowners. Applicants would be asked to complete a simple home energy questionnaire, from which a home energy report would be produced, recommending possible measures to be implemented.

# REPRESENTATIONS SUMMARY - CHAPTER 6: CLIMATE CHANGE

---

## CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, 6.1 Climate Change, Water &

---

### 11636 Support

Summary: strongly agree

### 14245 Support

Summary: Materials and construction waste:

It would be good to have some targets/bench-marking and also data collection and publication in this area.

Perhaps this may only relate to key materials and products used (ie structure, cladding etc).

It would also be useful to ask where these key materials/products are coming from. I would like to see a policy which considers local materials and products or even local skills and services.

Adaptability/re-use of buildings:

Keeping good records of building designs is key to assessing adaptability and re-use at a later stage in the life. In particular structural engineering drawings and design criteria.

### 15522 Support

Summary: Sustainable development is defined in the NPPF in terms of its economic, environmental and social dimensions, and encompasses the historic environment. Sustainable communities have also been a term used to define communities that are well designed and built, reflecting all dimensions of sustainability. It is important that the terminology in this chapter is precise, and that where the subject matter relates to 'green' issues, then this is stated.

### 16336 Support

Summary: I strongly support this vision. Is it attainable?

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Option 41 - Innovative and Sustainable Communities  
Climate Change, Water &**

---

**16686 Object**

Summary: I am opposed to the excessive priority given to climate change and the need for a low carbon City. I would like to see much more emphasis placed on jobs, quality family housing and protecting the historic built environment of the City.

**18058 Object**

Summary: Where to Build: Build in locations close enough to enable walking, cycling, frequent public transport with good existing infrastructure or the capacity to provide this.  
Strengthening and diversifying existing settlements - detached suburbs / dormitory villages.  
Redevelop/adapt existing structures/neighbourhoods (thinking of Newmarket Rd sheds) as these become inner - rather than edge - conditions. Density and improve environment at every opportunity - there are no "straightforward schemes!"  
Site Strategies: Consider orientation, topography / gravity, access neighbourliness and inclusivity.

**7750 Support**

Summary: This must be fundamental to any new development and all other policies. I like the use of the work 'radical' but may be helpful to specify the need to make communities more self-sufficient by producing their own energy.

**8038 Support**

Summary: I agree this is fundamental at a period of overwhelming evidence of global warming.

**8093 Support**

Summary: I strongly support this option

**8258 Support**

Summary: We welcome the proposal that all developers demonstrate presumption in favour of sustainable development. We would place great emphasis on the sustainability of all development.

**10247 Support**

Summary: Truly environmentally sustainable development is the only option for future development in Cambridge and elsewhere.

**10497 Support**

Summary: not really an option, this is a given on which all other decisions are predicated.

**11638 Support**

Summary: Strongly agree. Cambridge should lead by example.

**12897 Support**

Summary: Sustainable communities is the only way forward, and Cambridge should be an example. Sustainable development is a key aspect, and policies and regulations to guarantee it, fundamental.

**13558 Support**

Summary: It is particularly important to consider the effect of any development on flood risk since development reduces the drainage capacity of a given area and increases risk of flooding. Recent unpredictable weather patterns would confirm the need for extreme caution.

**13938 Support**

Summary: We must continue to reduce our carbon footprint as individuals and as a city. We must find ways of building new homes, maintaining employment opportunities and encouraging healthy lifestyles without increasing the amount of water or fossil fuels we use. Sometimes we need a degree of compulsion to do the right thing that only comes with the force of planning law.  
As a result of changes in regulations on new developments, many minority choices have become the norm, and this must continue.

**14634 Support**

Summary: Climate change is a reality and we should aim to deal with actual problems rather than chasing politically inspired

**14703 Support**

Summary: In respect of transport we agree that it is important to reduce carbon emissions. Cycling can play an important part of that so we want to see levels reach 40% of all journeys city wide. We also request that more cycling officer posts are put in place (at least two full time equivalent posts.) They are a key factor in enforcement and promotion of cycling in Cambridge.

**16338 Support**

Summary: Strongly support, but make the developers support it too.

**16849 Support**

Summary: Agree  
Obviously it would be best in terms of Mitcham's Corner environment (as well as Cambridge and the whole world) to have the most stringent possible sustainability requirements in terms of energy uses, water usage and use of green roofs etc. on all new developments so we support this. We do not support the idea of developers being able to bribe their way out of delivering on the commitment to a specific site by contributing to a fund. We can see that this would be used to the detriment of certain parts of the city such as Mitchams Corner!

## **16924 Support**

Summary: We strongly support the intention behind this strategic policy as it applies to existing communities as well as to new development. We also welcome the emphasis on innovative solutions which may require some flexibility in the way that other policies are interpreted and put into effect.

## **17682 Support**

Summary: Reduce public lighting, encourage green roofs and sustainable drainage. Want to live and contribute to a sustainable city. The issue is the conflict between growth and stagnation. I recognise that it is difficult to improve sustainability in terms of protection of resources, dealing with climate change and carbon reduction in the light of the need of economic growth including housing, water and flood requirements.

## **17709 Support**

Summary: Natural England generally welcomes Options 41 - 59 which address sustainable development, climate change, water and flooding.

---

## **CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Objectives Climate Change, Water &**

---

### **9166 Object**

Summary: The wording is insufficiently strong and inconsistent with Strategic objective 2:  
To ensure that all new developments have a neutral impact on water, contribute to an overall flood risk reduction and help improve the quality of the River Cam and other water features in the city.

The reduction of flood reduction risk should be the primary environmental policy of the Council. Flood risk is a likely and serious local consequence of climate change, its importance appears to be recognised by Council in every area except strength of policy.

The next level of policy would be related to Adaption and Mitigation.

---

## **CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, 6.3 Climate Change, Water &**

---

### **7653 Support**

Summary: This is so fundamental and should drive all our other decisions.

### **11001 Support**

Summary: Sustainability is the MOST important factor in all the ideas put forward for the development of Cambridge in future. Water, air quality, traffic emissions, are all vital considerations.

### **11642 Support**

Summary: strongly agree

### **15523 Object**

Summary: Conservation and enhancement of the historic environment should be included in any policy addressing sustainable development in the sense stated in the NPPF.

### **15929 Object**

Summary: Ref the notion of sustainability, when applied to a particular house it should mean a building that has not consumed too much energy or raw materials in its construction as well as one that will not use too much energy when it is occupied. In addition, when applied to anew urban development, it should mean one that has good public transport links with the rest of the city, is socially balanced and architecturally (and, if you like, ergonomically) well arranged and has the appropriate amenities for a community of its size, just as a new settlement without the city limits should also have good public transport and amenities and enjoy a measure of economic independence, not simply export most of its workforce into Cambridge every day.

### **18069 Object**

Summary: Behaviour: Information - Domestic information points, energy consumption / usage, bus times, car-sharing. Local enabler information: advice on lifestyle/maintenance, coordination of deliveries, veg boxes etc. Rewards for recycling - tokens for guided bus etc - as short-term incentives. Understand that these changes and technologies are not "fit and forget!", they require monitoring, feedback and modification - regular and ongoing. (SH - Federal Environment Agency - Dessau - Bretschneider)

### **18073 Object**

Summary: Community: Existing "host" communities in/around new developments should offered opportunities (with grants, loans, subsidies if necessary) to upgrade their homes in terms of insulation, airtightness, renewables and link into new energy networks. To be given a "stake" in the new, more sustainable community. Use proposed development of City-owned land at Clay Farm and Community Centre as an exemplar for the development of sustainability strategies (energy, fabric and community) across the spatial strategy.

#### Decision-making:

Developers to provide target EPC for proposed dwellings and communitues including performance against water usage, transport, information uptake, etc. Commit to establishing management organisation with long-term developer involvement, to ensure performance - with facilities to monitor this and report, improve (see fit and forget). Understand that CfSH and Passivhaus are only partial metrics. Develop more holistic, "Sensible Housing" requirements.

### **6911 Support**

Summary: The policy should learn from the best examples in Europe, where low carbon low impact people friendly development is much further advanced.

### **9764 Support**

Summary: Access to open spaces is very important for the well-being of the population, with access to spaces beyond the City boundaries important. Care should be taken with any road improvement schemes that make foot or pedestrian access dangerous. Where large roundabouts (such as at Histon and Milton) are unavoidable then foot/cycle bridges need to be seriously considered.

### **10783 Support**

Summary: Much needed

### **11005 Support**

Summary: This needs to come before any of the other detailed planning.

### **11060 Support**

Summary: The College is keen to adapt its existing buildings, to manage and maintain their property and operate systems in a more sustainable way. The reduction of carbon emissions through improved energy efficiency, water efficiency and use of renewable energy are key to this. The College would like to see policy which positively supports this objective and seeks to facilitate it. For example, such improvements can require physical works. The College owns many heritage assets and would want a policy which allows for the sensitive alterations to building fabric.

### **11602 Support**

Summary: We need to create a sustainable way of living, including in cambridge

### **12022 Support**

Summary: It is the responsibility of the human species to demonstrate its wise stewardship of planet Earth, to care for the natural environment on all scales, and to preserve the best of valuable human made environments, all for the benefit of future generations. This ambitious objective has to be accomplished at this time of climate change, with the consequent increased variability of meteorological phenomena whilst simultaneously developing worthwhile and beneficial economic activities. I consider that it is best if those in employment can walk or cycle from their home or train station to their place of work, rather than having to use cars or buses that cause local pollution of the atmosphere. Thus the optimal siting of train stations and the appropriate uses of the buildings in their "catchment area" are crucial in this regard.

## 12314 Support

Summary: More needed on existing communities, infrastructure & buildings, as well as new development.

National 80% reduction target in carbon emissions by 2050 and the City's 89% target demand massive low-carbon changes across the city, not just in new developments.

Of the homes we will inhabit in 2050, around 80% are already standing and these have to be the main focus for carbon-reduction policies.

"Decarbonising Cambridge" calls for the "Council to show leadership by driving improvements in existing stock. Opportunities include when a house is purchased and when planning permission for building work is sought."

## 13066 Support

Summary: The Trust recognises the importance of adapting existing buildings and managing and maintaining those buildings in a more sustainable way. The reduction of carbon emissions could be through improved energy efficiency, water efficiency and use of renewable energy. Such a policy needs to facilitate this where improvements may mean alterations and adaptations to existing buildings.

## 13134 Support

Summary: We would support the principles of option 42 which proposes a comprehensive sustainable development policy for Cambridge. A clear policy guiding sustainability concerns would assist with development proposals and provide guidance to developers on issues for consideration during the working up of design proposals within the City. In relation to the Compass House site particular emphasis should be placed on the adaptability of buildings, including the re-use of existing buildings. In setting requirements for development proposals regard must be had to the NPPF and its guidance on viability (see paragraph 173 of the NPPF).

## 13298 Support

Summary: The College is at the forefront of Colleges in reducing carbon emissions in both their new and existing buildings and operation and management. There is an extensive green policy which is in line with the Council's objectives for sustainable communities.

## 13763 Support

Summary: With the lowest of the growth options.

## 14635 Support

Summary: A policy is required that places emphasis on a smarter use of land, especially in the public realm. Devoting ever more land to traffic movement and parking is a luxury Cambridge cannot afford. Car parks need to be provided but should be multi-level and/or built over to make better use of the land on which they stand. This will reduce land take for development leaving more for open space and other uses.

## 14720 Support

Summary: I support, with the suggestion that policies to control pollution should include control of light pollution and noise pollution.

## 15013 Support

Summary: I support, with the suggestion that policies to control pollution should include control of light pollution and noise pollution.

## 15164 Support

Summary: Support. Resources are finite. City leaders should be taking a long term view. What will happen after the greenbelt land and other locations are all used up?

## 15824 Support

Summary: We welcome recognition that Cambridge is in an area of severe water stress and the proposed policies to reduce the level of water use in connection with new building households. But we would argue that this problem requires, in addition, more radical policy changes: a total rethink on the level of growth envisaged.

## 16002 Support

Summary: CUH is committed to sustainable development and, to date through the early schemes for the expansion of the biomedical campus, has been requiring development to incorporate sustainable development measures as far as practicalities have allowed. We accept that there is every likelihood that sustainability standards will be raised in the future, and will endeavour to continue to meet whichever standards are in place. Nevertheless, we consider that the wording of these emerging policies should be such that there can be some flexibility in the application of the policy standards if site specific circumstances necessitate it.

## 16042 Support

Summary: Yes, there needs to be and a policy. It should, if possible, be applied to present development to ensure the best standards and considerations are being met.

## 16340 Support

Summary: I support all these points strongly.

## 16724 Support

Summary: This option would allow for the development of a sustainable development policy setting out the principles that should be embedded into all development proposals in Cambridge. This could also include "carbon neutral", low light pollution, low noise pollution.

## 16925 Support

Summary: We support a more detailed sustainable development policy covering the full range of issues listed in the report.

## 17721 Support

Summary: Natural England generally welcomes Options 41 - 59 which address sustainable development, climate change, water and flooding.

Option 42 Develop a comprehensive sustainable development policy - Natural England would welcome a sustainable development policy setting out the principles that should be embedded into all development proposals in Cambridge. We would particularly welcome the inclusion of requirements to consider carbon/greenhouse gas reduction, energy efficiency, pollution and protection and enhancement of biodiversity and adaptation to climate change.



---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Question 6.1**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**11974 Object**

Summary: Yes there should be a comprehensive policy but the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes clear that sustainable development is about positive growth and that LPA's should positively seek opportunities to meet the economic, social and environmental development needs of their areas.

The consultation option focuses on environmental matters and needs to reflect economic and social considerations if it is to be properly considered as a comprehensive sustainable development policy.

**17560 Object**

Summary: This is an important priority, but would be concerned that it could be given precedence over other equally important priorities such as heritage, historic character, special interest etc. that make parts of Cambridge so uniquely special.

**7088 Support**

Summary: Yes, a policy is needed, but one which developers will have to abide by. It needs to be clear and unambiguous, or it's not worth having.

**7276 Support**

Summary: Good to see coherent policy in this area.

**7353 Support**

Summary: yes

**7991 Support**

Summary: Yes.

**8095 Support**

Summary: Yes, need a policy

**8260 Support**

Summary: need policy

**8432 Support**

Summary: Yes

**8602 Support**

Summary: The Trumpington Residents' Association supports the development of a comprehensive sustainable development policy and Options 41 and 42.

**9076 Support**

Summary: Yes. Let's start consuming less, having better quality of life and pass something decent onto our children and grandchildren.

**9144 Support**

Summary: of course

**10155 Support**

Summary: Yes. We need a definition of sustainable development which is then incorporated into other policies.

**10250 Support**

Summary: This policy is essential to any future development or re-development of the city

**10356 Support**

Summary: Most definitely agree there should be a policy for all new developments. Should also include a specified amount of land for allotments and food growing spaces to ensure that provision is made.

**10784 Support**

Summary: Necessary

**10925 Support**

Summary: Yes - this is a no brainer. However it must be crystal clear, and stuck to by everyone, no exceptions.

**11181 Support**

Summary: We support the principle of a single sustainable development policy within the Local Plan.

**11295 Support**

Summary: Yes, we need to develop a policy.

**11420 Support**

Summary: Support

**12315 Support**

Summary: This policy is much needed and important.  
It will be the foundation for other policies and decisions in this area.

**12498 Support**

Summary: There is absolutely a need for a policy to support sustainability within our community. I completely agree that every single development proposal ought to have this policy at its core.

## **12703 Support**

Summary: Essential

## **12949 Support**

Summary: support. Add gardens

## **13092 Support**

Summary: Yes. Urban food production space should include community gardens (for residents without gardens and the resources to manage an allotment) areas of semi-wild forage opportunities such as community orchards and nut trees and private gardens.

## **13185 Support**

Summary: In order to be sound, the council's sustainable development policy should be in compliance with paragraph 14 of the NPPF which promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development as a 'golden thread' running through plan making and decision taking.

## **13466 Support**

Summary: Yes

## **13719 Support**

Summary: Of course! Who wants an unsustainable Cambridge?

## **14109 Support**

Summary: There is the greatest possible need for a policy on this issue. Carbon reduction should be a priority, via first reduced energy demand and second decarbonised energy supply. If we do not halt or slow climate change, then all other plans are a waste of time.

## **14939 Support**

Summary: Yes, support.

## **16185 Support**

Summary: We support the proposal to incorporate a policy to address the principles of sustainable development for Cambridge.

We would be happy to assist further in the development of a policy to address this issue, or indeed provide further evidence as required to justify the approach toward sustainable development.

## **16341 Support**

Summary: Yes, there is a need for a policy

## **16805 Support**

Summary: Yes - Support

## **18419 Support**

Summary: The suggestion that 'recycling and waste facilities' could be included within a comprehensive sustainable development policy (option 42) is supported and this goes some way to acknowledging the strategic importance of waste. It is as vital as road links, schools, medical facilities parks and public art. Moreover, any policy addressing this issue could be a STRATEGIC PRIORITY given the overarching context of achieving sustainable development set out in International Resolutions, European and primary legislation primary eg The 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, The 2008 Planning Act, The Climate Change Act 2008, The NERC Act 2006, The Localism Act 2011 and the NPPF.

## **18521 Support**

Summary: We support the development of a comprehensive sustainable development policy and Options 41 and 42.

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Question 6.2**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**7354 Object**

Summary: No priorities within the list? Too little focus on upgrading existing housing stock.

**8261 Object**

Summary: Support the principle of the policy, but other principles to add for all development proposals:

\* Residential developments should include access to open space for all residents, to allow drying of clothes without using tumble dryers

\* Consideration for secure bicycle storage for all properties.

**8603 Object**

Summary: The Trumpington Residents' Association notes that the document states that demand for water is likely to increase by 33% by 2031 but it is unclear on what this is dependent. Surely much will depend on the amount of growth of homes and jobs? This should be clarified against each of the options for homes.

**10162 Object**

Summary: All three aspects of sustainability - social and economic as well as environmental - should be required and one aspect cannot be traded against another. For example if a development provides jobs, that should not outweigh concern over unsustainable water use.

**10166 Object**

Summary: We need to evaluate the potential for renewable energy in Cambridge and set a target for developing it. This may mean allocating space for energy industry such as energy from waste plants.

**10167 Object**

Summary:

Regarding "Access to open space including space for urban food production," this could be expanded to include renewable materials production. Also, we propose an additional principle to be included in all development proposals in Cambridge which is the creative use of space for food production, for example community gardens on waste land, espalier trees against the sides of buildings, and edible landscaping.

**11068 Object**

Summary: The College would be keen to explore options to reduce its carbon footprint and improve water efficiency. However as much of its property is listed it can be both difficult and expensive to obtain the necessary approvals. The Council need to be working with colleges to facilitate this.

**13292 Object**

Summary: The policy needs to recognise that Colleges are very keen to adapt existing buildings, to manage and maintain their property and operate systems in a more sustainable way. The reduction of carbon emissions through improved energy efficiency, water efficiency and use of renewable energy are key to this. The policy should positively support this objective and seek to facilitate it. For example, such improvements can require physical works. The College owns many heritage assets and would want a policy which allows for the sensitive alterations to building fabric.

**14737 Object**

Summary: Maximise use of natural materials (e.g. timber, recycled materials) to minimise climate emissions caused by manufacture of brick, concrete, steel. Cambridge cannot afford to trigger a rise in the sea level: the city is located next to a large region that is close to the present sea level. Flooding the city with refugees is not compatible with economic growth.

**14940 Object**

Summary: Not all of these concepts can be applied to developments which encompass existing Listed Buildings.

**16806 Object**

Summary: The local Plan should include planning policies that encourage and support mixed-use developments, particularly the development of low-rent studios and live/work schemes. Under this heading, there should also be protection and support for allotments and other open spaces.

**17899 Object**

Summary: This requires the city council to prepare for a future that takes into consideration the effects of combat climate change on residents lives and the need to embrace a reduction in the use of finite resources; moving towards what we produce locally at all levels.

We need to reduce our carbon footprint from a 3 Planet lifestyle to a 1 Planet lifestyle. We also need to adapt to a lifestyle that is not dependant on oil. The strategies that help us to reduce our carbon footprint also reduce our dependency on fossil fuels and while individuals have to take some responsibility for making these changes many of the changes can't be done without local authorities and government facilitating them.

**18386 Object**

Summary: Sustainable construction encompasses many aspects to be promoted e.g. quality construction, 'long life, loose fit', recycling of components e.g. bricks have a long life, take high energy to produce but many buildings still use cement mortar which means they cannot be recycled.

## 18420 Object

Summary: The County Council considers that the plan should include a short waste section. There should be a recognition that growth and development will impact on waste arisings and may lead to a need for further infrastructure to support the growth. The inclusion of a specific waste section would contribute to the public's understanding of this need. This section should also mention the RECAP guide so potential developers are aware of their responsibilities in regard to waste from the outset.

## 18522 Object

Summary: We note that the document states that demand for water is likely to increase by 33% by 2031 but it is unclear on what this is dependent. Surely much will depend on the amount of growth of homes and jobs? This should be clarified against each of the options for homes.

## 8096 Support

Summary: Should add that outdoor drying space should be provided for all homes to decrease use of tumble driers

## 8433 Support

Summary: The policy addresses the development of the new rather than correcting current problems, e.g the pollution created by our current buses.

## 8862 Support

Summary: Green spaces could also be part of this sustainable development strategy and this would ensure a more integrated approach than a stand alone green space policy(4.4).

## 11297 Support

Summary: The proposal here (option 42) mentions "Recycling and waste facilities" as part of sustainable development. While I think recycling for households is excellent in Cambridge, it is shocking that there is no mandatory recycling for businesses in Cambridge. People working in shops always say 'it's too expensive for us to recycle'. I think either the Council has to make this available for free or force business owners to eat the cost. They recycle nothing - while households are doing very well. It's mysterious why this isn't part of a sustainability vision.

## 11786 Support

Summary: Lip service only seems to be applied to this concept. The current sustainable housing is of poor quality. People have refused to take them up because the materials used have allowed them to hear what is going on above, below and to the sides of them. All housing developments now should be fully insulated against sound, and should be as near as possible carbon neutral. This costs developers money but if you do not wish to establish areas where most would not wish to live this aspect of building is very important.

## 12325 Support

Summary: in addition to our comment on Option 42, we propose:

- a) Promoting and supporting behaviour changes that lead to carbon emissions reduction. Individuals' Low-carbon choices and demand reduction can make a big contribution towards a low-carbon Cambridge
- b) Support for communal meeting places to strengthen local communities, as communal meeting places in each locality can strengthen local communities.
- c) Other support of local food production (and open spaces). Allotments and communal gardens provide healthy low-carbon food.
- d) Support for outlying market stalls, not just the central market. - for further localisation and small enterprise opportunities.

## 14248 Support

Summary: Materials and construction waste:

It would be good to have some targets/bench-marking and also data collection and publication in this area. Perhaps this may only relate to key materials and products used (ie structure, cladding etc). It would also be useful to ask where these key materials/products are coming from. I would like to see a policy which considers local materials and products or even local skills and services.

Adaptability/re-use of buildings:

Keeping good records of building designs is key to assessing adaptability and re-use at a later stage in the life. In particular structural engineering drawings and design criteria.

## 17517 Support

Summary: I would like to propose an idea to reduce the carbon footprint of development. All new double glazed windows/doors allow light and warmth to enter a building. If a new build were to obstruct direct sunlight from entering an existing building, the consequence would be higher heating costs and emissions. If planning/building regs were to protect the warmth direct sunlight gives, this could impact on the reduction of Britain's CO2 emissions.

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Question 6.3**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**7355 Object**

Summary: Use micro policies as well as macro-policies to deal with environmental impact, flood management and biodiversity. Thus, maintain/encourage hedges, lawns, trees and gardens and be much stricter about loss of these to hard surfaces for parking and inserted developments; allow council tenants and leaseholders to install solar panels rather than stopping them as now; encourage/support rain water collection and recycling.

**14428 Object**

Summary: I would like to see more explicit consideration for the basic essentials of life in our new plan. There is very little about food other than allotment provision and certain types of shops. So how about a policy that every new institutional building/community facility with a kitchen should also have a kitchen garden? And how about provision for local distribution of fresh produce (very local farmers markets)? If this seems unimportant, think back to the lorry drivers' strike when food nearly ran out in the shops.

**17902 Object**

Summary: We need to stop Cambridge growing in size so we can feed ourselves in 2031 and reduce the use of valuable farmland being used by corporate business interests for housing development. The council should be developing policy alongside South and East Cambs councils to release of the land for food production for young local farmers unable to get hold of land to start new business. Land needs to be freed up for young people to give them opportunities to develop food related businesses.

**17905 Object**

Summary: Future house building on rich productive green belt land is not appropriate we need to hold this land for food production especially land within a cycle ride of population so that people can participate at times of high labour need. Set a Passivhaus standard to be reached in all buildings. All new housing to include micro-generation suitable for the property e.g. PV and solar water and orientation of new buildings to draw on solar gain.

**9039 Support**

Summary: On small developments, policy should be advisory only, or it will add unnecessarily to building costs

**14348 Support**

Summary: It would be worth considering Hackney Council proposal for a Wood First policy (also support by DEFRA's recent independent panel report on Forestry):  
<http://apps.hackney.gov.uk/servapps/newspr/NewsReleaseDetails.aspx?id=2437>  
Such a policy could help reduce the environmental impact of construction and help boost low carbon construction skills.

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, 6.5**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**17562 Object**

Summary: Setting targets for sustainable development: Develop a policy for setting sustainable construction standards using BREEAM (Level 4 or higher) and Code for Sustainable Homes (very good or excellent). To also include standards for water consumption levels.

**7654 Support**

Summary: I'd like to see real innovation here and not only sustainable (ie wood, wool) building products, but sustainable design features.

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, 6.6**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**17573 Object**

Summary: Reduction of Carbon emissions from new development: Need to balance overall increase in carbon emissions from new developments with reducing carbon greenhouse gas emissions. Also consider impact on viability of new development.  
Option 44: detailed target of 44% reduction in CE up to 2016 and zero carbon (not yet well defined) after. In keeping with current standards.  
Option 45: detailed targets in line with 'Decarbonising Cambridge', but may impact on viability.  
Option 46: Leave carbon reduction to Building Regulations and continue with percentage policy. This may have impact on viability.

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Option 43 - Sustainable Construction Standards  
Climate Change, Water &**

---

**11061 Object**

Summary: Imposition of BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes standards may not be achievable particularly where development incorporates historic buildings. Retention of (updated) guidance would be a better option to reduce carbon emissions.

**13041 Object**

Summary: Cambridge City Council should create a specific Planning Strategy to ensure that new development in identified growth areas implement grey and rain water recycling, implement SUDS systems and require Sedum roofs on new properties, in addition to any CFSH level required

**13069 Object**

Summary: Requirements for development to achieve excessive BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes standards may not be viable or achievable. Retention of (updated) guidance would be a better option to reduce carbon emissions.

**13135 Object**

Summary: We would support the broad thrust of option 43 which in relation to Compass House would seek BREEAM very good or excellent. We would seek for sustainable construction standards to be achieved through Building Regulations at a national level as opposed to locally set criteria. We would oppose standards which are higher than those set by current Building Regulations as this would threaten viability and make Cambridge less attractive to investors and developers alike.

**13304 Object**

Summary: Imposition of BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes standards may not be achievable particularly where development incorporates historic buildings. Retention of (updated) guidance would be a better option to reduce carbon emissions. Such extreme policy would be counterproductive.

**18061 Object**

Summary: Accept that developers current use of "bolt-on" renewables as a way of apparently reducing carbon (and meeting current 10% policy) is tokenistic and neither sustainable nor likely to meet proposed BR definitions (Part L)  
New build  
Fabric first for insulation, air tightness and thermal mass  
Passivhaus (plus thermal mass)  
Resilience to future climate  
Use local/recycled materials  
Lock up carbon in construction materials

**18575 Object**

Summary: CUH is committed to sustainable development and, to date through the early schemes for the expansion of the biomedical campus, has been requiring development to incorporate sustainable development measures as far as practicalities have allowed. We accept that there is every likelihood that sustainability standards will be raised in the future, and will endeavour to continue to meet whichever standards are in place. Nevertheless, we consider that the wording of these emerging policies should be such that there can be some flexibility in the application of the policy standards if site specific circumstances necessitate it.

**7537 Support**

Summary: New buildings must not make the same mistakes as previous builds which we're energy inefficient

**7655 Support**

Summary: This is a minimum.

**11292 Support**

Summary: Support

**11646 Support**

Summary: I favour higher construction standards for sustainable homes. I think the current standards are too low and that this is a false economy in the long run.

**12337 Support**

Summary: Strengthen Option 43 by:

"Requiring a minimum level of the Code for Sustainable Homes (at least Level 4, AND RISING OVER THE PERIOD) and BREEAM ('very good' RISING TO 'excellent')".

"Consideration SHOULD also be given to setting much higher standards for specific scales and types of development."

"Flexibility SHOULD be written into the policy to enable the standards set to rise should more ambitious national standards be adopted in the future through the government's Zero Carbon Policy."

**12633 Support**

Summary: Strongly agree- Cambridge should lead by example here.

**14636 Support**

Summary: We should require all new construction to meet the best accepted standard currently available. This also applies to dimensions for commercial premises and the application of 'whole of life' standards to new housing.

### **16343 Support**

Summary: Strongly support, but why only a 'minimum' level of the Code? Shouldn't we be aiming at the highest standards. Why wait for 'more ambitious' national standards?

### **16926 Support**

Summary: We welcome the intention to apply minimum standards to new developments and to reserve the right to raise those standards should higher national standards be introduced.

### **17724 Support**

Summary: Natural England generally welcomes Options 41 - 59 which address sustainable development, climate change, water and flooding.

**11187 Object**

Summary: In summary whilst we support BREEAM standards we respectively suggest that the Council policy is aligned to national standards in order that it can be incorporating flexibility in circumstances where the Government will seek to change timescales and/or requirements to meet their Zero Carbon Policies.

**11979 Object**

Summary: The University carries out BREEAM assessments on all new buildings over 1000m<sup>2</sup>, with a target to achieve a rating of 'Excellent' with a minimum rating of 'Very Good'. There is no appropriate BREEAM for existing buildings, however, and we would be concerned if policy prescribed the use of BREEAM for all developments.

The preferred approach is to set out a requirement for appropriate assessment of sustainable construction in the comprehensive sustainable development policy, and then provide guidance on methodologies, if necessary, in the Sustainable Design and Construction (SD&C) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

**16188 Object**

Summary: We do believe that the need for a sustainable development policy is sound though would like the policy to go further.

**7356 Support**

Summary: yes

**8262 Support**

Summary: need policy

**8434 Support**

Summary: Yes. Developers will always try to cut corners. Good quality and sustainability are cheaper for users in the long run

**8604 Support**

Summary: The Trumpington Residents' Association supports sustainable construction standards and Option 43.

**10169 Support**

Summary: Yes. However, current standards for sustainable construction are not perfect now, with some buildings given surprisingly low or high ratings. The council should consider alternative standards to BREEAM and the Code for Sustainable Homes as they arise and are recognised.

**10785 Support**

Summary: Yes

**11421 Support**

Summary: Support

**12342 Support**

Summary: This policy is important and much needed.

By requiring building development with high standards of insulation and energy efficiency, this policy can result in significant on-going carbon emissions reductions in the use of the buildings, contributing to achieving the City and national reduction targets.

**13467 Support**

Summary: Yes

**16344 Support**

Summary: Yes, there is a need for a policy

**17567 Support**

Summary: Yes

**17768 Support**

Summary: Developers should be required to build environmentally sustainable dwellings and respect the limitations of the flood plain and water supplies/drainage.

**18430 Support**

Summary: The County Council is supportive in principle of this policy, but is mindful of Codes or Standards changing over the life of the Plan. In addition, existing buildings, facilities, and infrastructure also need to be embraced.

**18523 Support**

Summary: We support sustainable construction standards and Option 43.



---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Question 6.5**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**7357 Object**

Summary: It is likely to be cheaper now to build to highest specification than it will be and most developers will try to cut costs if given chance, so go for highest reasonable spec now.

**10411 Object**

Summary: Neither objection nor support but question

Have maintenance costs been taken into account when considering sustainability. The best old fashioned boilers need very little maintenance. Unless you are very lucky condensing boilers cost a lot more in maintenance lowering their green credentials.

**13211 Object**

Summary: Option 43 suggests the development of a policy requiring a minimum level of the Code for Sustainable Homes of at least Level 4 and BREEAM Excellent or Very Good. Option 43 further states that flexibility could be written into the policy to allow for the standards set to rise to be adopted through the Government's zero carbon policy. We highlight to the Council that the Code for Sustainable Homes is due to be consulted upon and updated to reflect changes to Building Regulations Part L 2013 and the emerging definition of zero carbon homes. While recognising the need for sustainable development, our client cannot commit to achieving a standard when there is no certainty about what that standard will be following the above mentioned changes.

**13219 Object**

Summary: There is currently limited understanding of the health implications relating to living in homes with low levels of air leakage as required by Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 and above. Until these implications are better understood, we consider it unwise for policy to prejudice these findings, and therefore Option 43 is not justified.

**17836 Object**

Summary: The policy requires compliance with regimes including the Code for sustainable Homes and the building regulations. This is unnecessary and burdensome and is demonstrated by the recent publication of the 'A Review of Local Standards for the Delivery of New Homes' report. Paragraph 11 of the supplement to PPS1 makes it clear that the controls under planning and other regulatory regimes should not duplicate each other. In addition, Paragraph 95 of the NPPF notes that local standards are consistent with the Government's zero carbon building policy, and arguably should not require higher standards or be ahead of the respective trajectories.

**12344 Support**

Summary: We propose further extension of these standards into retrofit, in addition to Option 50 - "Consequential improvements policy"

Policy flexibility is also needed to enable appropriate changes as lower-carbon materials become available. For example cement production accounts for 5% of global CO2 emissions, but low-carbon cements are arriving.

See our comments on Option 42.

**14241 Support**

Summary: ref 6.7 - the use of materials with low environmental impact will not be achieved just through BREEAM or CfSH rating. Further policy would be required linking to embodied carbon calculation perhaps through the emerging EPD route?

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Question 6.6**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**17570 Object**

Summary: The same if not higher levels of sustainability should be set for non-residential development.

**17837 Object**

Summary: We would propose that BREEAM "Very Good" is adopted as the minimum standard for non-residential development. Achieving BREEAM "Excellent" cannot always be viably delivered, particularly where there is not an identified end use. Speculative development of non-residential development should be encouraged to ensure there is a supply of available high quality employment space in Cambridge and policies should not be adopted which could impact on the viability and delivery of this.

**7358 Support**

Summary: Going for highest reasonable spec now may provide a way to get only best employers with highest standards in the area and so control indirectly both numbers and quality of jobs.

**8263 Support**

Summary: Should target BREEAM excellent standards for non-residential development, because what is excellent at present will probably only equate to 'good' in the future when progress is made on building standards.

**8605 Support**

Summary: The Trumpington Residents' Association would support a target of BREEAM, either very good or excellent for non residential development.

**13469 Support**

Summary: Yes. All new development, and refurbishment of existing development (listed buildings/conservation areas exempted) to reach 'very good' or 'excellent' BREEAM standards

**16167 Support**

Summary: We would propose that BREEAM "Very Good" is adopted as the minimum standard for non-residential development. Achieving BREEAM "Excellent" cannot always be viably delivered, particularly where there is not an identified end use. Speculative development of non-residential development should be encouraged to ensure there is a supply of available high quality employment space in Cambridge and policies should not be adopted which could impact on the viability and delivery of this.

**16345 Support**

Summary: We should be aiming at the highest standards for both.

**18524 Support**

Summary: We would support a target of BREEAM, either very good or excellent for non residential development.

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Question 6.7**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**17838 Object**

Summary: The complexity of the three part policy has always been problematic for us, where it has made no sense (in all but exception locations) to require on-site district wide energy provision or a % of renewables energy source where a dwelling-centric approach is the most sensible solution. Developers should be required to construct fabric to high energy performance standards and then to mitigate remaining carbon via a levy i.e. Allowable Solutions that can be applied to more effective, larger-scale carbon mitigation. The end game of all policy should be carbon mitigation and broader sustainable solutions, not adherence to performance targets that may not mitigate carbon.

**7509 Support**

Summary: As a BREEAM professional I know that BREEAM is a crude and far too bureaucratic system to work effectively. Many issues it covers are simply a repeat of items in the proposed local plan and the building regulations. Better to have a strong local plan suited to the context.

**9040 Support**

Summary: On small developments, policy should be advisory only, or it will add unnecessarily to building costs

**11429 Support**

Summary: One means of achieving sustainability and a low carbon footprint is self-build homes. An owner-builder is likely to be more adventurous in their use of low-carbon technologies, and to be invested in making sure they are used effectively as they live in the property. A commercial developer will, however, apply the lowest standards they can get away with, sometimes as a 'box ticking' exercise rather than as a genuine holistic contribution.

**14274 Support**

Summary: BREEAM just deals with design and construction. Consideration should be given to how the building performs in occupation. We have this for vehicles (MoT) and the mechanism is there for buildings EPC's and then DEC's. Post occupancy evaluation is something that should be carried out on all major new buildings and developments.

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Climate Change, Water & Option 44 - Detailed targets for on site carbon emission reductions that relate to levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes being sought**

---

**7753 Object**

Summary: Not sufficiently ambitious.

**14637 Object**

Summary: Setting targets can be counterproductive. The policy should lay stress on use of proven measures to secure carbon reduction, i.e. something that has an objective and provable basis

**6912 Support**

Summary: support but the role of renewables in decarbonisation should be recognised in this as well as the Merton approach.

**11506 Support**

Summary: Agreed

**17725 Support**

Summary: Natural England generally welcomes Options 41 - 59 which address sustainable development, climate change, water and flooding.

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Climate Change, Water & Option 45 - Detailed targets for on site carbon emission reductions in line with the findings of Decarbonising Cambridge**

---

**14638 Object**

Summary: Setting targets can be counterproductive. The policy should lay stress on use of proven measures to secure carbon reduction, i.e. something that has an objective and provable basis

**7656 Support**

Summary: I'd support the stronger level of policy intervention.

**7752 Support**

Summary: Support

**12643 Support**

Summary: Support this more stringent approach. I strongly feel that Cambridge should lead by example here. I think this would be good for the image of Cambridge but ultimately I think it is the right thing to do.

**13137 Support**

Summary: We would support the objective for carbon reduction in non-residential buildings being linked to planned changes in Building Regulations. Where opportunities exist to achieve standards beyond this (for example connecting to district heating systems) we would support this aspiration in achieving reductions in carbon emissions. All requirements for carbon reduction technology must have regard to development viability (see reference to paragraph 173 of the NPPF) and must not threaten the viability and deliverability of schemes.

**13749 Support**

Summary: This seems like the best compromise, pushing the boundaries somewhat without putting developers off.

I'm not sure that I fully understand the wording. How can a 70% reduction in carbon emissions be greater than zero carbon?

**16927 Support**

Summary: We would support a policy which set more challenging targets for carbon emissions reduction from new developments, to be reviewed in the light of early experience.

**17728 Support**

Summary: Natural England generally welcomes Options 41 - 59 which address sustainable development, climate change, water and flooding.

**11509 Object**

Summary: No, little will be done.

**13138 Object**

Summary: We would have concerns regarding option 46 as it has the potential to impact upon development viability. A requirement for carbon reductions above that required by Building Regulations could impact negatively on development viability and in turn make developing in Cambridge less attractive to developers and potential investors. Building Regulations would be the preferred method for ensuring that development achieves carbon reductions. We would have concerns regarding any policy seeking standards higher than those required by Building Regulations.

**17851 Object**

Summary: We object to Option 46 which requires an additional reduction to carbon reduction to that being sought by Building Regulations, to be brought about specifically through the use of on- site renewable energy. Whilst we acknowledge the need for energy security etc., renewable energy generation is the least cost effective way of abating carbon; therefore we strongly recommend in accordance with Government Policy that a Fabric First approach to development is undertaken. Thereafter Allowable Solutions should be instigated to leverage wider community improvements and to mitigate emissions. For onsite matters, we consider Building Regulations to be the appropriate control mechanism.

**7751 Support**

Summary: Support

**13303 Support**

Summary: Regulations need to specify % renewables required, supported by planning guidelines. Because of changes in items such as FIT, planning responses need to be much more rapid.

**14639 Support**

Summary: Setting targets can be counterproductive. The policy should lay stress on use of proven measures to secure carbon reduction, i.e. something that has an objective and provable basis. This particularly the case with so-called 'carbon reduction' and 'renewable energy' initiatives that often owe more to hype and very generous subsidies than to evidence-based research and development.

**17729 Support**

Summary: Natural England generally welcomes Options 41 - 59 which address sustainable development, climate change, water and flooding.

**6975 Support**

Summary: Clearly there is need for a policy on reducing carbon emissions, as reducing carbon emissions is a public good with private cost, and will therefore only happen given (worldwide) regulation.

**7360 Support**

Summary: yes

**8264 Support**

Summary: need policy

**8435 Support**

Summary: Option 45

**11433 Support**

Summary: Support

**12347 Support**

Summary: A policy on reducing carbon emissions from new development is a key element in successfully reducing Cambridge Carbon emissions over the period.

As in paragraph 6.9: "The achievement of national targets for the reduction of carbon emissions will require action across all sectors of energy use."

**13470 Support**

Summary: Yes

**16260 Support**

Summary: In light of the importance of delivering sustainable development, we recognise the need for a sustainable development policy.

**16347 Support**

Summary: Yes, there is a need for a policy.

**17574 Support**

Summary: Yes

**17849 Support**

Summary: In light of the importance of delivering sustainable development, we recognise the need for a sustainable development policy.

**6976 Object**

Summary: I prefer Option 45. However, while reducing carbon emissions by ensuring that any new build conforms to higher standards is desirable, methods of reducing carbon emissions that involve more building in and around the city and its green belt for the purpose of reducing emissions by commuters is thoroughly undesirable - the latter should instead be addressed by relocating jobs to places where there is already adequate housing build, and by appropriate policies in regard to families at national level (to reduce split families).

**11989 Object**

Summary: The initial view of University Estate Management Officers is that policy should focus on carbon reduction rather than the provision of on-site renewables.

The level of carbon reduction for non-residential buildings should reflect the changes in Building Regulations (as set out in Option 45) but any more rigorous targets need to be the subject of further consultation and incorporate a degree of flexibility.

Option 46 - continuing to operate a percentage renewable energy policy - is not supported.

This matter will need to be subject to further discussion within the University before a definitive response can be given.

**16061 Object**

Summary: We suggest that the Council bases its local requirements for sustainability on the stepped targets detailed in the Building Regulations.

**17850 Object**

Summary: We would broadly support Option 44 that detailed targets for on-site carbon emission reductions should relate to levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes being sought at a national level, and which follows the zero carbon definition and its trajectories. Appropriate wording would however need to be adopted to capture non-residential development. In relation to Option 45, we welcome that the focus remains on delivering national policy via building regulations which is already challenging rather than placing additional impediments. We would object to any proposals which suggested that specific sites could go beyond these levels as the ability to connect into such things as district heating may be restricted due to non-planning issues. Indeed, why is the Policy targeting a 70% trajectory?

**7361 Support**

Summary: option 45 - enforceable and provides less wriggle room for developers

**8266 Support**

Summary: Option 45 is preferred on grounds of long-term sustainability

The technologies for renewable energy generation are developing and changing rapidly so care should be taken in mandating particular technologies. Policy should be phrased accordingly

**9041 Support**

Summary: Option 46

**10170 Support**

Summary: We prefer Option 46 promoting more renewable energy.

**12350 Support**

Summary: Option 45 is best.

But it needs extending into non-residential development and should include renewable energy provision.

It's well suited to an ambitious Cambridge Local Plan, being based on Decarbonising Cambridge, it derives from local data and this recent local proposal for meeting our carbon reduction targets.

**13473 Support**

Summary: Option 45

**16268 Support**

Summary: We would broadly support Option 44 and Option 45. We object to Option 46.

**16349 Support**

Summary: Option 45, but it should apply to existing housing as well as new developments.

**17575 Support**

Summary: Option 45 preferred

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Question 6.10**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**13073 Object**

Summary: The policy should recognise that significant carbon reduction is achieved through energy efficiency measures of a level which could not be achieved through renewable energy sources. It seems more logical to minimise the necessary use of energy before considering generation. Further renewable energy features tend to be more visibility than energy efficiency measures which can cause design issues.

**17852 Object**

Summary: Whilst covered in Option 47, this section should also recognise is that on-site renewables are not always the most efficient option and this option should allow for contributions to off-site renewables to be taken into account if on-site solutions are not appropriate or viable.

**9042 Support**

Summary: Requiring local standards will add unnecessarily to building costs

**16273 Support**

Summary: Whilst covered in Option 47, this section should also recognise that on-site renewables are not always the most efficient option and this option should allow for contributions to off-site renewables to be taken into account if on-site solutions are not appropriate or viable.

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Question 6.11**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**9043 Support**

Summary: No targets - rely on good practice

**17576 Support**

Summary: The policy could incorporate a sliding scale whereby the standards are higher for larger developments where there are greater profits but also greater increase in overall emissions. The minimum standards could be lower for single dwellings and midway for small developments.

**8916 Object**

Summary: Is this not a way of allowing developers to do things on the cheap? Wasted energy in the development will still have to be paid for (by the property/ householder). When eventually the conversion to lower carbon usage is unavoidable the developer will be gone and the cost will fall on someone else (probably also the householder). The scheme should be rejected.

**9750 Object**

Summary: Please disregard response 8267 which was entered in error at this point. The correct response should have been as follows:-  
Is this not a way of allowing developers to do things on the cheap? Wasted energy in the development will still have to be paid for (by the property/ householder). When eventually the conversion to lower carbon usage is unavoidable the developer will be gone and the cost will fall on someone else (probably also the householder). The scheme should be rejected.

**11647 Object**

Summary: I am sceptical of 'carbon offsetting'. It seems to me that many of the offsets purchased may be used to finance schemes that would have gone ahead anyway. Developers should be responsible for producing environmentally-friendly buildings, and not just pay a bit extra in order to absolve themselves of this responsibility. If this causes the resulting buildings to be more expensive, so be it. Hopefully, over time this cost will pay for itself. Even if it does not, we have a responsibility to future generations. Think long-term!

**12647 Object**

Summary: I would need to understand more about this to be convinced. I would not want this to be a way that developers can wriggle through a loophole to avoid putting in the most carbon efficient measures. It should be for cases where such measures cannot be put in place by developers and this is the next best option. The rules for being allowed to go down this route should be very carefully thought through.

**13308 Object**

Summary: Offsets are not acceptable alternatives to making real improvements and, in a historical buildings context, this would permit planners to oppose reasonable fabric upgrades while imposing an 'environmental tax', which does nothing to help us improve the building stock.

**14186 Object**

Summary: Support move away from on-site, or specific site related, provision of eg. heat and power generation.

Focus ought be on making energy supply via the national gas and electricity grids efficient and resilient.

Funding should be from all, not via another tax on those wanting to buy homes.

**14640 Object**

Summary: No. This will be abused as a cheap way out as is done so often with S.106 obligations where you pay a small sum, check to see if it has been spent for a proper purpose within the time allowed and then claw it back if you can.

**18576 Object**

Summary: We do not support the idea of developers being able to bribe their way out of delivering on their carbon reduction commitments by contributing to a fund. We can see that this would be used to the detriment of certain parts of the City such as Mitchams Corner.

**7657 Support**

Summary: I am supportive of this, but think that developers often don't contribute enough to these types of funds and really should be encouraged to rethink their model of development instead.

**12362 Support**

Summary: The fund's "investment in carbon reduction projects" should include "Smaller scale projects, such as retrofit of low carbon technologies to existing buildings"

New developments should deliver CO2 reductions on site, rather than offsetting these. Tough negotiations with developers are called for.

The Fund's projects must result in real carbon savings of at least those the developer would have been obliged to deliver on-site.

Excellent management, communications and transparency of the Fund is needed to attract public support.

**13139 Support**

Summary: We would support the objective of option 47 to establish a Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund. This would provide developers with an alternative to providing on-site renewables where this is not possible. Further work would be required in order to identify a suitable mechanism for calculating financial contributions to a Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund. Where financial contributions or on-site provision has been made to other infrastructural improvements consideration of reduced contributions should be considered in order to ensure development viability and to facilitate development within Cambridge.

**17731 Support**

Summary: Natural England generally welcomes Options 41 - 59 which address sustainable development, climate change, water and flooding.



---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Question 6.12**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**6977 Object**

Summary: Yes, there is a need for a policy on offsetting carbon emissions, as almost always people choose to "offset" rather than comply with carbon emission restrictions, and most such means of "offsetting" actually achieve almost nothing. It is important that developers should have to comply with, rather than get round or offset, carbon emission regulations.

**7362 Object**

Summary: No - best to require full carbon reduction on site; less wriggle room for developers. Less costs to the council of administering and enforcing the scheme; less complex altogether NOT to have such a scheme.

**8606 Object**

Summary: The Trumpington Residents' Association comments that there is insufficient information available on how this would work in practice and more research is needed. Developers should be encouraged to meet their zero carbon obligations and not be able to buy their way out by contributing to a Common Energy Fund.

**10005 Object**

Summary: No policy needed for reasons given in response to option 47 (representation 9750). Is this not a way of allowing developers to do things on the cheap? Wasted energy in the development will still have to be paid for (by the property/ householder). When eventually the conversion to lower carbon usage is unavoidable the developer will be gone and the cost will fall on someone else (probably also the householder). The scheme should be rejected.

**11194 Object**

Summary: St John's College wish to raise concerns about the direct relevance of any funding that would occur having regard to the location of the development to which it relates.

**13101 Object**

Summary: Qualified support, developers should seek to address zero carbon obligations primarily through design - the energy fund should not offer 'wiggle room' for avoiding design responsibilities.

**17577 Object**

Summary: Possibly, but only if it could be reliably demonstrated that local Government has the ability to manage and deliver effective and efficient community energy projects, and that the cost of administering such a fund was reasonable.

**18525 Object**

Summary: We comment that there is insufficient information available on how this would work in practice and more research is needed. Developers should be encouraged to meet their zero carbon obligations and not be able to buy their way out by contributing to a Common Energy Fund.

**8436 Support**

Summary: yes

**9044 Support**

Summary: Unworkable in practice. Rely on good practice.

**10171 Support**

Summary: We are in favour of a community energy fund which allows developers to contribute to energy saving in existing homes. It is more cost effective, usually, to upgrade existing houses than to build PV panels.

We would also like to have a fund in which Cambridge people can invest for community renewable energy projects in Cambridge

**12045 Support**

Summary: The initial view of University Estate Management Officers is that the option to off-set any carbon reduction that cannot be achieved on site is worthy of further consideration. We suggest that this is dealt with as part of any policy developed to secure carbon reduction, so as to avoid a proliferation of policies in the Local Plan.

This matter will need to be subject to further consultation with the University on detailed proposals before a definitive response can be given.

**12353 Support**

Summary: Offsets are problematic. Often people feel free to continue their emissions, instead of reducing them to the minimum, because they're being offset. Offset schemes often fail to deliver their claimed savings because they are double-counted by more than one scheme or because of high overheads or poor management and monitoring. These worries also apply here. Offsetting should be a last resort when all possible carbon reductions have been made.

The actual on-site reductions should be maximised. Any payment to a Community Energy network must result in off-site savings, equivalent to the residual on-site emissions.

**12364 Support**

Summary: Yes, clear policy and transparency of the Fund will help attract public support and assist it making real carbon savings.

**13478 Support**

Summary: Yes

## 16170 Support

Summary: Adopting a policy that allows developers to contribute towards off-site renewables in lieu of on-site provision is supported. Restricting this only to the Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund is considered too limiting and there should be flexibility for off-site contributions to be made to other properly constituted bodies. In part, this is due to the local opposition to certain types of renewables within Cambridgeshire which could limit the effectiveness of the Fund.

## 16350 Support

Summary: Yes, there is a need for a policy.

---

### CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Question 6.13 Climate Change, Water &

---

## 17803 Object

Summary: How would such a fund be administered?  
How would such projects be selected to receive funding? How would effectiveness be monitored?  
Would Developers use this as a cheap and easy option to avoid their environmental responsibilities that they will always be able to negotiate lower?

---

### CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Question 6.14 Climate Change, Water &

---

## 8270 Object

Summary: An option for offsetting carbon reduction often provides an easy way to 'meet targets' without achieving the purpose of the target ( i.e. reducing emissions). Developers must be required actually to reduce emissions by providing good quality housing.

## 16173 Support

Summary: Contributions should be allowed to other appropriate bodies, not just the Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund - as recognised in the current 'Allowable Solutions' policy proposals.

## 17805 Support

Summary: Developers would still be required to meet minimum emission standards (e.g. present standards or above, but could offset any excess requirements against a payment to the fund.

---

### CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, 6.14 Climate Change, Water &

---

## 6913 Support

Summary: UK lags the rest of Europe in district heat. New development (especially mixed use development) offers opportunities for renewable CHP with district heat and these should be supported and promoted in the plan

## 15200 Support

Summary: There could be an opportunity to use the city sewage works to generate energy via anaerobic digestion. The industry already has the expertise to do this for their own internal needs. Perhaps they could also provide district heating for Northern Fringe East developments, especially if the works are modernised and down-sized.

When additional organic feedstock is required to meet the demands of winter CHP a solid waste stream arising from the Green Bin scheme could be added to the process.

**8271 Object**

Summary: This option is too vague. There should be some indication of how energy is to be generated.

**14641 Object**

Summary: No. Having experienced the benefits of a district heating system it is something that needs very careful planning and an essential criterion is that those connected to it have the means to control the level of heating provided, other than by opening windows, the method we found necessary on the Tachbrook Estate in Pimlico. Low carbon generation should be encouraged but many systems have poor performance and reliability records as yet. The aim should be that any installation should relate to the specified minimum lifetime of the building, around 30 years for many commercial buildings.

**17844 Object**

Summary: Whilst the aspiration to connect into existing district heating systems or encourage new ones is perfectly reasonable, there seems to be little recognition of the potential difficulties of achieving this. This is not simply a cost or planning issue but extends to legal issues (i.e. developers may not have the right to connect into systems owned and controlled by others) and such things as the impact on adoptability of services and highways, all of which must be taken into account.

**18067 Object**

Summary: Maximise micro and mid-scale  
Local energy networks to efficiently use treated heat and power  
Large scale - waste to power plant  
Waste:  
Local collection/recycling points

**7658 Support**

Summary: Good plan.

**11512 Support**

Summary: Sounds good.

**12370 Support**

Summary: We Support the development of a policy to promote the development of renewable and low carbon energy generation within Cambridge, including community energy projects.

Solar, Wind, Biomass, waste and district heating show promise for generating significant low-carbon energy.

District heating has some promise, particularly in developments around Addenbrookes.

Community energy projects build public support and finance for renewables. They enable participation by people who don't own a suitable site for renewables.

From October Solar Thermal installations will be supported by the Renewable Heat Incentive

**12649 Support**

Summary: This sounds good in theory, but I'm not sure I fully understand how it would work.

**13143 Support**

Summary: We support the principle of Option 48 regarding renewable and low carbon energy generation. We would have concerns regarding the impact of such requirements on viability and would seek for any policy to have regard to site specific issues including an assessment of the impact of providing energy generation on site and the cost of providing infrastructure to allow connection to district heating systems for example. Issues of development viability must be considered when drafting this policy. Requirements should not be above and beyond those set out in current Building Regulations as this could threaten development viability within the city.

**13309 Support**

Summary: A positive approach to more strategic renewable and low carbon energy generation is welcomed.

**17733 Support**

Summary: Natural England generally welcomes Options 41 - 59 which address sustainable development, climate change, water and flooding.

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Question 6.15**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**6978 Object**

Summary: Yes. The suggested policy to support the development of community heating methods is good. However, it should not be applied to new build only, but also be made available to existing buildings where it is the most appropriate next method to reduce energy wastage.

Further, the need to cool as well as heat should not be overlooked, particularly given the predictions for increases in mean temperature outlined in this report.

**9045 Object**

Summary: Not an efficient solution. Rely on good practice.

**17807 Object**

Summary: Possibly, but will this not be covered by the standards for low energy emissions above

**17845 Object**

Summary: Whilst the aspiration to connect into existing district heating systems or encourage new ones is perfectly reasonable, there seems to be little recognition of the potential difficulties of achieving this. This is not simply a cost or planning issue but extends to legal issues (ie. developers may not have the right to connect into systems owned and controlled by others) and such things as the impact on adoptability of services and highways, all of which must be taken into account.

**7363 Support**

Summary: yes

**8272 Support**

Summary: need policy

**8437 Support**

Summary: yes

**10172 Support**

Summary: Yes. We support strategic district heating areas.

**12374 Support**

Summary: Yes:

The developing UK renewables market has suffered from uncertainty and sudden changes in incentives, as when the Feed in Tariff was suddenly halved.

Clear local policy will help planning and provision of more renewables.

**12506 Support**

Summary: An excellent proposal.

**13480 Support**

Summary: Yes

**16176 Support**

Summary: Whilst the aspiration to connect into existing district heating systems or encourage new ones is perfectly reasonable, there seems to be little recognition of the potential difficulties of achieving this. This is not simply a cost or planning issue but extends to legal issues (ie developers may not have the right to connect into systems owned and controlled by others) and such things as the impact on adoptability of services and highways, all of which must be taken into account.

**16351 Support**

Summary: Yes, there is a need for a policy. What already exists?

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Question 6.16**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**12046 Object**

Summary: Any policy encouraging renewable and low carbon energy generation should not focus solely on district heating.

**7364 Support**

Summary: should be applied to/encouraged for existing communities, not just to new ones - especially council owned stock.

**9176 Support**

Summary: The Council should look to work with the local universities to seek funding and provides locations suitable for piloting renewable energy / carbon reduction schemes. Benefits include action on climate change, integration of town and gown, real-life testing of "blue-sky" ideas, jobs, investment.

**14941 Support**

Summary: There is an opportunity at Jesus Green weir to install a hydro-power scheme.

**16355 Support**

Summary: Yes, agree with this. Vital that new developments are planned with our changing climate in mind, as well as ensuring that they do not exacerbate climate impact for neighbouring communities.

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Question 6.17**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**15078 Object**

Summary: The other point is in relations to sustainable energy. There is no mention anywhere of wind energy. I appreciate that the City has fairly tightly defined boundaries fairly close to the urban footprint but it should nonetheless seek to establish whether there may be locations potentially suited to an appropriate scale of wind energy use particularly towards the boundaries and, having regard to the duty to co-operate with neighbouring authorities, the potential for cross boundary sites that may have application for generating carbon free electricity in the context of land/co-operation traversing planning authorities

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, 6.16**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**9180 Support**

Summary: The policies on flooding and new development do not match the strength of wording.

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Option 49 - Climate change adaption**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**13311 Object**

Summary: It is recognised that climate change factors need to be considered but such a policy is overly restrictive. It is already part of the general design principles. It should be noted that inclusion of a climate change adaption strategy in the Design and Access Statement is not currently a national requirement.

**7659 Support**

Summary: Urban greening, design solutions, and urban form itself are all fundamental elements of a successful approach.

**10786 Support**

Summary: Basically good ideas

**11513 Support**

Summary: Sounds good.

**12167 Support**

Summary: The considerable biodiversity (see p. 169), as evidenced by many bird species (e.g., herons, owls, woodpeckers) on the river Cam, in the trees and hedgerows, and other wild fauna and flora, contribute essentially to the character of these Green Belt areas; they are highly valued by walkers and others involved in recreational activities. Encouragement and the taking of personal responsibility may be preferable ways of achieving them, rather than via Regulations.

**12651 Support**

Summary: Sounds good in theory but would like more detail on this policy please.

**13147 Support**

Summary: We would support the objectives of option 49. The redevelopment of Compass House would allow for the inclusion of a range of features which would aid climate change adaptation. If a Climate Change Adaptation Strategy is proposed to be included in Design and Access Statement's, we would welcome guidance from Cambridge City Council on the requirements of this. There may be impacts on development viability as a result of the application of a policy on climate change adaptation. At all times regard should be had to the NPPF guidance on ensuring the viability of sustainable development (see paragraph 173).

**14642 Support**

Summary: I like the aspiration but can this be turned into a sensible policy aim? Orientation is often constrained by other factors and trees, whilst beneficial, can sometimes be very bad neighbours, especially when that pretty garden shrub turns out to be a giant standard tree.  
Conserving and recycling energy and water makes sound economic sense and it is to be hoped that the capital costs of doing both will come down to encourage both.

**16191 Support**

Summary: We would support the development of a policy to address climate change adaptation and would be happy to assist further in the development of a policy to address this issue.

**17735 Support**

Summary: Natural England generally welcomes Options 41 - 59 which address sustainable development, climate change, water and flooding.

**17848 Support**

Summary: We broadly support these objectives and have used an emerging methodology for incorporating climate change adaptation measures into masterplan's and urban design. To mitigate and adapt to future climate change, places will to incorporate green and blue infrastructure to ameliorate future temperatures and to reduce the effect of urban heat island affect. However, whilst the building design will utilise proven passive approaches this must not be at the expense of high-quality placemaking. In addition, the legacy costs and the future funding of maintaining such places will need to be carefully reviewed in light of S206, CIL and the emerging Flood and Water Management Act.

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Question 6.18**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**9046 Object**

Summary: Council would have to make automatic grants of at least 75% of costs as an incentive.

**11200 Object**

Summary: The fourth bullet point within Option 49 refers to "consideration could be given to setting a tree canopy cover requirement for new developments" - this reference to tree canopies is unclear and further detail is sought as to the intentions of any such policy as it relates to new development.

**12047 Object**

Summary: There is no need for a separate Local Plan policy but advice could be incorporated into the Sustainable Design & Construction SPD and should cover alterations to existing buildings. Any guidance should be realistic in its aspirations and have regard to viability issues.

**7365 Support**

Summary: yes

**8273 Support**

Summary: need policy

**8438 Support**

Summary: yes

**10175 Support**

Summary: There are two parts to this policy which is confusing. The adaptation measures listed address both:  
\* Large scale problems such as the heat island effect and drainage problems  
\* Individual building scale problems due to high temperatures  
Planning policy should be targeting mainly the large scale problems which can be mitigated by landscaping whereas the individual building issues should be handled through building regulations.

However, we agree that adaptation is needed at all levels.

**10266 Support**

Summary: Support as this is a vehicle to help protect, enhance and increase the area of wildlife habitats and green spaces throughout the city.

**10787 Support**

Summary: Yes

**10934 Support**

Summary: Yes, although the measures listed and further development do not go hand in hand.

**11434 Support**

Summary: Support

**12377 Support**

Summary: Clear information and policy on likely climate change impacts will help good planning for adaptation. Requiring developers to produce a climate change adaptation Strategy will improve attention to adaptation.

Developers and planners need to anticipate changes in climate and design for them.

eg: The expected rising summer temperatures will increase the demand for cooling in buildings, which could be eased by clever design of natural ventilation and shading.

**13039 Support**

Summary: Living in a flood risk zone and having faced recently two flood alerts I find it essential that climate change be taken into account in planning new development, especially when it comes to water management.

**13482 Support**

Summary: Yes

**13788 Support**

Summary: This area seems currently rather overlooked - but measure to mitigate the effects of climate change will have a very positive impact on everyday lives of the population

**16356 Support**

Summary: Yes, there is a need for a policy.

**17809 Support**

Summary: Seems to be legal requirement

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Question 6.19**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**10520 Object**

Summary: I should like to see the inclusion of green walls as a suggested element in building design.

**17811 Object**

Summary: Measures only focus on global warming and rising sea levels.

**7366 Support**

Summary: should be applied to/encouraged for existing communities, not just to new ones - especially council owned stock. Why does council prevent individual leaseholders investing in solar panels? More enforcement and planning control needed to control 'hard surfacing' of gardens etc.

**14301 Support**

Summary: Regarding urban landscaping and the role of trees reference should be made to DEFRA's recent independent panel report on forestry:  
<http://www.defra.gov.uk/forestrypanel/>

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Question 6.20**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**14321 Support**

Summary: The use of 'cool' building materials to reduce the impact of higher temperatures needs to be better explained. Heavy materials retain heat and act as a radiator (good in winter, bad in summer). In extended periods of hot weather thermal mass can be counter-productive. Also the colour of materials needs to be considered, ie lighter coloured materials for roofs and walls can help reduce the effect of the urban heat sink effect.

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, 6.18**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**6979 Support**

Summary: Yes, as indicated above all methods of cheap cooling available need to be considered. A provision on minimum level of tree canopy cover, affecting not only new build but also existing parts of the city, would be most welcome.

**11294 Support**

Summary: I work in a Council owned building which must be THE most energy-inefficient building on the planet. Council needs to get its own house in order in this respect.

**8274 Object**

Summary: We do not believe that implementation should be 'required' although we do believe it should be encouraged and that the long term financial advantages of implementation should be made clear.

**11935 Object**

Summary: I think that compulsion in this matter is inappropriate. The cost/benefit impact to the householder should be a consideration. For example, insulating an older (non-cavity wall) property could be very expensive.

**13313 Object**

Summary: Such a policy would put a severe financial strain on major landowners, and suggests that small improvements would unleash major upgrading to the entire building. In College terms, this could mean that an improvement in an attic area might require (unaffordable) work to an entire range of buildings in order to achieve planning approval. Equally it may have the opposite effect of delaying minor works until they are affordable.

**14643 Object**

Summary: Cambridge has many older buildings the are likely to be retained for the foreseeable future. The policy should allow and encourage the fitting of double-glazing, insulation and other measures to reduce the their carbon footprint and make them more user-friendly even if this 'compromises' the character of the building for the purists. Compulsion is not the best way of achieving this object given the powers of some agencies and specialists to raise issues with even the most modest proposals that affect a building of architectural or historic interest.

**14841 Object**

Summary: Strongly object. Property owners wishing to do loft conversions/extensions should not be encumbered by 'yet more red tape'.

**18063 Object**

Summary: Don't just rely on "consequential-improvements" stick - offer carrots  
Provide finance opportunities (Bank of Dave, Boring Bank of Cambridge, Cambridge Retrofit, Community Energy Funds - locally targeted) for private and public sector housing upgrade to address climate change mitigation and adaptation.  
Adopt mandatory/advisory standards with regard to conservation/heritage (as Historic Scotland) with regard to replacement d/glazing etc  
Build on / coordinate multifarious existing initiatives, bodies to give simple, relevant, consistent advice about priorities, constructions, risks etc. Use College/Universities experience/expertise to inform this (Guthrie, Middleton, New Ct). Monitor and understand - can't fit and forget.

**12653 Support**

Summary: I think this is really important for a city like Cambridge. There are for example a lot of houses with solid walls that have no cavity to fill. Insulating these properties is very expensive though, so there should be some sort of (meaningful!) grant to help people to carry out this work. I could see this as a potential option for the community energy group policy- essentially getting developoers to subsidise. As above this would have to be very tightly controlled to stop developers just taking the easy (cheap) option!

**16357 Support**

Summary: Agree, but why does this poilcy only apply to planning permissions for new work on existing houses? Should it not apply to all properties?

**16928 Support**

Summary: This is an imaginative policy which would require other cost effective energy improvements or water saving measures to be made to a property as and when loft conversions or extensions (needing planning permission) were undertaken. It would have a marked and positive impact on existing residential areas such as this, particularly if it were applied sensitively so as not to discourage the more limited but worthwhile schemes.

**17736 Support**

Summary: Natural England generally welcomes Options 41 - 59 which address sustainable development, climate change, water and flooding.



**7488 Object**

Summary: It is highly unfair to penalise householders who attempt to improve their homes by imposing additional work to the rest of the house!  
Firstly many will be on a tight budget and may not be able to afford the additional work, secondly many may not want to submit to the added inconvenience. The result of this restrictive policy will be to discourage improvements in private homes!

**9461 Object**

Summary: Further regulation which restricts the freedom of existing home and business owners should not be introduced. Imposing onerous energy improvement requirements acts as a disincentive to owners to make any improvements at all. Much better to have a small improvement to what might be an old and very inefficient building (which owners can afford), than to insist on big improvements which the owners cannot afford and end up doing nothing.

**12051 Object**

Summary: There is no need for a separate Local Plan policy as Building Regulations deal with this matter sufficiently.

**17812 Object**

Summary: Not necessarily. The new build component would be covered by the policies above, and the heritage asset of the existing building should have precedence over energy conservation.

**6980 Support**

Summary: Yes - and I would support the policy entitled Option 50.

**7367 Support**

Summary: yes

**8097 Support**

Summary: Need for policy. I support option 50

**8275 Support**

Summary: need policy

**10176 Support**

Summary: Yes - especially we should be considering requiring water efficiency measures in existing homes.

**10936 Support**

Summary: Yes, which should focus on the small scale e.g. grants for loft insulation, water butts etc.

**12385 Support**

Summary: This policy is needed for improving the energy performance of the city's current housing stock.

We support the City Council leading on this, in spite of the government shelving a similar scheme.

Low-carbon Retrofit has a bigger part to play than new development in reducing carbon emissions from buildings.

Consequential improvements are one of the few planning levers that can require work to improve building energy performance.

Since builders are already on-site for the extension (or other work being undertaken), it's a cost-effective time to improve other aspects of the building's energy performance.

**13483 Support**

Summary: Yes

**16360 Support**

Summary: Yes, there is a need for a policy.

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Question 6.22**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**17813 Object**

Summary: How is 'cost effective' defined and would such a policy prevent people from considering upgrading homes

**7368 Support**

Summary: Why does council prevent individual leaseholders investing in solar panels? More enforcement and planning control needed to control 'hard surfacing' of gardens etc.

**12404 Support**

Summary: Other energy efficiency opportunities in existing buildings:

New Option 1: Private Rented property EPC policy:

that Cambridge City Council develop a stronger policy based on The Energy Act 2011 that requires from April 2018, all private rented properties to be brought up to a minimum energy efficiency standard likely to be EPC rating "E", especially if the national requirements slip further.

New Option 2: Policy to Support low-carbon choices in buildings.

Choices made by people who use and control buildings are key to reducing their carbon emissions.

eg:

- \* thorough draft-proofing
- \* better heating controls, used effectively
- \* improving insulation, (with Green Deal help?)

**13484 Support**

Summary: I agree with the principle of adapting buildings to better cope with climate change, but would like to stress that this should not be at the expense of adversely affecting the historic environment or character of conservation areas. It is entirely possible to develop sustainable, energy-saving measures within old buildings without affecting their character.

**13888 Support**

Summary: There has been no reference to the Cambridge Retrofit project. This seeks to achieve carbon reductions in line with national targets by focusing on the existing housing stock; the whole stock not just houses undergoing other improvements.

It will require a financing model of course and the Government Green Deal will be the first test. As it seems unlikely this will appeal to the majority, Retrofit will explore other models as well as seeking a skilled workforce and cost reductions.

The Local Plan should support this project wholeheartedly.

---

**CHAPTER: 6 - Sustainable Development, Question 6.23**  
**Climate Change, Water &**

---

**17815 Object**

Summary: Surely incentives to increase energy efficiency are more effective than compulsion

---