



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, 11 February 2013

Date: Tuesday, 19 February 2013

Time: 4.30 pm

Venue: Committee Room 1 & 2 - Guildhall

Contact: Toni Birkin

Direct Dial: 01223 457013

AGENDA

1 APOLOGIES

To receive any apologies for absence.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

3 MINUTES

Minutes to follow.

4 PUBLIC QUESTIONS (SEE BELOW)

**5 CAMBRIDGE LOCAL PLAN - TOWARDS 2031 ANALYSIS OF
COMMENTS AND OPTIONS** *(Pages 1 - 256)*

Information for the Public

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Further information about speaking at a City Council

meeting can be found at;

<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.

**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.

Fire Alarm

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

**Facilities for
disabled
people**

Level access to the Guildhall is via Peas Hill.

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

Accessible toilets are available on the ground and first floor.

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

For further assistance please contact Democratic

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

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

General Information Information regarding committees, councilors and the democratic process is available at 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 Services
Relevant scrutiny Development Plan 19/2/2013
committee: Scrutiny Sub Committee
Wards affected: All Wards

CAMBRIDGE LOCAL PLAN - TOWARDS 2031

Approach to draft Plan – Pollution, Housing and Employment

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 Pollution, Housing and Employment sections 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 Pollution, Housing and Employment as set out in Appendices A, B and C and
 - To endorse the response and approach to take forward in the draft Plan, as set out in Appendices A, B and C and tables 1, 2 and 3.

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.
- 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 16th October 2012. For further information, please see the following link:
<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/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 Pollution, Housing and Employment sections 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 pollution, as well as summaries of the representations received. Appendix B contains the same for housing and Appendix C for employment, while Appendix D provides information on the Use Classes Order 1987 (as amended) to aid Members. 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. Rather the reformed plan-making system focuses on the key issues arising from consultation which the analysis and recommendations focus on.

- 3.5 At this stage, detailed policy wording has not been suggested, but sufficient detail of the evidence behind potential policy options has been provided to give Members a broad steer as to what should be included in the policy so Members can agree the broad direction in which policies should be developed. Following on from this committee, officers will draft the relevant policies, which will be presented to Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee at forthcoming meetings.
- 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.

Pollution (Options 84 to 88)

- 3.7 Chapter 8 of the Issues and Options Report considered the policy approach to pollution. Appendix A contains the officer analysis of the key issues raised for pollution as well as summaries of the representations received.
- 3.8 Appendix A discusses the potential to use a general policy approach to pollution (Option 84) or to develop a range of specific policies pertaining to different types of pollution (Options 85 – 88). Options on visual pollution and water quality have already been discussed at the Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee meetings in November and December 2012.

Table 1: Recommended preferred approach for pollution

OPTION/OBJECTIVE NUMBER AND DESCRIPTION	PREFERRED APPROACH FOR DRAFT PLAN
Option 84 – General Pollution Policy	The recommendation is not to pursue Option 84 as it is considered appropriate to develop a range of different policies

OPTION/OBJECTIVE NUMBER AND DESCRIPTION	PREFERRED APPROACH FOR DRAFT PLAN
	covering different aspects of pollution.
Option 85 – Air Quality Policy	The recommendation is to pursue Option 85 and ensure that Air Quality Policy in the Local Plan requires that the health impacts of new developments on current and future residents can be addressed. A detailed and specific Air Quality Policy will explicitly provide future protection from poor air quality.
Option 86 - Noise Policy	The recommendation is to pursue Option 86. A detailed and specific policy is necessary to prevent both new and existing development from either giving rise to or being subjected to unacceptable levels of noise.
Option 87: Contaminated land	The recommendation is to pursue Option 87. A detailed and specific Contaminated Land Policy should ensure that new development is appropriate and that the site is suitable for its new use.
Option 88 - Light Pollution	The recommendation is to pursue Option 88. A detailed and specific policy is necessary to limit the impact of light pollution on residential amenity, wildlife and landscape as well as promoting public safety and the prevention of crime.

Housing (Options 97 to 101 and 111 to 120)

3.9 Chapter 9 of the Issues and Options Report considered the policy approach to housing in Cambridge. It covered matters ranging from employment related housing through to provision for Gypsy and Travellers and residential moorings.

3.10 Appendix B contains the officer analysis of the key issues raised for housing, as well as summaries of the representations received. Options 90 – 94 on Affordable Housing and Options 95, 96, 147 and 148 on the provision of student accommodation do not form part of

this report as the final outcome of viability testing to support the delivery of the Community Infrastructure Levy is still awaited.

- 3.11 Options 102 to 105 on density and 106 to 110 on internal and external residential space standards were discussed at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee in December 2012. Three options on internal and external residential space standards have been consulted on as a part of the Issues and Options 2 consultation during January and February 2013.
- 3.12 Members' attention is drawn to the the recommendation is to pursue Option 119, which will set out the criteria to guide the location of sites for Gypsy and Traveller provision. The criteria outlined are based on previous national guidance, and good practice guidance along with the current requirements sets out in the National Planning Policy Framework and planning policy for traveller sites. This option would allow for the development of a criteria based policy to guide the location of permanent, transit and emergency stopping provision for Gypsy and Traveller sites in Cambridge. Given the ongoing need for pitches, Members are also asked to consider whether a policy should be developed that states that any allocated or windfall development sites of at least 500 homes would be required to bring forward Gypsy and Traveller site provision in line with locally identified need.

Table 2: Recommended preferred approach for Housing

OPTION NUMBER AND DESCRIPTION	PREFERRED APPROACH FOR DRAFT PLAN
Option 97 – Specified Tenure Mix	The recommendation is to pursue option 98, which allows for the tenure mix on sites to be guided by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document.
Option 98 – Tenure mix specified through the SHMA and Affordable Housing SPD	
Option 99: Employment related housing	The recommendation is to pursue option 99 and to bring forward a criteria based policy, which sets out the need to establish the role that the institution has in the local economy; the level of need for existing staff and for recruitment and retention and the need for an allocations policy for the key worker housing.
Option 100: Housing mix – General policy	The recommended approach is to pursue option 100, which would involve the

OPTION NUMBER AND DESCRIPTION	PREFERRED APPROACH FOR DRAFT PLAN
Option 101: Housing mix – specific levels policy	development of a policy, which sets out the need to have a mix of housing within new development. Evidence to support decisions on housing mix would be available through the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and more detailed advice would be included in the Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document.
Options 102 – 110 on density and residential space standards	These options were considered at Development Scrutiny Sub Committee on 6 and 13 December 2012.
Option 111: Lifetimes Homes standard applied to all development	The recommendation is to pursue Options 111 and 113 to set out a requirement for all homes to comply with those Lifetime Homes criteria which are not addressed by building regulations a percentage of all housing, split between market and Affordable Housing should be provided as housing which could be adapted to suit the needs of wheelchair users, dependent on the findings of the update to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Joint Needs Assessment work.
Option 112: A proportion of new homes to meet Lifetime Homes standard	
Option 113: A proportion of new homes that meet the Wheelchair Housing Design Standard	
Option 114: Criteria based policy for small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens	The recommendation is to pursue Option 114, which comprises a criteria-based policy for infill development affecting gardens. Option 115 will not be pursued as it is considered to be too restrictive.
Option 115: Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens	
Option 116: Criteria based policy for HMOs	The recommendation is to pursue Option 116, which sets out a criteria based approach, recognising the contribution that HMOs make to the overall supply of housing in Cambridge.
Option 117: Specialist Housing	The recommendation is to pursue Option 117 on specialist housing, which would set out a criteria based approach to the delivery of all types of specialist housing.

OPTION NUMBER AND DESCRIPTION	PREFERRED APPROACH FOR DRAFT PLAN
Option 118: Opportunities for providing new housing	<p>The recommendation is to pursue criteria based policies addressing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conversion of large properties; • Loss of housing to other uses.
Option 119: Criteria based policy for the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites	<p>The recommendation is to pursue Option 119, which will set out the criteria to guide the location of sites for Gypsy and Traveller provision. The criteria outlined are based on previous national guidance, and good practice guidance along with the current requirements sets out in the National Planning Policy Framework. This option would allow for the development of a criteria based policy to guide the location of permanent, transit and emergency stopping provision for Gypsy and Traveller sites in Cambridge. Given the ongoing need for pitches, Members are also asked to consider whether a policy should be developed that states that any allocated or windfall development sites of at least 500 homes would be required to bring forward Gypsy and Traveller site provision in line with locally identified needs. This could also state that any artificial subdivision of sites to avoid making provision of pitches for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation will not be permitted.</p>
Option 120: Residential moorings	<p>The recommendation is to pursue a criteria-based policy for residential moorings, which would include criteria suitable for development management use for both on-line and off-line moorings.</p>

Employment (Options 121 – 135)

3.13 Chapter 10 of the Issues and Options report considered the policy approach for employment. Appendix C contains the officer analysis of the key issues raised for employment, as well as summaries of the representations received. Appendix D provides information on the Use Classes Order 1987 (as amended). Appendix D supports discussion on Option 122 – 124 and 125 – 129.

Table 3: Recommended preferred approach for Employment

OPTION NUMBER AND DESCRIPTION	PREFERRED APPROACH FOR DRAFT PLAN
Option 121: Building a strong and competitive economy	The recommendation is to pursue option 121 subject to minor amendments.
Option 122 – Continue with selective management of the economy unamended	The recommendation is to pursue option 124 and discontinue the policy of Selective Management of the Economy.
Option 123 – Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses	
Option 124 – Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy	
Option 125 – Continue with protection of industrial and storage space unamended	The recommendation is to protect all land and buildings in employment use (B use class).
Option 126: Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites	
Option 127: Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development	
Option 128: Do not protect office space	
Option 129: Protection of office space	
Option 130: Continue to promote cluster development	
Option 131: Do not promote cluster development	
Option 132: Promote shared social spaces	The recommendation is to pursue option 132, and promote shared social spaces

OPTION NUMBER AND DESCRIPTION	PREFERRED APPROACH FOR DRAFT PLAN
Option 133: Do not promote shared social spaces	as part of employment sites, this could be through a more general, mixed-use policy.
Option 134: Density existing employment areas	The recommendation is to pursue option 135 and not have a specific policy that seeks to densify existing employment areas.
Option 135: Do not densify existing employment areas	Individual allocations and proposals will be considered on their merits, and a general strategic objective can seek to make best use of land by encouraging densification of all suitable sites for all uses across the city if accessible to public transport.

Next steps

3.14 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. Joint working with South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council will continue in line with our duty to cooperate. 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 and Full Council. The draft plan will then be made available for a ten-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 pollution, plus summaries of representations received;
- Appendix B: Analysis, responses and preferred approach to housing, plus summaries of representations received;
- Appendix C: Analysis, responses and preferred approach to employment, plus summaries of representations received;
- Appendix D: Use Classes Order 1987 (as amended)

7. Inspection of papers

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

Author's Name: Andrew Lainton
Author's Phone Number: 01223 457186
Author's Email: andrew.lainton@cambridge.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix A: Analysis, responses and preferred approach to pollution, plus summaries of representations received

ISSUE: POLLUTION AND PROTECTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Total representations: 36	
Object: 10	Support: 26

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 84 – General Pollution Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General statements in support of a policy option on pollution; • Some comments that one overarching policy dealing with pollution is sufficient; • Other comments in support of detailed policies as well especially as PPS23 and PPS24 have been lost; • One preferred approach would be that a general policy on pollution be supported by SPD Guidance on the individual issues of air quality, noise and contaminated land; • Light pollution is a growing menace; • Noise pollution from air conditioning units is increasing; • Additional recent damage to the health of people living near major roads from extra development needs to be recognised; • ‘External lighting’ should include internal lighting that is visible externally; • This policy needs to extend to residential boats; • This policy should extend to odour issues; • Policy should include protection and enhancement of agricultural and good quality soils.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

This option will help protect against pollution and should contribute positively to identified issues relating to health, well being, and water resources. This option is also likely to improve the quality of the environment more generally across the city while maintaining a safe environment for residents and visitors, in terms of minimum levels of illumination, for example.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Environmental Protection Act 1990 as amended
- Cambridge City Council Contaminated Land database and historic maps/aerial photographs

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 4/13 - Pollution and Amenity

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The planning system's role in pollution control is to ensure that proposed development is suitable for a particular area of land bearing in mind existing or potential pollution of that land. It also has to consider whether a proposed development is likely to give rise to additional sources of pollution that would impact on the local environment, amenity and public health. The National Planning Policy Framework recognises the role that planning has to play in preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, water or noise pollution or land instability. In addition, planning has a role to play in ensuring the remediation and mitigation of despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.

The purpose of policy option 84 was to develop an overarching policy dealing with all forms of pollution, which would sit within a development principles section of the Local Plan. The policy would set out criteria, which proposals that might cause pollution would need to meet for permission to be granted. As more detailed policies in relation to contaminated land, water quality, air pollution, noise, visual and light pollution will be included in the Local Plan, it is considered these policies would provide sufficient coverage of pollution from all sources.

One respondent felt that a general policy on pollution matters would be sufficient, with further specific guidance contained in a Supplementary Planning Document. While a single policy would be a simpler approach, the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that Supplementary Planning Documents should only be used where they can help applicants make successful applications or aid infrastructure delivery. They should not be used to add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development, and given that measures to remediate and mitigate pollution matters will have a financial implication for developments, these matters should be dealt with through policy.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is not to pursue Option 84 as it is considered appropriate to develop a range of different policies covering different aspects of pollution.

ISSUE: AIR QUALITY

Total representations: 30

Object: 3

Support: 27

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 85 – Air Quality Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative approach would be that a general policy on pollution be supported by SPD Guidance on the individual issues of air quality, noise and contaminated land;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns raised over deterioration of air quality resulting from congestion, better planning of road layouts and junctions would be beneficial; • Concerns raised over damage to health of those residents living near major roads; • Concerns raised over current air quality.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

By preventing developments that would have potential adverse effect on air quality or result in impacts on their users due to the AQMA, this option should help contribute to improved community health and well being benefits. This option is likely to have a positive effect in the City Centre in helping mitigate any further deterioration in air quality in the existing AQMA. This option's proposal that developments with the potential to cause an AQMA to be declared should not be permitted may help to reduce the risk of a further worsening in the city's air quality.

KEY EVIDENCE

-
- Cambridge City Council (2009) Air Quality Action Plan
- Cambridge City Council (2008) Air Quality in Cambridge. Developers Guide
- Data from air quality monitoring points across the city.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 4/14 - Air Quality Management Areas

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The Local Plan will seek to ensure that Cambridge develops in the most sustainable way possible. This means delivering our social and economic aspirations with compromising the environmental limits of the city for current and future generations. It will be important to ensure that new development proposals do not lead to a worsening of air quality, both in the Air Quality Management Area and the city as a whole. The primary local impacts on air quality in Cambridge are from road transport, with a contribution from domestic, commercial and industrial heating sources. Given the current Air Quality Management Area and the forecast growth of the City, the development management process – specifically using local planning policy – is a key tool in protecting and enhancing Air Quality. Indeed, it is a specified statutory process for achieving and maintaining air quality objectives where needed.

Air pollution in parts of Cambridge currently breaches EU limit values for Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂). The City Council has a statutory duty to reduce relevant pollutant levels and plan to meet the EU Limit values through the Air Quality Action Plan. The Joint Air Quality Action Plan (with Huntingdonshire and South Cambridgeshire District Councils and Cambridgeshire County Council) in 2009 incorporates measures for improvement of and protection from poor air quality using the development

management system.

There is a strong message throughout the National Planning Policy Framework that air quality is an important factor in the quality of life, health and well-being and so is a key aspect of sustainable development supporting the need for a planning policy. Planning Policies are specifically mentioned. The Taylor review of Government Planning Practice Guidance which was undertaken in 2012, following the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework, recommends that new planning guidance is needed for several pollution topics including air quality as “important issues on which Government could set standards in order to ensure appropriate development.” It is therefore important that an air quality planning policy is produced to provide sufficient detail to enable the planning authority and developers to achieve the quality of life and protection of human health aims enshrined in the National Planning Policy Framework both in the interim and when this guidance is available. It is clear from the responses that air quality issues are of concern; specific issues raised will be made more explicit in the forthcoming Submission Draft Local Plan.

The recommendation is to pursue Option 85 and ensure that Air Quality Policy in the Local Plan requires that the health impacts of new developments on current and future residents can be addressed. A detailed and specific Air Quality Policy will explicitly provide future protection from poor air quality. This approach is strongly supported by the consultation responses. The policy will provide the key local approaches to reduce ambient levels of atmospheric pollutants, to minimise long-term health risk to new and existing residents from poor air quality, to minimise adverse effects of transport, domestic and industrial emissions on people and the environment and to promote a safe and healthy environment, minimising the impacts of development upon the environment. Without local policy, there will be no clear direction for developers, leading to uncertainty and inconsistency in the development management process and an increase in planning appeals. It will be difficult to carry on with the measures in the Air Quality Action Plan. With a local policy, there will be continuity of air quality regulation and ongoing compliance with the measures in the statutory Air Quality Action Plan (local authorities are required to demonstrate that they are working towards improvements in air quality to avoid the threat of judicial review; further, there will be local legitimacy and certainty within the local policy and most importantly, there will be no deterioration in air quality and an improvement in air quality in the long term.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 85 and ensure that Air Quality Policy in the Local Plan requires that the health impacts of new developments on current and future residents can be addressed. A detailed and specific Air Quality Policy will explicitly provide future protection from poor air quality. This approach is strongly supported by the consultation responses.

ISSUE: NOISE

Total representations: 10	
Object: 2	Support: 8

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES
Option 86 - Noise Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Several general statements of support for a noise pollution policy;• Several mentions of noise pollution caused by the airport including the suggestion that a separate mention should be made of aviation noise;• Several mentions made of traffic generated noise including that noise reduction measures should include reduction from existing sources of noise (e.g. traffic from the M11);• The A14 upgrade would surely have a detrimental effect on noise;• Several concerns over existing noise sources, such as industrial, small plant, licensed premises including rock festivals and vehicle noise. Suggestion that Policy should look at existing industrial sources of noise;• Sound insulation needs to be improved in modern properties

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

No additional options have been suggested.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

By reducing and mitigating the noise impacts of new developments and/or locating in consideration of noise sensitive receptors this option will secure good quality development within Cambridge which will help to maintain and enhance local amenity, as well as being cost effective for businesses. This will contribute positively to the health and well being of people both working and living in Cambridge.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Environmental Protection Act 1990 as amended.
- National Planning Policy Framework (2012) Paragraphs 17, 109, 110, 120 and 123 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment)
- Cambridge City Council (2007). Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
- External Review of Government Planning Practise Guidance, Taylor Review (2012)

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 4/13 (Pollution and Amenity)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The National Planning Policy Framework states at paragraph 6 that the purpose of the planning system is to “contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.” It goes on to describe an environmental role as one of the three dimensions to sustainable development and highlights that minimising pollution is an important part of this role. Paragraph 17 lists the core planning principles. These include that planning should “always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupiers of land and buildings.” Thus leading to better places for people to live. Paragraph 109, in relation to conserving and enhancing the natural environment, explains that the planning system should prevent “both new and existing development from contributing to, or being put at, unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution.” Paragraph 123, then goes on to describe four main aims for planning policies concerning noise. There is a strong message throughout the National Planning Policy Framework that noise is an important factor in the quality of life, health and well-being and so is a key aspect of sustainable development supporting the need for a planning policy.

The Taylor review of Government Planning Practice Guidance which was undertaken in 2012, following the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework, recommends that new planning guidance be provided for several pollution topics including noise as “important issues on which Government could set standards in order to ensure appropriate development.” It is therefore important that a noise planning policy is produced to enable the planning authority and developers to achieve the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework both in the interim and when this guidance is available.

With regard to alternative legislative controls, detriment to the amenity is a much lower level of effect than that required to establish a statutory noise nuisance under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. In addition, the nuisance powers are limited to noise from premises and cannot therefore be used to protect residents from traffic or aviation noise for example. As the aim of the planning system is protection of the amenity the nuisance powers given to Local Authorities cannot therefore be accepted as a suitable alternative and hence a planning policy on noise is required.

There were several respondents concerned over aircraft and traffic noise as well as noise from existing development. The impact of aircraft and traffic noise cannot be dealt with by other legislative controls such as the Environmental Protection Act. It is therefore necessary for future development to be controlled and protected via the planning process. The planning process cannot deal with noise from existing developments retrospectively, this is controlled under the nuisance powers of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 which does not afford the same level of protection of amenity, thus supporting the need for a planning policy on noise to ensure future developments accord with the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework. Whilst specific reference can be made to aircraft noise in the policy on noise pollution, the policy option on Cambridge Airport - Aviation Development (Option 198) also makes reference to the need to maintain the amenity of residents.

In relation to road traffic noise, this is primarily the responsibility of the Highways Agency. Although the A14 is not within the city boundary, the Highways Agency will consult with the Council and any increase in noise and proposed mitigation measures affecting residents will be taken into consideration during the planning process.

The Local Plan and policies can only deal with proposed future development and licensing issues have to be dealt with under the relevant licensing regime. Noise issues from existing sites are controlled by the statutory nuisance procedures under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The Local Plan and policies cannot deal with this retrospectively. In relation to music festivals, this type of event is regulated via the Licensing Regime and the statutory nuisance provisions of the Environmental Protection Act.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 86. A detailed and specific policy is necessary to prevent both new and existing development from either giving rise to or being subjected to unacceptable levels of noise. There is strong support given in both the National Planning Policy Framework and the responses to this approach.

ISSUE: CONTAMINATED LAND

Total representations: 20

Objections: 3

Supports: 17

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES
Option 87: Contaminated land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong support for development of this policy; • Alternative approach would be that a general policy on pollution be supported by SPD Guidance on the individual issues of contaminated land, air quality and noise; • The need for more stringent control of radioactive waste around the city was expressed. Concern about emissions from radioactive material in the City was also raised; • Preference was expressed of undertaking remediation in a single phase rather than in a phased manner (When required) in phased developments; • Comment expressed about local residents not being adequately consulted on any possible remediation works in their area; • New development should not give rise to pollution; • This option needs to be amended to assume that all brownfield sites could be adversely affected by contamination and a detailed assessment should be undertaken on each occasion;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option should include more stringent control of radioactive waste around the city; • Do not build houses on contaminated land. Parkland should be the preferred option.
--	---

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

No additional options have been suggested.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

This option looks to ensure that new developments are appropriate, given potential sensitivities to adverse effects from pollution, and also that the site is suitable for its new use. It is likely that this will provide health benefits through avoided contact with pollutants.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Environmental Protection Act 1990 as amended;
- Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part IIA –Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance (2012);
- External Review of Government Planning Practice Guidance, Taylor Review (2012);
- Cambridge City Council Contaminated Land Strategy (2009);
- Cambridge City Council Contaminated Land in Cambridge. Developers Guide (2009);
- Contaminated Land Database; Historic Maps; Aerial Photographs.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 4/13 - Pollution and Amenity

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Land contamination is a material consideration for the purposes of planning. It is important to ensure that proposed developments are situated on land that will be safe and suitable for the proposed use. There will be situations where remediation works will be required to make land safe prior to being developed; for example if a site’s previous use was a petrol station, there will be a need to ensure that no residual fuel in storage tanks or in the soil itself is left on-site as it may cause a health hazard for future users. In some instances, the level and type of contamination of land may make it unsuitable for certain types of development, for example recently closed landfill sites are considered to be unsuitable for residential development.

As part of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (as amended), the Part II A regime focuses ‘on land which has been contaminated in the past’. The regime was not introduced in order to address contamination issues arising during the redevelopment of land. This approach is reinforced in the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part II legislation which states that ‘Part IIA is one of the main policy measures used to deal with the historic legacy of contaminated land’ and that ‘the role of the town and country planning and building control regimes is ensuring that land is made suitable for any new use, as planning permission is given for that new

use.'

The Taylor 2012 review identified that there are 'A number of policy areas, mainly from the introduction of the Localism Act and the National Planning Policy Framework, where there are gaps in the present guidance' and concludes that 'Guidance is needed on noise, air, land, water and light pollution, important issues on which Government could set standards in order to ensure appropriate development'. Despite the Taylor review clearly identifying a gap in the existing guidance for contaminated land, there is currently no clear commitment/indication that this gap will be addressed at the national level. It is therefore of great importance that this gap is addressed at a local level.

The adoption of a policy at a local level is supported by paragraph 121 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that 'Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that:

- 1) the site is suitable for its new use taking account of ground conditions and land instability, including from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, pollution arising from previous uses and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation or impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation;
- 2) 2) After remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990'.

This approach is also reinforced by the Environmental Protection Act 1990 which states that 'Land contamination, or the possibility of it, is a material consideration for the purposes of town and county planning. This means that a planning authority has to consider the potential impacts of contamination both when it is developing plans and when it is considering individual applications for planning permission'.

The Interim Sustainability Appraisal has also recognised that the adoption of this policy can ensure that new developments are appropriate; given potential sensitivities to adverse effects from pollution, and also that the site is suitable for its new use. Strong support was also expressed in the representations for a policy that would 'prevent new developments from contributing to pollution', which is an integral part of the National Planning Policy Framework.

As such one option for the new local plan would be to develop a detailed policy dealing with contamination, incorporating key elements of guidance previously contained in PPS23. The policy could be supported by a Supplementary Planning Document, which could set out some of the finer detail to help provide certainty for developers.

The principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraphs 109-111, 120 and 121, demonstrate why contaminated land is important and what criteria the new developments should meet with respect to land pollution. The implementation of Option 87 will build further on the principles of the National

Planning Policy Framework by providing guidance on how these principles will be met, reference to technical material and acceptable practises will be included. This approach is supported by the National Planning Policy Framework in paragraph 8, which states that ‘the planning system should play an active role in guiding development to sustainable solutions’. Ultimately, this policy will enable owners, land developers and any other interested parties to demonstrate how a development is ‘suitable for its new use’ and have ‘minimised impact to the local environment’, which lie at the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 87. A detailed and specific Contaminated Land Policy should ensure that new development is appropriate and that the site is suitable for its new use. This approach is strongly supported by the consultation responses.

ISSUE: LIGHT POLLUTION

Total representations: 11	
Object: 4	Support:7

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES
Option 88 - Light Pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirement for a need assessment, site survey and modelled levels of light spill should not be required for all types of development as this would be unnecessarily onerous and costly for small developments. The requirement should only apply to major development, development with floodlighting or in countryside locations; • Concerns with protection of the night sky: Street lights should go off at 2am; • New lighting should be low energy; • All cycle routes in urban areas should be lit with normal street lighting; • The policy should give consideration to energy saving, impact on biodiversity but also public safety and crime prevention; • Concerns with the protection of amenity: 'External lighting' should include internal lighting that is visible externally (stairwells); • Concerns with safety and crime prevention • Particularly important in the western part of the city, because of the impact on observatories; • A preferred approach would be to include a general policy on pollution matters with guidance on individual issues within SPD guidance; • There should be an additional requirement for an ecological assessment of the impact of any proposed

	<p>lighting scheme;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should take account of heritage street lighting and the lighting character of an area; • Need for retrospective action • Support a policy that protects wildlife and wild spaces like Stourbridge Common and Ditton Lane • Important when considering location of sports facilities • Need to design lighting to be effective with minimal spillage as well as being attractive • The levels of street lighting is already minimal; • There should be an additional requirement for an ecological assessment of the impact of any proposed lighting scheme.
--	--

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

An alternative option would be to include a general policy on pollution matters with guidance on individual issues within SPD guidance.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

By requiring applicants to demonstrate that they have minimised their contribution to light pollution, this option helps to reduce the adverse effects of light pollution, including light spillage. It also maintains appropriate levels for a safe and accessible environment, and helps contribute to local amenity and improved safety. Specific reference to minimising the impact of light on wildlife and the wider landscape should help address key issues relating to Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure issues and Cambridge’s Landscape and setting.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Cambridge City Council (2007). Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 4/15 - Lighting

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Paragraph 125 of the National Planning Policy Framework specifically mentions that planning policies and decisions should aim to “limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.” Although light has now been brought into the Statutory Nuisance provisions of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, this does not protect to the same standard as detriment to the amenity and neither does it extend to protecting intrinsically dark areas or wildlife. As the aim of the planning system is protection of the amenity, intrinsically dark area and wild life the nuisance powers given to Local Authorities cannot therefore be accepted as a suitable alternative and hence a planning policy on light is required.

The policy will cover issues, including:

- Safety and crime prevention;
- Impact on biodiversity;
- Impact on amenity;
- Impact on the wider landscape, particularly for sites on the edge of Cambridge.

A needs assessment, site survey and modelled levels of light spill will be required for major development, development with floodlighting or in countryside locations as these forms of development could contribute significantly to light pollution. Ecological assessment of the development site may be needed in some instances, where there are species, which are particularly sensitive to light. For developments that include cycle routes over private land, the standard of lighting will be expected to be commensurate with lighting on the public highway, where appropriate. Lighting to cycle routes on the highway is regulated by the Highways Authority, Cambridgeshire County Council.

Whilst respondents suggested that a single general policy represented a simpler approach, it would not have sufficient detail to address the full range of issues pertaining to pollution. The use of a range of different policies which clearly set out the requirements expected of developers would allow greater certainty through the development process. This could impact positively on the cost of development and the likelihood of development coming forward.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 88. A detailed and specific policy is necessary to limit the impact of light pollution on residential amenity, wildlife and landscape as well as promoting public safety and the prevention of crime.

APPENDIX A - ANALYSIS, RESPONSES AND PREFERRED APPROACH TO POLLUTION PLUS SUMMARIES OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	8.43
--	-------------

17910 Object

Summary:

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	8.44
--	-------------

17104 Object

Summary:

I am deeply cynical of traffic planning that allows huge, sometime double articulated lorries to move around an historic city centre. I speak as someone whose house shakes at night as these extra-ordinary vehicles enter our city boundaries.

Having satellite car parks as we do now there is no reason why pallets cannot be transferred to smaller vehicles for serving shops outside closing hours. However as we wait to see if we might have our 40mph restriction moved up to Girton - at least commensurate with the city boundary, I'm not holding my breath over sensible traffic planning.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Option 84 - General pollution policy
--	---

9343 Object

Summary:

Support in principle but the final bullet point contains an error or omission and the meaning is obscure.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 84 - General pollution policy

10978 Support

Summary:

Bidwells considers that one overarching policy dealing with all forms of pollution is sufficient, as the specifics relating to the control of pollution is provided by other legislation, which is not necessary to repeat in the Local Plan.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 84 - General pollution policy

16492 Support

Summary:

Broadly support. Bullet point 6 is very important - existing residents need protection.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 84 - General pollution policy

17779 Support

Summary:

Options 84 - 88 include policy proposals which will seek to address general pollution, air quality, noise, contaminated land and light pollution, through development. These options recognise the benefits of such policies for the natural environment, including wildlife and Natural England would welcome this approach being taken forward in the Local Plan.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.42

6995 Support

Summary:

Yes, there is a need for a policy on pollution, and I would support Option 84.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.42

7110 Support

Summary:

Yes, because it brings under one roof the various issues which need to be faced when considering a proposal for new development.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.42

8472 Support

Summary:

yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.42

9344 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

10149 Support

Summary:

yes, air conditioning causes noise pollution and is increasing.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

10619 Support

Summary:

The Wildlife Trust supports the inclusion of relevant pollution prevention policies

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

10705 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

10818 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

11759 Support

Summary:

yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

12114 Object

Summary:

A preferred approach would be to include a general policy on pollution matters with guidance on individual issues air quality, noise, contaminated land incorporated within SPD guidance.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

12979 Support

Summary:

yes. Light pollution a growing menace with security lights and sporting facilities.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

13624 Support

Summary:

Very important. Someone mentioned air con systems and the noise they generate. I'm dismayed to have learnt that the new office buildings in Station Rd will not have windows that can be opened, but air con.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

14032 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

15016 Support

Summary:

Yes, support.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

15250 Support

Summary:

There should be a refusal of permission that would add to existing pollution problems or create new ones. Two particular issues are the stink at grassy Corner arising from the discharge from overwhelmed small private sewage treatment plants on Chesterton Fen. and houseboats belching carcinogenic woodsmoke onto public footpaths along and over the Cam. Both nuisances should be made priorities for action in so far as any effective action falls within the remit of planning policy.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

16496 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

17425 Support

Summary:

Pollution/Air Quality - additional recent damage to the health of people living near major roads from extra development needs to be recognised, e.g. increased asthma, and has been made significantly worse where extra congestion has been added by several developments since 2006, due to extra cars and extra intersections interrupting traffic flow. This requires major attention and mitigation, and further study to ensure air quality improves, not worsens

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

17907 Support

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

18187 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.43**

9187 Support

Summary:

"External lighting" should include internal lighting (such as in stairwells) where this is visible externally.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.43**

9346 Object

Summary:

Clarify final bullet point.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.43**

11761 Support

Summary:

"External lighting" should include internal lighting (such as in stairwells) where this is visible externally.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.43**

15021 Support

Summary:

The policy needs to extend to those residential boats granted permission to moor on the city's common lands.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.43**

17426 Support

Summary:

Pollution/Air Quality - additional recent damage to the health of people living near major roads from extra development needs to be recognised, e.g. increased asthma, and has been made significantly worse where extra congestion has been added by several developments since 2006, due to extra cars and extra intersections interrupting traffic flow. This requires major attention and mitigation, and further study to ensure air quality improves, not worsens

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.43**

18097 Object

Summary:

See extract 4 of submission relating to groundwater.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.43**

18190 Object

Summary:

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.44

17427 Support

Summary:

Pollution/Air Quality - additional recent damage to the health of people living near major roads from extra development needs to be recognised, e.g. increased asthma, and has been made significantly worse where extra congestion has been added by several developments since 2006, due to extra cars and extra intersections interrupting traffic flow. This requires major attention and mitigation, and further study to ensure air quality improves, not worsens

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.44

17802 Object

Summary:

The report does not really consider the protection and enhancement of soils through the development process. Where significant development of agricultural land is unavoidable, poorer quality land should be used in preference to that of higher quality, except where this would be inconsistent with other sustainability considerations. Paragraph 112 of the NPPF is relevant when considering the protection of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.

Land quality varies from place to place and the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) provides a method for assessing the quality of farmland to enable informed choices to be made about its future use within the planning system. We believe this should be included to ensure the plan is compliant with the NPPF.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.44

17911 Object

Summary:

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.44

18192 Object

Summary:

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

8.46

15023 Support

Summary:

We are in support of paragraph 8.46 (development of detailed policies).

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

8.46

16498 Support

Summary:

Detailed policies for significant pollution concerns should be developed, not could. How did the former guidance in PPS23/PPS24 get lost?

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 85 - Air quality policy

9347 Support

Summary:

Yes.

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Option 85 - Air quality policy

16499 Support

Summary:

Broadly support.

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Option 85 - Air quality policy

17781 Support

Summary:

Options 84 - 88 include policy proposals which will seek to address general pollution, air quality, noise, contaminated land and light pollution, through development. These options recognise the benefits of such policies for the natural environment, including wildlife and Natural England would welcome this approach being taken forward in the Local Plan.

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Question 8.45

6996 Support

Summary:

Yes, there is a need for a policy on air pollution, and I would support Option 85.

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Question 8.45

8473 Support

Summary:

yes

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Question 8.45

9348 Support

Summary:

Yes

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Question 8.45

10819 Support

Summary:

Yes

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Question 8.45

11762 Support

Summary:

yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.45
--	----------------------

12116 Object**Summary:**

A preferred approach would be to include a general policy on pollution matters with guidance on individual issues air quality, noise, contaminated land incorporated within SPD guidance.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.45
--	----------------------

13124 Support**Summary:**

We favour the development of a detailed air quality policy - for the reasons given in Option 85. Air quality is only achieved by vigilance.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.45
--	----------------------

14034 Support**Summary:**

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.45
--	----------------------

15026 Support**Summary:**

Yes, support.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.45
--	----------------------

15252 Support**Summary:**

See comment on Option 84. In parts of the City air quality is reduced by emissions from slow moving or stationary vehicles. The most effective way of lessening vehicular contributions to the problem is to reduce measures that cause halting or slowing of traffic to a minimum and this can be helped by better planning of road layouts and junctions. Elimination of right hand turns across oncoming traffic is one of the simplest and most effective measures.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.45
--	----------------------

16501 Support**Summary:**

Yes.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.45
--	----------------------

17428 Support**Summary:**

Pollution/Air Quality - additional recent damage to the health of people living near major roads from extra development needs to be recognised, e.g. increased asthma, and has been made significantly worse where extra congestion has been added by several developments since 2006, due to extra cars and extra intersections interrupting traffic flow. This requires major attention and mitigation, and further study to ensure air quality improves, not worsens

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.45**

17909 Support

Summary:

Pollution - don't build housing next to M11/A14. This is risky for young children - research shows an increased rate of asthma and in older vulnerable adults with respiratory conditions higher level of illness.

Open green space that is natural and uncluttered by non-natural items, that has natural restful sounds and peaceful space and biodiversity are shown to offer benefits great for mental health. Research shows that sound and air pollution greatly increase stress in humans.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.45**

17913 Support

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.45**

18194 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.46**

9188 Support

Summary:

Pollution by contractors' vehicles and plant also needs to be addressed

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.46**

10706 Support

Summary:

This option needs to cover the current air quality in the city, not simply that for developments, but it cannot be properly addressed without consideration of road and traffic matters such as the enforcement of standards for vehicles, particularly buses.

This is urgent as the current position is that air quality does not meet the AQMA standards in many Cambridge locations. If this pollution is not tackled urgently it will degrade the appearance and structure of our historic Heritage Assets.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.46**

11764 Support

Summary:

Pollution by contractors' vehicles and plant also needs to be addressed.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.46**

15029 Support

Summary:

The policy needs to extend to residential boats moored inside the City boundaries.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.46**

17430 Support**Summary:**

Pollution/Air Quality - additional recent damage to the health of people living near major roads from extra development needs to be recognised, e.g. increased asthma, and has been made significantly worse where extra congestion has been added by several developments since 2006, due to extra cars and extra intersections interrupting traffic flow. This requires major attention and mitigation, and further study to ensure air quality improves, not worsens

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.46**

17914 Object**Summary:**

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.46**

18195 Object**Summary:**

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.46**

18365 Support**Summary:**

South Cambridgeshire District Council is consulting on whether its new Local Plan should include a policy that requires proposals for development that have the potential to contribute significant emissions to the local area to prepare and implement a site-based Low Emissions Strategy or Low Emissions Scheme (see Issue 96). In view of the close relationship between the two districts, and in particular in relation to city edge sites, there may be merit in taking a coordinated approach to this issue and the Council would be willing to work with the City Council on this.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.47**

6924 Support**Summary:**

yes; if you follow Malmo's example and run buses (and taxis) on gas the air quality issue will be solved. This will require political commitment, but is simple readily available technology that can even save money.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.47**

17431 Support**Summary:**

Pollution/Air Quality - additional recent damage to the health of people living near major roads from extra development needs to be recognised, e.g. increased asthma, and has been made significantly worse where extra congestion has been added by several developments since 2006, due to extra cars and extra intersections interrupting traffic flow. This requires major attention and mitigation, and further study to ensure air quality improves, not worsens

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.47**

17915 Object

Summary:

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.47**

18198 Object

Summary:

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 86 - Noise policy**

7686 Support

Summary:

The airport is a large contributor to noise pollution in the south of the city.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 86 - Noise policy**

9349 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 86 - Noise policy**

10640 Object

Summary:

Separate mention should be made of aviation noise. Advice is currently included in the Air Transport White Paper (December 2003) and is currently under discussion in the Draft Aviation Policy Framework (July 2012).

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 86 - Noise policy**

11589 Object

Summary:

Need to make sure that noise reduction measures include reduction of noise from existing sources of noise e.g. traffic noise from M11. Please consider how City Council can through policy assist in obtaining reduction in traffic noise by use of specially developed road surfaces

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 86 - Noise policy**

11649 Support

Summary:

I am very glad to see that the issue of noise pollution is recognised in this report. So often it is neglected. I support efforts to reduce noise impacts that might arise from the construction and use of new developments. Also the airport is a large contributor to noise pollution in the city.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 86 - Noise policy**

12510 Support

Summary:

I am very supportive of a noise policy, which should apply to the road traffic as well as other sources of noise such as light industrial.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 86 - Noise policy**

14341 Support

Summary:

It's good to be considering noise pollution. We suffer a lot of noise from the airport

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 86 - Noise policy**

15253 Support

Summary:

Recent sources of noise nuisance reported in Chesterton have been small generators, late night motor cyclists and air-conditioning units placed close to houses and flats. Persistent low-level hum can actually be more disturbing than a louder well-defined noise.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 86 - Noise policy**

16749 Support

Summary:

Development of a detailed policy aimed at reducing and mitigating noise impacts that might arise from the construction of and use of new development. This should also agree noise controls on existing industrial and other major sources of noise.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 86 - Noise policy**

17782 Support

Summary:

Options 84 - 88 include policy proposals which will seek to address general pollution, air quality, noise, contaminated land and light pollution, through development. These options recognise the benefits of such policies for the natural environment, including wildlife and Natural England would welcome this approach being taken forward in the Local Plan.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.48**

6997 Support

Summary:

Yes, definitely - and there are some surprising sources of noise around the city, for example Haggis Farm at the time of "Rock Festivals", whose noise permeates right into the Western part of the city at times when people are trying to sleep.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.48**

8474 Support

Summary:

yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.48**

9350 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.48**

10820 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.48
--	----------------------

11768 Support

Summary:

on balance, yes to a policy

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.48
--	----------------------

12511 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.48
--	----------------------

14036 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.48
--	----------------------

14343 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.48
--	----------------------

14355 Support

Summary:

Noise is the worst aspect of city life. Unfortunately much noise comes from vehicles and apart from declaring car free zones there is little recourse available.

As for noisy operations, the paper recycling site on Mercers Row is a bad example, starting up as early as 5:30am and operating on Sundays. It would be helpful if retrospective action could be taken.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.48
--	----------------------

15030 Support

Summary:

Yes, support.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.48
--	----------------------

16502 Support

Summary:

Yes. I support Option 86 on this.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.48

17116 Support

Summary:

The four parishes of Barton, Coton, Grantchester and Madingley have submitted a vision document to the South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City Council, entitled "A Quarter to Six Quadrant". This sets out in detail how the QTSQ part of Cambridge could contribute to Cambridge's green infrastructure, ensuring that the total development of Cambridge and District is developed in a sustainable manner. It also sets out the importance of noise reduction measures in the area, in particular from traffic, from the M11. These measures have not been addressed since M11 was built in 1980, and should be in 2016-31 period.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.48

17916 Support

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.48

18200 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.49

9189 Support

Summary:

Noise pollution can be partially controlled by licensing policy, e.g. no "disco" music after midnight except on Friday and Saturday evenings when the limit should be 2 am. In any case, there should be no such music before noon.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.49

11770 Object (W/drawn 2012-10-30)

Summary:

Noise pollution can be partially controlled by licensing policy, e.g. no loud or disco music before and after certain specified times (these would vary according to location)

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.49

11934 Support

Summary:

There should be a policy of trying to eliminate noise at source. This includes things like (car) door slamming, hooting and car alarms that can often blight residential areas.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.49

12261 Support

Summary:

One area which is currently ignored in noise production is within the development after completion. A significant reason why many "empty nesters" might not want to live in higher-density accommodation is the very poor sound proofing of modern properties. Not only can loud music be heard, but also normal volume TV and the shutting of doors and even cupboards. This comment links with those concerning build quality. Thermal insulation is required of modern properties. To make the dwellings really attractive, then significantly improved sound insulation should be a requirement.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment Question 8.49

12513 Support

Summary:

What will be the impact of the A14 upgrade on this policy? This will surely have a detrimental effect on noise in many of the northern fringes?

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment Question 8.49

15031 Support

Summary:

The policy needs to extend to residential boats moored inside the City boundaries.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment Question 8.49

17547 Support

Summary:

There should be a much stricter attitude to loud noise.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment Question 8.49

17917 Support

Summary:

Yes - Hours of work that building and construction work can be carried out, specifically at weekends

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment Question 8.49

18202 Object

Summary:

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment Question 8.49

18271 Support

Summary:

There is a substantial problem of noise nuisance and anti-social behaviour in the neighbourhood that comes from two sources - night clubs and late-night alcohol outlets..

Both of these are sources of public nuisance to all who reside in the city centre as well as to shopkeepers who frequently have to clear the footways in front of their premises of vomit, urine and litter. The customers of these establishments normally take taxis home at closing time creating severe noise disturbance for residents through most of the night.

One option for consideration is a Council surcharge on such premises that do business after evening hours in order to discourage late night opening, and provide funding for late night street wardens and police.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.50**

9191 Support**Summary:**

Some developments such as sports venues may be inseparable from an element of noise, but conditions should be imposed restricting such use, e/g. only on Saturday afternons and perhaps not more than one evening per week. If this cannot be achieved through planning conditions, then licensing powers should be used.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.50**

17918 Object**Summary:**

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.50**

18205 Object**Summary:**

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 87 - Contaminated land policy**

9351 Support**Summary:**

yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 87 - Contaminated land policy**

15254 Support**Summary:**

Pollution from new developments should not be acceptable the technology for cleaning solid, liquid and gaseous emissions has been well-established for many years. Research into prior uses, often as simple as coming and talking to local people, can identify potential hazards at an early stage and avoid the necessity of remedial work during construction has happened with the redevelopment of the Meadowcroft site in Chesterton.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 87 - Contaminated land policy**

17783 Support**Summary:**

Options 84 - 88 include policy proposals which will seek to address general pollution, air quality, noise, contaminated land and light pollution, through development. These options recognise the benefits of such policies for the natural environment, including wildlife and Natural England would welcome this approach being taken forward in the Local Plan.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.51**

8475 Support**Summary:**

yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.51**

9352 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.51**

11771 Support

Summary:

yes to a policy

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.51**

12118 Object

Summary:

A preferred approach would be to include a general policy on pollution matters with guidance on individual issues air quality, noise, contaminated land incorporated within SPD guidance.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.51**

14038 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.51**

15035 Support

Summary:

Yes, support.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.51**

16503 Support

Summary:

Yes.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.51**

17919 Support

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.51**

18208 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.52

9192 Support

Summary:

There should be a presumption that all brownfield sites are liable to be contaminated and a detailed assessment should be required in every case. Where remediation is required on phased developments it should be a condition that the whole site is remediated at the outset, not on a phased basis.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.52

11772 Support

Summary:

There should be a presumption that all brownfield sites are liable to be contaminated and a detailed assessment should be required in every case. Where remediation is required on phased developments it should be a condition that the whole site is remediated at the outset, not on a phased basis.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.52

14040 Support

Summary:

While I am uncomfortable with the idea of building housing on contaminated land, I am struck by the success by which parkland has been built on factory land. A great example of this is the Olympic Park in Stratford. Such an approach would be an excellent approach to dealing with contaminated land.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.52

17920 Support

Summary:

Ensuring that local residents of the areas affected are given the opportunity to object & that the measure taken to decontaminate the area is clear. The issues experienced by the local residents of the 'Harrow' site in Hauxton are unacceptable.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.52

18096 Support

Summary:

There should be a future plan for more stringent control of radioactive waste around the City. Sites central and around Cambridge still release emissions of radioactive material. This should not be permitted in a City environment.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.52

18210 Support (W/drawn 2012-10-30)

Summary:

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.53

17921 Object

Summary:

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.53**

18212 Object

Summary:

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **8.52**

9889 Support

Summary:

There are areas of Cambridge e.g. on the western fringe where there are still dark skies. These need to be protected by policies against light pollution. In addition to prevent negative impact on residential amenity

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 88 - Light pollution policy**

7687 Object

Summary:

Vital.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 88 - Light pollution policy**

9353 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 88 - Light pollution policy**

9580 Support

Summary:

Light pollution is a serious form of pollution throughout the city. It is a pity that retrospective action cannot be taken against some of the worst offenders.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 88 - Light pollution policy**

10257 Object

Summary:

there are areas of Cambridge e.g. on the western fringe where there are still relatively dark skies. These and other parts of the city need to be protected by policies against light pollution for this reason and also to prevent negative impact on residential amenity

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 88 - Light pollution policy**

10982 Object

Summary:

Notwithstanding Bidwells' representation to Option 84, if Option 88 is adopted, Bidwells considers that the requirement for a Need Assessment, Site Survey and modelled levels of light spill, should not be required for all types of development as this would be unnecessarily onerous and costly for small developments. The requirement should only apply to major development, development with floodlighting, or in countryside locations.

Response to Option 84:

Bidwells considers that one overarching policy dealing with all forms of pollution is sufficient, as the specifics relating to the control of pollution is provided by other legislation, which is not necessary to repeat in the Local Plan.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 88 - Light pollution policy

12461 Support

Summary:

Look at the blaze at night in satellite photos. We should do all we can to reduce it. Street lights should go off by 2am at the latest.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 88 - Light pollution policy

12515 Support

Summary:

All new lighting should be low energy in my opinion.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 88 - Light pollution policy

14351 Support

Summary:

yes, this is a big problem. There is a lot of light pollution around Addenbrookes development, for instance

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 88 - Light pollution policy

14704 Object

Summary:

All cycle routes in urban areas should be lit with normal street lighting. Across green spaces we would also want routes lit, preferably with low level lights such as those at the Leisure Park. The narrow width of many paths can cause unnecessary conflict so a formalisation of the widths is called for and attention paid to sweeping paths and maintenance of the shrubbery nearby so that the full width of the path may be used. White lines along the edge of paths, and at the side, can also be very helpful.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 88 - Light pollution policy

15413 Support

Summary:

Yes, a detailed light pollution policy is required that reduces "spillage", saves energy, and reduces negative impacts on biodiversity, while giving consideration to public safety and crime prevention.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 88 - Light pollution policy

17785 Support

Summary:

Options 84 - 88 include policy proposals which will seek to address general pollution, air quality, noise, contaminated land and light pollution, through development. These options recognise the benefits of such policies for the natural environment, including wildlife and Natural England would welcome this approach being taken forward in the Local Plan.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

6998 Object

Summary:

Yes, particularly in the Western part of the city, because of the impact on the various observatories. I'm not sure that the policy entitled Option 88 is really restrictive enough in this particular regard.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

8476 Support

Summary:

yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

9354 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

9799 Support

Summary:

We would support a light policy that protects wild spaces in Cambridge from light pollution - i.e., Stourbridge Common and Ditton Meadows.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

9892 Support

Summary:

to minimise light pollution, the erosion of the dark sky where it exists, to protect amenity and avoid wasting energy

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

10259 Object

Summary:

there are areas of Cambridge e.g. on the western fringe where there are still relatively dark skies. These and other parts of the city need to be protected by policies against light pollution. In addition to prevent negative impact on residential amenity

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

10621 Support

Summary:

The Wildlife Trust supports the inclusion of a policy seeking to reduce and minimise light pollution as set out above.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

11774 Support

Summary:

yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

11975 Support

Summary:

Agreed. A policy is necessary. Lighting along the guided busway which was, I think, limited so as to minimize pollution is now being challenged. This policy would also be important when considering locations for eg sports facilities.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

12119 Object

Summary:

A preferred approach would be to include a general policy on pollution matters with guidance on individual issues air quality, noise, contaminated land incorporated within SPD guidance.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

12516 Support

Summary:

Yes, and it will contribute to increasing city wildlife at night e.g. bats, as well as reducing our carbon footprint.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

12980 Support

Summary:

yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

14042 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

15037 Support

Summary:

Yes, support.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

15255 Support

Summary:

Yes. All public lighting should direct light to where it is actually needed and minimise light pollution that has denied most city dwellers the beauty of the clear night sky. In the City the globe lamps and candles are tow examples of needless spreading of light from lamps designed to look pretty rather than being efficient sources of illumination for pedestrians.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

16511 Support

Summary:

Yes.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

16860 Support

Summary:

Yes there is a need for a policy on light pollution

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

17118 Support

Summary:

We fully support the development of a light pollution policy. We note that recent developments, in particular in sports facilities, have not taken adequate consideration of light pollution, and we recommend that these be rectified.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

17922 Support

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

18213 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.55**

9193 Support

Summary:

"External lighting" should include internal lighting (such as in stairwells) where this is visible externally.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.55**

9893 Support

Summary:

But there should be an additional requirement for an ecological assessment of the impact of a lighting scheme on the natural environment

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.55**

10261 Support

Summary:

there should be an additional requirement for an ecological assessment of the impact of any proposed lighting scheme on the natural environment

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.55

11497 Support

Summary:

The County Council's PFI for street lighting appears to be a very broad-brush, one-size-fits-all approach. It should take more notice of local conditions, both for retaining heritage street lighting and the lighting character of an area (and thus its pollution).

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.55

11775 Support

Summary:

"External lighting" should include internal lighting (such as in stairwells) where this is visible externally.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.55

12265 Support

Summary:

What is missing is any mention of safety from collision for pedestrians and cyclists. Also, designing out crime. So, more efficient use of the light (better design) is important. Please consider safety!

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.55

16512 Support

Summary:

The present levels of street lighting are already 'minimum' - the levels of lighting in St John's Street, for instance, are abysmal.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.55

16863 Support

Summary:

The policy covering the issue of stray light must state that any lighting required by new development must not have any effect (light intrusion) into neighbouring properties.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.55

17923 Object

Summary:

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.55

18215 Object

Summary:

No

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Question 8.56

17924 Object

Summary:

No

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Question 8.56

18216 Objec

Summary:

No

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix B: Analysis, responses and preferred approach to housing, plus summaries of representations received

OPTIONS 90 – 94 ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND 95, 96, 147 AND 148 ON STUDENT ACCOMMODATION WILL BE CONSIDERED AT A FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB COMMITTEE. THESE OPTIONS WILL BE FINALISED FOLLOWING RECEIPT OF FINAL VIABILITY TESTING DATA.

ISSUE: TENURE MIX

Total representations: 41	
Object:	
Option 97: 9	Option 98: 6
Support:	
Option 97: 8	Option 98: 18

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 97 – Specified Tenure Mix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The minimum of 75% of the 40% to be housing for rent should be retained; This would place added constraints on the market.
Option 98 – Tenure mix specified through the SHMA and Affordable Housing SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tenure mix should not be set out in the Local Plan since flexibility is required to take account of changes in housing requirements and also other factors such as funding provision and Central Government specifications.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Given current issues surrounding the balance of tenures required, such as the introduction of new Affordable Rents and fundamental reforms to the welfare system (which will affect the ability of tenants on low incomes to access different sizes, types and tenures of housing), maintaining the current approach set out in option 98 would enable flexibility to adapt to any future changes in housing requirements. This may have significant positive effects on community and well-being, as it would continue to encourage mixed communities and social cohesion. Adopting option 97, whilst making the Council's position on tenure requirements clear, would potentially become out of date as local circumstances change. The Housing Strategy and Affordable Housing SPD could be used to ensure advice on tenure requirements is clearly set out. The Council could however, consider including wording to clarify the definition of Affordable Housing, relative to the revised national definition, to include affordable rent.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Cambridge City Council (2008) Affordable Housing SPD;
- Cambridge City Council (2012) Housing Strategy 2012 -2015.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

Not applicable

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE
--

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Council encourages a mix of tenures to be provided as part of new development. With high levels of need for rented housing identified through the housing register, the Council currently resolves to achieve that 75% of the Affordable Housing on qualifying sites should be Social Rented Housing and 25% Intermediate Housing. The national definition of Affordable Housing was revised in June 2011 and a new tenure type was added - Affordable Rent - which is a form of rented rather than intermediate housing. Affordable Rents are not subject to the same prescriptive rent control as Social Rented Housing and Affordable Rents can be set by the Registered Provider at up to 80% of local market rents. Under current guidance, with very few exceptions, all new Government grant for rented Affordable Housing allocated by the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) from April 2011 to March 2015 will require new housing to be let at Affordable Rents rather than Social Rents. It is also noted that HCA grant will not be available for new Affordable Housing delivered under S106 planning agreements.

Research undertaken by the University of Cambridge's Department of Land Economy on behalf of the Council in March 2011 has shown that at 80% of local market rent, Affordable Rents would not be "affordable" to the majority of households who cannot afford lower quartile market housing. The Council has therefore negotiated with the HCA to limit Affordable Rents to approximately 65% of local market rent. Coupled with fundamental reforms to the welfare system, it is too early to fully assess the impact of the introduction of new Affordable Rents on the ability of tenants on low incomes to access different sizes, types and tenures of housing.

Work on the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Council's Housing Strategy has identified that there is a growing group of people unlikely to be able to access Social or Affordable Rented homes, but who are also unable to afford to purchase on the open market. Intermediate housing can help to provide for people in this group.

The Issues and Options report set out two options on tenure mix. The first option (97) suggested the inclusion of a policy setting out the tenure requirements. The disadvantages of this approach were that this would be difficult to assess with any degree of accuracy, and would potentially become out of date as local circumstances change. The second option (98) promoted greater flexibility, by setting out a general policy which stated the need to consider tenure mix and referencing the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document.

This second approach in Option 98 follows best practice to meet a full spectrum of affordable need and was supported by a significant percentage of respondents to

the two options. It allows the Council to adapt to changes in housing requirements as a new Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document will be produced to reflect, complement and provide additional detail on the policies in the new Local Plan. Whilst the Council has considered various tenure mixes as a part of its viability testing of Affordable Housing percentages and thresholds, this work could also inform the development of the Council's approach to precise tenure mix within the new Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document, subject to defined affordability triggers.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 98, which allows for the tenure mix on sites to be guided by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document.

ISSUE: EMPLOYMENT RELATED HOUSING

Total representations: 38

Object: 14

Support: 24

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 99: Employment related housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 99 could help prevent new housing simply being taken by London commuters; • Encourages local working; • What happens when a person in employment related housing leaves the employer?; • Many people prefer to live away from their work; • Opposed to the creation of enclaves; • There is clearly a need for affordable housing provision, but there is a lack of evidence that locally specific circumstances exist to require employment related housing; • It is important to explore the possibility of specific institutions and employers providing housing specifically for their staff, particularly for the University and its colleges; • It would need to ensure that low paid employees were not excluded from this housing; • It should be secondary to enforcing the provision of affordable housing; • Disincentive to economic development and growth; • Need to specify key worker housing; • Should not negate need for affordable housing; • College employees should be included if housing is provided by University of Cambridge; • A percentage of affordable housing should be given over to key workers and University and College workers

	should be included on a list of key workers.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT
By supporting the provision of housing, this option could have a significant positive impact by helping deliver more housing in Cambridge, and by supporting vital services that can influence health and well-being. Economic effects could also be significantly positive, as the housing needs of institutions who contribute to the Cambridge high technology economy can be addressed specifically. Provision of key workers in more central locations may reduce the use of the private car in some instances. The city centre will potentially gain significantly benefits as extra housing provision may allow it to capitalise on opportunities for growing business sectors. Housing support for key staff may also assist employers in the wider city, contributing to reducing deprivation in the North, South and East Cambridge areas.

KEY EVIDENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge City Council (2008) Affordable Housing SPD; • The Cambridge Sub-region Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2008 and updates). • Cambridge City Council (2009) Advice Note – Deleted Local Plan Policies • University of Cambridge (2011) North West Cambridge Key Worker Housing Statement • University of Cambridge (2008) Housing Needs Study (submitted as part of the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan examination)

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED
Not applicable

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE
<p>This option sets out the development of a specific policy, which encourages the provision of key worker housing for specific institutions in Cambridge. Generally, this option was supported by respondents, in particular the University of Cambridge and the Bursars’ Committee.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 50) requires local planning authorities to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities by planning for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community. This could include provision for key workers associated with a range of institutions within Cambridge.</p> <p>Policy 5/6 of the Cambridge Local Plan set out the requirement for proposals for employment development, which impact on the demand for affordable housing, to provide affordable housing on-site; contributions towards off-site housing or by</p>

means of key worker housing provision. This policy was deleted after application to the Secretary of State to save the policies of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 because it was recognised at the Examination in Public for the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the East of England that there was an absence of convincing evidence that specific local circumstances existed to justify the imposition of the requirement. The key difference between the deleted policy 5/6 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and option 99 of the Issues and Options report is in the positivity of wording. Deleted Policy 5/6 was worded in a more negative manner, requiring mitigation of impacts on Affordable Housing Provision as a result of new employment development, whilst option 99 seeks to encourage key worker housing provision for specific institutions within the city, who have an established need for housing for their employees. Direct action by local institutions may help alleviate the existing pressures of the housing market in Cambridge as it could take a number of people out of the private rented sector.

Due to the high level of housing need in Cambridge and the need to support the economy and the delivery of vital services, it is important to allow scope for institutions to provide housing for their staff. The provision would not need to be within the employment site itself. Around 40% of workers are employed in the public sector and in higher education in Cambridge. The higher education sector has faced challenges in both recruiting and retaining staff. The University of Cambridge has sought to address this issue by providing 50% of the housing at their North West Cambridge site for University and College staff. Evidence of their need was provided in their Housing Needs Study (2008) as a part of the process of developing and adopting the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan and in their Key Worker Needs Statement (2011), which formed part of the subsequent approval of the outline planning application 11/1114/OUT. The University's Housing Needs Study includes a survey of University and College Staff, covering household characteristics, housing circumstances and incomes across all staff groups (Academic, Contract Research, Administrative/Clerical, Technical and Manual). It then sets out the housing needs for University staff, based upon current and projected levels of recruitment. The University's Housing Needs Study identifies housing needs across all University staff groups.

It is considered that the option should be developed into a policy which sets out a criteria based approach. The criteria should include the role that the institution plays in the local economy; the extent of housing need for existing staff and the issues of recruitment and retention and the allocations policy for the key worker housing.

In order to allow any provision of key worker housing, the applicant would need to demonstrate that there is a proven need for key worker housing that cannot be met by the housing market and that, in the absence of this new housing provision, the provision of their business/services would suffer. It is expected that any schemes to come forward under this policy approach would be for 100% housing for the eligible institution or employer, tied into a S106 agreement. The planning application for key worker housing would be required to have an allocations policy identifying the

range of key workers within their institution. This allocations policy would also form part of a S106 agreement.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 99 and to bring forward a criteria based policy, which sets out the need to establish the role that the institution has in the local economy; the level of need for existing staff and for recruitment and retention and the need for an allocations policy for the key worker housing.

ISSUE: HOUSING MIX – SIZE AND TYPE

Total representations: 82	
Object:	
Option 100: 10	Option 101: 12
Support:	
Option 100: 29	Option 101: 31

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 100: Housing mix – General policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 100 is preferable to Option 101 as it would allow local circumstances, needs and the housing market to determine the appropriate mix on each site; • Support, but need to avoid high density and very tall buildings; • Strong vision for an area is needed, developed in close consultation with residents.
Option 101: Housing mix –specific levels policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support, but need to encourage 3 bed dwellings or more for families; • Support more provision suitable for the elderly; • Support, but need minimum unit sizes; • Support provision of housing cooperatives; • Support, but need to avoid high density and very tall buildings; • Option 100 is preferable to Option 101 as it would allow local circumstances, needs and the housing market to determine the appropriate mix on each site; • It would lead to poor design; • The detail in the policy is critical – the character of the site and area, the market and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment are vital; • General approach is supported, with the mix in developments determined at the point of planning permission, responding to the market, local need and viability; • Should ensure adequate unit sizes, including provision of sufficient 3 bed + units; • The types of accommodation on sites depends on

	<p>location. It would be preferable to retain flexibility;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mix of housing must not lead to high density or high rise; • There is a need to understand who needs what size dwelling in Cambridge; • Mix is a key lever for affordable housing; • Properties should be based on size, not number of bedrooms; • Need for more family housing; • Need for housing for the elderly; • Occupancy levels are important; • Space standards are vital.
--	---

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

No additional options have been suggested.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Maintaining the current approach set out in option 100 would enable flexibility to adapt to any future changes in housing requirements through the SHMA. This may have a positive effect on community and well-being, as it would continue to encourage mixed and balanced communities with social cohesion. A general policy allows for factors such as the character of an area, site characteristics, and the market and housing need to be taken in account when determining the appropriate housing mix for a site. Whilst enabling the Council's to exercise more control over the mix of housing sizes and types to be achieved on sites providing new housing, option 101 is much less flexible and would therefore potentially become out of date as local circumstances change. The Housing Strategy and Affordable Housing SPD could be used to set out requirements for housing mix.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Policy 5/10 Dwelling Mix

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Cambridge City Council (2008) Affordable Housing SPD;
- The Cambridge Sub-region Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2008 and updates).

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 50), it is important that new residential development provides a good mix of size and type of dwellings to meet a range of needs. Development of a mix of different dwelling sizes, types and tenures will assist in the creation and maintenance of mixed, inclusive and sustainable communities. Two options were put forward for consultation on housing mix, including option 100, which suggested a general policy on housing mix with more detailed advice provided through the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Council's new Affordable Housing Supplementary

Planning Document, whilst Option 101 suggested setting specific levels within the policy itself.

The level of support from respondents was very similar for both options, although many respondents emphasised issues, which these options do not address, such as the overall density of the development or the need for housing for the elderly. It is considered that maintaining the current approach set out in option 100 would enable flexibility to adapt to any future changes in circumstances in the wider economy and in the local housing market. This is noted in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Issues and Options Report and recognises that updates to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document can reflect and allow for changes in local housing need more frequently and more regularly than through formal plan-making. The sub-regional Strategic Housing Market Assessment is currently being updated and it is proposed that the Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document is updated to reflect and complement the new Local Plan. Consideration should also be given to the need to express the housing mix across all tenures and whether to differentiate between houses and flats. The dwelling size would be measured by the number of bedrooms provided.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommended approach is to pursue option 100, which would involve the development of a policy, which sets out the need to have a mix of housing within new development. Evidence to support decisions on housing mix would be available through the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and more detailed advice would be included in the Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document.

OPTIONS 102 – 110 ON DENSITY AND RESIDENTIAL SPACE STANDARDS HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED AT EARLIER DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEES ON 6 AND 13 DECEMBER 2012.

ISSUE: LIFETIME HOMES

Total representations: 73		
Object:		
Option 111: 2	Option 112: 2	Option 113: 3
Support:		
Option 111: 21	Option 112: 23	Option 113: 22

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 111: Lifetimes Homes standard applied to all development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All new homes should be designed for safe and comfortable movement in and around them. If Cambridge were to adopt a Housing Design standard that required specific justification for raised thresholds, steps or narrow doorways, most of the Lifetime Homes criteria would become the norm, and people would not be excluded from parts of their own or their friends' houses

	<p>by mobility problems;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new homes should include the provisions of lifetime homes as the costs are modest and it will only have the effect of slightly increasing the area of the dwelling; • Options 111 and 113 impose a requirement for 100% Lifetime Homes and a proportion of housing to meet Wheelchair Housing Design Standards, which would result in an unnecessarily adverse impact on the viability of the development, and would increase the challenge of successfully developing constrained sites. The requirement for Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Housing Design Standards should reflect local needs and the characteristics of a site; • Option 112 would be more appropriate, although additional flexibility should be incorporated to ensure that viability is not adversely affected, by including the wording "unless not viable"; • Space needs are greater not only for physically disabled people but for people with other forms of disability e.g. learning disability, for example when they require a carer or carers all the time or for most of the time. Autistic people may not be able to go out very often because of the lack of adequate support and it has been known for some time that many disabled children (including autistic children) need extra room at home so that they can play; • It should be a mandatory assessment with a system of awards; • Fiscal incentives should be introduced to make attractive to many of those living in larger houses (e.g. single occupation of family homes) to downsize/smartsize, freeing up accommodation to those who have families.
<p>Option 112: A proportion of new homes to meet Lifetime Homes standard</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 112 would be more appropriate than Option 111, although additional flexibility should be incorporated to ensure that viability is not adversely affected, by including the wording "unless not viable"; • With changing demographics and health needs and with the aim of helping people to continue to live independently, we should aspire to design homes that are as flexible as possible; • All new housing should be built to Lifetime Homes standard; • Support a combination of 112 and 113, say 10% wheelchair housing design standard and a further 15% to Lifetime Home standard. This would improve our performance on this issue (an important one given our ageing population and historical failure to anywhere near meet the needs of the disabled), while not imposing too

	<p>high a standard for developers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Option 112 if the proportion of new homes to meet Lifetime Homes Standards is increased from 15%;
<p>Option 113: A proportion of new homes that meet the Wheelchair Housing Design Standard</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are increasing numbers of disabled and elderly people; • Needs can change very swiftly, so housing should be adaptable to suit those changing needs; • Options 111 and 113 impose a requirement for 100% Lifetime Homes and a proportion of housing to meet Wheelchair Housing Design Standards, which would result in an unnecessarily adverse impact on the viability of the development, and would increase the challenge of successfully developing constrained sites. The requirement for Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Housing Design Standards should reflect local needs and the characteristics of a site; • Option 112 would be more appropriate, although additional flexibility should be incorporated to ensure that viability is not adversely affected, by including the wording "unless not viable"; • Support a combination of 112 and 113, say 10% wheelchair housing design standard and a further 15% to Lifetime Home standard. This would improve our performance on this issue (an important one given our ageing population and historical failure to anywhere near meet the needs of the disabled), while not imposing too high a standard for developers.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No alternative options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

All Options would contribute towards addressing the pressing need to ensure the design and size of new homes meet the current and future needs of Cambridge's population, which is of growing importance as people live into older age, with higher rates of disability, as older people survive longer e.g. following a stroke or CHD. While the Government's strategy requires all new housing built with public funding to meet the Lifetime Home standard it is for Cambridge to decide to what extent this standard should apply to new private housing development. Option 111 would achieve a significant increase in the supply of more flexible and adaptable housing, providing increased choice of housing, regardless of age or disability. However, the Lifetime Homes standards may reduce viability and so reduce the volume of housing delivered.

Option 112 will maintain current rates of Lifetime Homes, increasing overall supply to meet the needs of older and disabled people. There is a risk that developers' decisions on the size and location of the Lifetime Homes standards could reduce open market housing options e.g. for families with disabled household members seeking a larger house, if it is mainly 1 or 2 bed apartments built to Lifetime Home Standards. Likewise, there is a risk that, without specifying otherwise, developers could meet their obligation entirely within Affordable Housing type housing. This would fail to improve choice for older and disabled people seeking housing within the market sector.

Option 113 would help deliver greater housing choices to wheel chair users. The 10% requirement adopted in London provides a benchmark guide for the proportion needed. The option would be strengthened by stating that provision should be across a range of house sizes, to meet the needs of a range of households of differing sizes with one or more wheelchair using household members. This option (113), alongside a policy requiring a higher proportion of Lifetime Home Standards, would enhance the range of housing suited for an ageing population and the specific needs of older and disabled people. A combined policy would need to be clear on whether the Wheelchair provision should be on top of Lifetime Home requirements or within Lifetime Home Standards requirements.

KEY EVIDENCE

- www.lifetimehomes.org.uk;
- Habinteg (2006). Wheelchair Housing Design Standard (Second Edition);
- Cambridge City Council (2009) Developing Affordable Housing Policy Guide.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 5/9 Housing for People with Disabilities

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Current building regulations require new developments to have a minimum standard of accessibility to and into the entrance level of a building. However, these minimum statutory standards provide only limited usability within the home for a disabled person.

The Lifetime Homes Standard (November 2011) is a widely used national standard, which uses technical advice to ensure that the spaces and features in and around new homes can readily meet the needs of most people, including those with reduced mobility. The Government's strategy requires all new housing built with public funding to meet the Lifetime Home standard by 2011. In London, the London Plan requires 10% of all new homes to be built to be easily adaptable to become fully wheelchair accessible. Having homes built to the sixteen points of the Lifetime Homes Standard helps to ensure that housing suits householders' needs and changing circumstances. Each design feature adds to the comfort and convenience of the home and supports the changing needs of individuals and families at different stages of life.

However, as noted by the Lifetime Homes website, whilst Lifetime Homes can accommodate or adapt to the needs of many wheelchair users, the standard does not match the enhanced accessibility provided by a property constructed to the Wheelchair Housing Design Standard. The Council's current Affordable Housing Policy Guide requires at least 2% of new Affordable Housing to be fully wheelchair accessible, and a further 8% to meet other specialist needs as required. It also requires all new Affordable Homes to be built to the Lifetime Homes standard as a minimum. In the Council's Housing Strategy 2012 – 2015, the Council aims to review its requirements around the Lifetime Homes Standard for new Affordable Homes, the percentage of wheelchair accessible homes on new developments, and to consider how it can ensure that new homes are designed in a way that disabled adaptations can easily be fitted in the future if required. The Council also confirms that it will continue to identify the need for specialist housing for people with physical and/or sensory disabilities, and explore, in the longer term, how better use can be made of the private sector in helping disabled people to access appropriate housing.

Requiring all new housing development to meet the Lifetime Homes Standard and the Wheelchair Housing Design Standard would help to provide a flexible and adaptable supply of housing to suit the needs and changing circumstances of all members of the community. Whilst option 111 sets out the requirement for all homes to be built to Lifetime Homes standards, such an approach may be overly prescriptive and may place unreasonable costs on the development industry undermining the viability of development. Whilst the internal requirements of Lifetime Homes are fairly straightforward to achieve and relate well to other standards such as the London Plan and Homes and Communities Agency's residential space standards, the external space standards can be more difficult to achieve on all sites, particularly in relation to parking layout and level access. Viability testing of residential development in setting the draft Community Infrastructure Levy charges has factored in Lifetime Homes.

Setting a percentage approach (Option 112) would on the other hand require Development Management officers to ascertain which dwellings were meeting Lifetime Homes and whether this complied with the policy. As Lifetime Homes

design standards can be incorporated into development at an early stage and are already required for all Affordable Housing delivered in the city, it is considered appropriate to set out a requirement for all homes to comply with Lifetime Homes standards.

In setting the need for all dwellings to meet Lifetime Homes Standard, it should be noted that this policy will cover those Lifetime Homes criteria which are not addressed by building regulations, as the Council would wish to avoid duplication. Furthermore, some flexibility will need to be applied in relation to the parking element of Lifetime Homes, as rigid application particularly in high density settings can result in poor urban design. The expectation will be that all homes are designed with the potential to be altered in the future for the changing needs of their occupants.

In relation to the Wheelchair Housing Design standard, it is considered that market and Affordable Housing should be considered in the same manner, subject to viability. It is proposed that a percentage of all housing, split between market and Affordable Housing should be provided as housing which could be adapted to suit the needs of wheelchair users, dependent on the findings of the update to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Joint Needs Assessment work. Whilst dwellings, particularly market housing, may not accommodate a wheelchair user in the first instance, the capacity should be there within the city's housing stock.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH
The recommendation is to pursue Options 111 and 113 to set out a requirement for all homes to comply with those Lifetime Homes criteria which are not addressed by building regulations a percentage of all housing, split between market and Affordable Housing should be provided as housing which could be adapted to suit the needs of wheelchair users, dependent on the findings of the update to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Joint Needs Assessment work.

ISSUE: SMALL SCALE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND INFILL DEVELOPMENT IN REAR GARDENS

Total representations: 128	
Object:	
Option 114: 14	Option 115: 7
Support:	
Option 114: 49	Option 115: 58

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 114: Criteria based policy for small scale residential development and infill development in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measured policy option which does not preclude development where appropriate and design standards are high; • Option 114 is preferable to Option 115, which does not provide sufficient flexibility to consider local circumstances for infill development in rear gardens.

the rear of gardens	<p>Option 114 provides adequate criteria to ensure such development is appropriate;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The option helps provide additional housing with a variety of designs to enhance the city’s landscape; • It reduces the pressure on Green Belt land; • Gardens are a precious commodity and a defining quality to areas; • Loss of amenity space coupled with problems posed by flooding make this option unwise; • Deterioration of quality of life.
Option 115: Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection should be given to gardens with mature trees; • Gardens are vital for biodiversity; • Gardens are a precious commodity and a defining quality to areas; • Gardens are an important part of reducing flood risk; • Very specific local circumstances could support this approach; • There is a presumption against development of gardens; • Deterioration of quality of life; Whilst welcoming a tougher policy stance on infill development in rear gardens, this should not preclude redevelopment on derelict sites; • Option 114 is preferable to Option 115, which does not provide sufficient flexibility to consider local circumstances for infill development in rear gardens. Option 114 provides adequate criteria to ensure such development is appropriate; • This option does not result in a balanced approach; • The amount of green space in residential areas needs addressing; • Need to restrict infill in existing areas of high density development.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
<p>One respondent suggested that there should be a hierarchy to 'sites' based on back gardens. If the garden is too large then sub-division into garden and allotment should be the first consideration. If there is a general agreement in an area that their gardens are too large amalgamation to provide public open space or amenity, e.g. tennis courts, should be the next consideration. This would preserve the benefit of green space within the city without making demands on infrastructure. Another respondent suggested a combination of both options, whilst another respondent suggested that permitted development rights needed to be restricted so that buildings in back gardens cannot become residential accommodation.</p>	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Option 114 is likely to help increase delivery of much-needed new housing in Cambridge. However, this is likely, depending on location, to be at the cost of biodiversity and green infrastructure, flood risk including climate change adaptation, and landscape. However, in areas of existing low density development or where existing buildings are demolished, this policy could potentially achieve new housing without compromising sustainable communities. Potential adverse effects of this option would be most acutely felt in areas already experiencing significant pressure on green space within the urban area. This option is likely to increase pressures on levels of personal car use, including pressures on car parking,

Option 114 should consider requiring any infill developments to be car free and provide adequate provision for cycle parking in line with that proposed in options 192 and 195, except in exceptional circumstances (e.g. to enable provision for dedicated car parking for a wheelchair accessible home).

The option to restrict infill development (115) would potentially restrict the potential delivery of much needed housing, although the wording to require 'very specific local circumstances' suggests this option would be developed to minimise its application. It would help contribute positively to addressing many sustainability issues relating to biodiversity and green infrastructure and maintaining local townscape. This option (115) would still support development. The extent to which option 115 would affect Transport, Flood Risk, Climate Change and particular areas is uncertain due to lack of detail.

KEY EVIDENCE

- National Planning Policy Framework (2012);
- Cambridge City Council Conservation Area Appraisals (various dates) – provide contextual information.
- Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006
- Cambridge City Council Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document (June 2007)
- Cambridge City Council Nature Conservation Strategy (November 2006)

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

-

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

In recent years, the issue of garden development (sometimes known as 'garden grabbing') has become a contentious issue. The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 53) states that "Local planning authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area." Additionally, the definition of previously developed land within the National Planning Policy Framework excludes private residential gardens.

In many cases, though, development on garden land may be regarded as entirely appropriate and there are many clear, definable benefits to such development. They

reduce the need to extend development out into the Green Belt and the wider countryside, create new homes without the need for significant additional infrastructure provision, provide better utilisation of land in areas where people no longer require large gardens due to changing lifestyles, and they may provide small sites appropriate for local developers who employ local people. For these reasons, garden land development may add to housing stock in ways that are sustainable and which meet identified local housing need.

There are also many arguments against developing on gardens. They may lead to increased building mass, loss of character, increased population density and a gradual associated increase in demand on local infrastructure. Environmentally, garden development can result in a loss of green space and paving over gardens; a reduction in habitats and biodiversity; and an increased risk of flash flooding due to increased run off.

Whilst new residential development is welcomed in addressing housing need, the development of existing gardens or curtilages needs to be handled carefully in order to avoid creating developments, which adversely affect the amenities of local residents and the character of the area. It is considered that there is a need to have a measured policy approach, which does not preclude development, where appropriate. As such, given the mixed character, density and form of existing residential development within the city, it is appropriate to take forward a criteria based approach, which would allow flexibility to consider local circumstances.

This policy approach would cover sites where:

- an existing house is retained and new dwellings are erected in the garden area or curtilage;
- the existing buildings are demolished and the plot(s) sub-divided in order to make way for further residential development.

Reference would not merely be made to infill development within rear gardens, as this type of development can affect the whole curtilage of a property.

The proposed criteria based policy would be positively worded and would include criteria on the following issues:

- The character and appearance of the area;
- Form and density of the proposed development;
- Amenities of neighbouring properties;
- Provision of adequate amenity space, vehicular access arrangements and parking spaces for the proposed and existing properties;
- Effect on the comprehensive development of the wider area.

In terms of alternative options, there was a suggestion that there should be a hierarchy to 'sites' based on back gardens, which could lead to large gardens being subdivided and used for public open space or amenity. Due to the challenges of land assembly, this approach will not be pursued through the Local Plan Review. In relation to restricting permitted development rights in order to prevent buildings in back gardens from becoming residential accommodation, this cannot be undertaken

through the Local Plan Review process. It would need to result from either national changes to permitted development rights or through the introduction of an Article 4 direction.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 114, which comprises a criteria-based policy for infill development affecting gardens. Option 115 will not be pursued as it is considered to be too restrictive.

ISSUE: HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO)

Total representations: 43	
Object: 20	Support: 23

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 116: Criteria based policy for HMOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for a policy was largely supported by respondents. Particular reference was made to the need for a cap on the number of HMOs in a given area. • The designation of three storeys seems out of date with so many houses having loft conversions; • Inhabitants of large HMOs are often transient and some landlords do not keep their properties in a good state of repair; • Would like to see specific policy that deters the conversion of large family homes to HMOs; • There should be a requirement for all licensed HMOs to lodge contact details for their owners and managers with local police or on the City Council website, so neighbours can have immediate access in cases of anti-social behaviour or emergencies; • Restrictions on car ownership and parking permits should be considered; • Many small houses in Romsey don't count as HMOs due to being on two storeys, but are overcrowded and provide poor living conditions; • Largest properties need improved regulation, without limiting the contribution that flexible shared housing makes to local housing provision; • There should be a review and improvement plan for the private rented sector. • Car parking is often a vexed issue with HMOs, so it is welcome to see it covered in the criteria; • Where respondents objected, it was based on the impact that restrictive criteria on HMOs could have on the Cambridge housing market; and upon the difficulty of enforcing such a policy. A number of Colleges and Anglia

	<p>Ruskin University responded in objection due to the impact restrictions could have on students' access to housing. HMOs are an essential sector of the housing stock at the lower end of the housing market. A positive approach should be taken to provision. Para 9.67 states 20% of HMOs are occupied by students. Therefore HMO policy should link in to a supportive policy for the provision of new student accommodation as the demand for both types of housing increases;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HMOs are an important part of the housing market in Cambridge. Cost of housing prices many young people out of the market. There is a shortage of affordable housing and 8,210 people on the Council's waiting list. HMOs play an important role in meeting housing needs and enabling workers who cannot afford to buy to live in the city close to where they work. Restrictions on HMOs will worsen affordability and push rents up; • There is the need to consider cumulative impact of HMOs in a given area, as they impact on availability of family housing and weaken the sense of community in a locality; • The threshold for converting small housing units to HMO should be lowered.
--	---

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

It was suggested that policy should be developed which deterred large family homes from being converted into HMOs. Additionally, it was suggested that area-based policy should be developed to protect family homes in the Mill Road and Glisson Road/Newtown Conservation Area from conversion to HMO. One respondent suggested that the number of HMOs allowed in a given area should be subject to a cap.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Option 116 is likely to contribute positively to Communities and Well Being issues helping provide additional accommodation while ensuring criteria to minimise the potential adverse impacts on neighbouring residential amenity. Option 116's criteria based policy for HMOs would enable HMOs to continue to address a proportion of the affordable housing needs of students, young people and small households reliant on welfare for housing, including those affected by welfare reform challenges to affordability. Criteria should enable actual and perceived threats to amenity to be managed. Where high concentrations of HMOs in an area arise, the option 116 may be inadequate to address these amenity concerns.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Cambridge City Council (2009). Private Sector Housing Condition Survey;
- National HMO Lobby (2008). Balanced communities and studentification: Problems and solutions;
- Strategic Housing Market Assessment;

- Circular 08/2010 Changes to Planning Regulations for Dwellinghouses and Houses in Multiple Occupation;
- Census 2011.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

-

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

In planning terms, HMOs are split into two different use classes, based on the number of occupants:

- A small HMO - this is a shared dwelling house which is occupied by between 3 and 6 unrelated individuals who share basic amenities such as a kitchen or bathroom. This falls into Use Class C4 under the Town and Country Planning Uses Classes Order (2010).
- A larger HMO – this is when there are more than six unrelated individuals sharing basic amenities such as a kitchen or bathroom. This falls into the sui generis class under the Town and Country Planning Uses Classes Order (2010).

All HMOs must meet certain standards of amenity and fire safety.

The change in approach to HMOs stems from amendments made to the Use Classes Order and the General Permitted Development Order on 6 April 2010 to introduce a new class C4: Houses in Multiple Occupation. Initially, the changes made in April 2010 meant that planning permission would be required for any change from a single household dwelling to either a small or a large HMO. However, on 1 October 2010, further changes were made to the General Permitted Development Order, which permitted changes of use to a C4 HMO without the need for planning permission.

The Government's Circular 08/2010 sets out the Government's formal guidance on dealing with HMOs through the planning system. It recognises in paragraph 2 that a high concentration of shared homes can sometimes give rise to problems, especially if too many properties in one area are let to short term tenants with little stake in the local community. The National Planning Policy Framework does not make specific reference to HMOs, but does assert that local planning authorities should identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand (paragraph 50).

According to the Council's Private Sector House Condition Survey 2009¹, there are approximately 5,000 HMOs in the city, making up some 12.6% of the housing stock compared with the national average of just over 2%. Just over 1,000 of these are thought to be occupied by students. Petersfield, Market and Romsey Wards have the greatest number of HMOs in the city due to their central location, which is

¹ Cambridge City Council House Condition Survey 2009: <http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/ccm/content/housing/housing-strategy-and-research/housing-research.en>

popular with students and young professionals.

HMOs form an important part of the housing market in Cambridge. With high house prices and private rents, and a relatively young population, HMOs add to the housing mix and play an important role in meeting a wide range of housing needs, and in helping to prevent homelessness. Cambridge has a high level of private renting at 26.2% of total housing stock in the city², which enables the market to offer the greater flexibility required to meet the very high levels of turnover in the city. A significant proportion of the private rented sector is given over to housing students, and this has acted as a force in driving buy-to-let in the city, with associated implications for the general availability and price of accommodation. Students at the two universities make up approximately 22% of the city's population. Overall, there were 18,243 full-time students enrolled at the University of Cambridge in 2011, including 11,948 undergraduates, and 8,911 students at Anglia Ruskin University in Cambridge, including 7,636 undergraduates. Within the University of Cambridge, Colleges aim to house all of their undergraduates and 90% of their postgraduates. Whilst Anglia Ruskin University has been increasing its stock of student accommodation in recent years, many students remain dependent upon the private rented sector.

Whilst there are a significant number of HMOs inhabited by students, there is also a demand for this type of accommodation from young professionals and economic migrants. HMO accommodation may be subject to further pressures as reforms to the welfare system take effect, particularly amongst under 35s who will no longer be entitled to claim Local Housing Allowance (a form of Housing Benefit) at the single-room rate.

Unfortunately, HMOs are also associated with issues that affect the neighbourhood, which can occur because of poor management of properties. Concentrations of poorly managed HMOs can change the nature of an area, impacting on community cohesion. The conversion of family-size dwellings to HMOs also reduces opportunities for families to buy or rent houses, potentially contributing to the high cost of housing in the city. It is recognised that issues can sometimes arise if there are high concentrations of this type of accommodation. Issues can include:

- Additional need for car and cycle parking provision;
- Inadequate bin storage space with associated difficulties for refuse collection;
- Anti-social behaviour and the consequential impact on other residents and the local community where properties are poorly managed; and
- Poor internal conditions such as poor amenities and overcrowding, which can often have an adverse impact on the health, safety and welfare of occupiers and neighbours.

Given the potential issues associated with HMOs, it is considered reasonable to include an option outlining the factors that need to be taken into consideration

² Census 2011

when making decisions on relevant planning applications. Given that HMOs will generally accommodate a greater number of adults than an equivalent sized family dwelling, it is considered important to set out specific criteria in the HMO policy to require full consideration of these aspects of development, when creating an HMO. This approach does not restrict or limit HMOs in a specific geographical area and is consistent with national guidance and the current approach set out in the 2006 Local Plan.

Conversely, setting out a policy with a presumption against further HMO development is not considered to represent a sustainable approach as it does not provide sufficient local flexibility in tenure and household composition. Whilst there may be concerns that over-concentrations of HMOs lead to unbalanced and transient local populations, and can give rise to problems for communities, the adoption of areas of restraint for HMOs or use of a threshold based policy would require a significant evidence base, which would require consistent updating. Restrictive approaches could have a negative impact on the local housing market and could also prove difficult to enforce. Whilst a case could potentially be made for introducing a cap on the number of HMOs in a given area, there is a lack of evidence to prove the need for a cap. Such an evidence base would be costly to produce and would need to be maintained. Given that the broad thrust of the Plan welcomes the vitality and vibrancy that the students and workers involved in universities and the knowledge-based economy brings to Cambridge, on balance it is considered that the case for introducing a cap has not been made.

In order to allow further development of HMOs, where the quality of the HMO itself is appropriate and there is no adverse impact on neighbourhood amenity, it is considered appropriate to develop a criteria based approach for HMOs in tandem with policies supporting the delivery of appropriately located purpose-built student accommodation and addressing the conversion of large properties (Option 118). It should be noted that new HMOs may not be eligible for parking permits in areas of the city where controlled parking zones are in place. In those areas of the city, without controlled parking zones, the Council would not be able to restrict the number of vehicles associated with an HMO.

The criteria based approach would include the following criteria:

- Consideration of potential impact on the residential amenity of the local area including noise from concentrations of these uses;
- Suitability of the building or site including any outbuildings and whether appropriate bin storage, cycle and car parking and drying areas can be provided;
- Proximity to bus stops, pedestrian and cycle routes, and shops and other local services; and
- Appropriate management arrangements are in place in order to reduce anti-social behaviour and any adverse impact on local residents.

This policy would only apply where an application for planning permission is required

for a large HMO (sui generis).

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 116, which sets out a criteria based approach, recognising the contribution that HMOs make to the overall supply of housing in Cambridge.

ISSUE: SPECIALIST HOUSING

Total representations: 27

Object: 6

Support: 21

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 117: Specialist Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support for the principle of the option;• Support for large, high quality retirement homes;• Need for bungalows for the elderly;• Housing cooperatives should be given more consideration;• Need to separate specialist housing from affordable housing categories;• Residents of specialist housing should have good access to safe and secure open space. It is important to health and well-being;• Whilst supporting the need for a policy, caution should be exercised in specifying amenity space requirements for accommodation for the elderly;• Specialist accommodation should be available within communities so that people can remain within their existing community even if they require more care;• Any policy relating to specialist housing must take into account the market's ability to deliver such provision and other site-specific demands;• Specialist housing should be close to a local centre.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

This Option will positively contribute to addressing key issues identified in the Communities and Well being Topic. In particular, it will support the provision of accommodation for the existing and future population, including older people, disabled people, including those with learning or mental health conditions and those in poor health. Specific consideration to the proposal's provision of suitable and safe amenity space and its proximity to local shops, services and community facilities should support residents' well being and provide easy access to sustainable forms of transport. However, there is a risk that these criteria, if imposed inflexibly, could be used as a means of resisting location of specialist housing in neighbourhoods, restricting options for the location of such provision unfairly, especially where the intended usage is to house particular groups, e.g. young people on remand, people with mental health conditions.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Cambridgeshire County Council (2011). The Supporting People Commissioning Strategy 2011-2015;
- Cambridgeshire County Council (2011). Commissioning Strategy for Extra Care Sheltered Housing in Cambridgeshire 2011-15.
- Cambridge City Council (2012) Housing Strategy 2012 - 2015
- Cambridge City Council, Older People's Housing Strategy 2009 - 2014

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 5/7 Supported Housing/Housing in Multiple Occupation

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

One of the objectives in the Council's Housing Strategy is to ensure that housing meets the needs of people who are at a disadvantage, and supported housing, in a range of tenures, adds to the mix and range of housing to meet a variety of needs. It is therefore important that the Local Plan accommodates the provision of housing that may be designed in a particular way or has a staff office or staff night-time facilities when staff are needed to support the people who are living in the housing. This housing can often demand a larger plot or building 'footprint' and is often termed as 'supported housing', although in some cases, such as fully wheelchair accessible housing, the person living in the property may not need support to live independently. Such housing should be provided across the city, as opposed to being concentrated in certain areas, to help to enable people moving into such accommodation to remain in their local area and to create and maintain balanced communities.

Specialist housing can be developed with particular groups of people in mind such as older people (including the frail elderly and those with dementia), people with physical and sensory disabilities, those with learning difficulties or acquired brain injury, young people at risk, people with alcohol or drug dependency, those requiring refuge from harassment and violence, and others who may, for a variety of reasons, be excluded from the local community. People with the need for specialist housing contribute to the community in many ways, but for some their ability to participate

fully in society is hampered by poor or inappropriate housing, which affects their physical or mental health, or their ability to get out and about.

Specialist housing is intended to enable people to live as independently as possible, but is designed so that support can be provided to them (and often to others in the wider community) from on-site. Examples may range from a small scheme of cluster flats with additional facilities for support staff, to much larger extra care schemes enabling older and disabled people to live in their own self-contained accommodation but with care and support on-site. Where possible, such housing should be designed flexibly so that it can be adapted to meet alternative housing uses as needs change in the future.

Although some groups will continue to require specialist housing, this needs to be balanced with the current general direction of travel for health and social care commissioning, which includes enabling and supporting people to remain in their own homes, and being able to retain their independence for as long as possible. This is reflected in the Cambridgeshire Supporting People Commissioning Strategy, which aims to reduce the amount of adult social care funded services in specialist accommodation, in favour of supporting people in their own homes where possible.

Extra care housing for older people is an example where local health and social care commissioners remain supportive of specially designed housing. Extra Care provides self-contained housing, but with other facilities provided on-site where people can receive care and support but still retain their independence, as opposed to residential care homes where occupants do not have their own tenure or 'own front door'. The Cambridgeshire Extra Care Commissioning Strategy 2011 (2011 – 2015) outlines the extra care housing priorities for Cambridgeshire. A current issue for local health and social care commissioners is where private market care homes for older people may achieve planning approval without reference to the demands they will place on local care and health revenue budgets.

The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the importance of planning for a mix of housing to meet different groups in the community. However, the location of provision needs careful consideration and should be in accordance with locally identified need. On this basis, only one reasonable option was considered appropriate for inclusion in the Issues and Options consultation in Summer 2012. This option's approach would allow for development of a policy relating to all types of specialist housing, including extra care provision for older people, to be developed. There was support for the principle of the option. Specific reference will be made in the criteria to the need for residents of specialist housing to have good access to safe and secure open space for their health and well-being and need for such provision to be in close proximity to local services. This promotes the need for specialist housing to form part of sustainable, mixed and balanced communities. With particular reference to older people, in Cambridge, over a third of people aged 60 plus have no access to a car, and this percentage increases with age, so the need for good public transport, local amenities and welcoming neighbourhoods is significant.

In combination with other relevant policies within the Local Plan, when assessing the suitability for supported care housing and care homes, the following should be taken into consideration:

- The location of such provision, including the proximity of the site to public transport facilities, the provision of a safe, accessible and secure environment and the convenience of the site's location in relation to local shops, services and community facilities;
- The location of such provision in relation to other similar accommodation;
- The provision of an adequate level of amenity space which is safe and suitable; and
- There is evidence of demonstrable need in accordance with the Council's Housing Strategy, Cambridgeshire County Council and local health commissioning strategies and, where appropriate, the Extra Care Commissioning Strategy for Cambridgeshire and its successor documents.

This option allows specific proposals to come forward in accordance with local need.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 117 on specialist housing, which would set out a criteria based approach to the delivery of all types of specialist housing.

ISSUE: OTHER OPPORTUNITIES TO PROVIDE NEW HOUSING

Total representations: 16

Object: 3

Support: 13

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 118: Opportunities for providing new housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option was supported by all respondents to this issue. Concern was raised that it should be designed to avoid short-term thinking and to ensure that opportunistic development does not result in a skewing of the overall housing mix in a given area; • Emphasis should be less on the need to create new units of accommodation and more on the need to retain the existing variety of stock suitable for different household sizes; • There should always be the presumption particularly for buildings of historic interest and in conservation areas that any conversion returns the house or building to its original use; • Identify empty houses to be repaired and brought back into use (perhaps using council loans to be paid back once a house is let or sold); • Identify derelict sites on residential streets, which could

	<p>be used for small amounts of housing (e.g. the old tapes shop on Gwydir Street);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Older buildings and those not in use should be renovated to address housing needs before there are schemes for large scale housing developments that lack community infrastructure.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

This option cannot be effectively appraised as it is not an option per se, but an option on whether there should be a policy or not. It is assumed that this Policy would aim to maximise the provision of new housing while ensuring it does not lead to the loss of family accommodation; and that any proposal is built to Decent Homes Standards and Housing Health and Safety Rating System, and would not lead to overcrowding. In this case this option would help ensure the size and design of new homes are appropriate to the existing and future population and reduce housing pressure on other land uses, such as open space; thus helping to contribute positively to the Communities and Well Being Issues. The extent to which this option would affect different areas in Cambridge is uncertain.

KEY EVIDENCE

- National Planning Policy Framework (2012)
- The Cambridge Sub-region Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2008 and updates).
- Cambridge City Council (2012) Housing Strategy 2012 – 2015.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 5/2 Conversion of Large Properties;
- Policy 5/3 Housing Lost to Other Uses;
- Policy 5/4 Loss of Housing.

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Given the need for housing in Cambridge, it will be important for the Local Plan to ensure that opportunities to provide new housing are explored and that the risk of losing housing to other uses is minimised. Whilst it is not the role of the Local Plan to bring empty homes back into use, their importance has been recognised by the Council. According to the Council's Housing Strategy (2012 – 15), the number of homes in the City which have been empty for more than 6 months at any one time has remained fairly steady over recent years at around 70. Although the number of long-term empty homes in Cambridge is well below the national average, dealing with empty homes was identified as a high priority by respondents to the Housing Strategy; and with such pressure on housing in and around Cambridge, the Council needs to continue to prioritise bringing long-term empty homes back into use.

Whilst the sub-division of large properties into additional dwellings makes a useful

contribution towards the overall housing need in the city, it can lead to the loss of family accommodation and in some cases, a loss of historic character. There is a need to ensure that any proposals would result in satisfactory living environment, without overcrowding, and that the quality of Cambridge's historic environment is preserved and enhanced. Ensuring satisfactory living arrangements is a factor when considering the retention or redevelopment of existing housing along with any opportunities to return appropriate buildings back to their original housing use. Whilst it is important to retain existing housing wherever possible, this needs to be balanced against other objectives and priorities, including the need for other uses and the National Planning Policy Framework's requirements for flexibility and responsiveness to changing economic circumstances.

In some cases, it will be appropriate to replace poorly designed housing or housing that is no longer cost-effective to repair and maintain with housing that meets modern standards of design, layout and energy efficiency. The current Local Plan includes policies relating to the conversion of large properties and the loss of housing. In accordance with national guidance, it is considered reasonable to continue with this approach on the basis that it is the most appropriate way of ensuring that opportunities to provide new housing are explored and suitable living environments are achieved. This approach has been supported by respondents to the Issues and Options consultation.

Pursuing this option would allow for the development of a series of policies which address the conversion of large properties and the loss of housing to other uses. This approach is consistent with national guidance and helps to maximise opportunities to increase housing supply in Cambridge to meet need. However, a balanced approach must be taken and consideration given to the needs of other uses.

In relation to the conversion of large properties to a greater number of smaller units, a criteria based approach should set out the need for the development to have a satisfactory standard of amenity for its occupiers and neighbouring properties; consideration of the impact on on-street parking and the character of the area; and refuse and cycle storage.

In terms of loss of housing to other uses, this will be permitted, where it can be demonstrated that the property is not suitable for habitation and is not capable of restoration; it is a subsidiary part of a non-residential property and has no separate access or potential for separate access; the accommodation will be replaced by an equivalent amount of residential floorspace in the new development; it is necessary for the provision of community facilities in Cambridge; it is a Listed building which would be better safeguarded by change of use.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue criteria based policies addressing the conversion of large properties and the loss of housing to other uses.

ISSUE: PROVISION FOR GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS

Total representations: 89	
Object: 51	Support: 38

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 119: Criteria based policy for the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gypsies and Travellers are the largest minority group comprising 1% of the population in our region, yet the Council suggests only 1 pitch is required between 2011-2031. The Cambridge Sub-Region Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTANA) 2011) seriously underestimates the need for permanent pitches in Cambridgeshire. The Assessment was carried out by the local authorities themselves as a technical exercise; • The gradient of inequalities may be steeper than reported here. The recent inequalities report from the DCLG includes the following statement in relation to life expectancy "...a recent study stated that the general population were living up to 50% longer than Gypsies and Travellers"; • Wording should be more careful on whether Gypsies and Travellers travel; • There is a need for Travellers to have better access to education; • This does not sufficiently recognise the extent to which Travellers have been forced into Council accommodation against their wishes and in a way which erodes their culture, and nor does it reflect the detrimental effects of being forced into council housing; • A significant part of the demand for new pitches is from Gypsies and Travellers moving from bricks and mortar into private sites. The numbers seriously underestimate the numbers involved; • Needs to be independent consultation with the Traveller community; • Consideration should be given to a transit site near Addenbrooke's; • Need to continue working with South Cambridgeshire to progress pitch provision. • The requirement that 'There should not be an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents or the appearance or character of the surrounding area.' allows for prejudice to determine objections by other residents; • The approach to Traveller sites should be as similar as

	<p>possible to that for housing;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of residential amenity is paramount; • Green Belt land should not be used for Traveller site provision. • Specific site allocations must be made; • Support planning permission for pitches at the existing Smithy Fen site in Cottenham; • Improve current sites and improve transport links to these sites; • Large sites should be possible to allow the Traveller community to thrive in large, mutually supportive, extended family groupings. Amenity blocks and provision for chalets as well as trailers and caravans are all necessary. Without permission for sufficient amenity blocks, proper sanitation will not be possible leading to inhumane living circumstances; • The Council could substantially enhance the prospects for traveller development through a policy to connect the Fen to Cowley Road, providing more direct connection to the trunk road network for heavy vehicles. Given the presence of the railway sidings this is likely to be along the northern boundary of Network Rail's land; • Spend grant funding on provision of new permanent sites with proper amenities; • Provide sites on brownfield uncontaminated sites; • Take on ideas from other existing sites where there is high quality internal and external landscaping to improve amenity for both traveller and settled communities. <p>Sites identified within the urban area during consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land off Coldham's Lane; • A transit site near to Addenbrooke's; <p>Sites identified within the Cambridge Green Belt during consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas on the edge of the city should be set aside for new provision; • A transit site near to Addenbrooke's; • Area adjacent to the new station at Northern Fringe East; • South Cambridgeshire or elsewhere in the county; • Beside Babraham Road Park and Ride site.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
<p>Respondents raised the need for site allocations to be made for Gypsy and Traveller provision.</p>	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

This option is likely to lead to positive effects on a number of Sustainability Topics. The option's specific reference to provision of site(s) within easy access to local services and play and residential amenity spaces should help contribute positively to addressing a number of the Community and Well-Being issues. Recognition of flood risk, site contamination and noise would also help address Community and Well Being issues and ensure account for the potential environmental, economic and social cost of flooding both now and in the future. Including criteria to protect local amenity through appropriate landscaping should help maintain and/or improve the appearance and character of the local area. The extent to which this option would affect different areas of Cambridge would depend on site specific proposals. However, these criteria should be applied in a manner and to a degree that is consistent with that for other forms of new accommodation, to avoid unreasonably discriminating against Gypsies and Travellers in the allocation of new sites, given the significant need for accommodation and the health and well-being costs arising from existing under-provision.

KEY EVIDENCE

- CLG (2012). Planning policy for traveller sites;
- Cambridgeshire County Council (2006). Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment;
- Cambridgeshire County Council (2011). Cambridge Sub-regional Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTANA);
- Cambridge City Council (2012). Cambridge Local Plan Towards 2031: Technical Background Document. Gypsy and Traveller Provision in Cambridge – Site Assessment;
- Cambridge City Council (2012) Housing Strategy 2012-2015.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 5/8 Travellers

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

In March 2012, the Government released national guidance on planning for Gypsy and Traveller sites. The guidance requires that councils set pitch targets to address the likely need, working collaboratively with neighbouring authorities. The guidance has a requirement to maintain a five-year supply of specific deliverable sites against their locally set targets and requires councils to develop criteria based policies to guide site allocations and planning applications for Gypsies and Travellers. There are currently no authorised Gypsy and Traveller sites in Cambridge although there are a number in South Cambridgeshire, some of which are on the edge of the city. There are no unauthorised sites in Cambridge, but small groups of Gypsies and Travellers do sometimes stop by the roadside or on other land in the city whilst passing through or wanting to access services. In 2011, a review of the 2006 Cambridge Sub-Regional Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment was undertaken. For Cambridge, it identified that one permanent pitch was needed between 2011 and 2031. This is related to the natural growth of Gypsies and Traveller family groups

identified as already in Cambridge. In addition to this, there is a need to consider transit or emerging stopping provision for Gypsies and Travellers in the Cambridge area.

Land supply in Cambridge remains limited and there are a number of competing demands. Given the juxtaposition of the built up area alongside the tight administrative boundary, it is difficult to find land that is suitable for site provision. In order to help with this process, the Council needs to develop an appropriate policy in the Local Plan to guide the location of Gypsy and Travellers sites as well as identifying a site or sites suitable for provision. The Council is continuing to work with South Cambridgeshire District Council to identify suitable land.

In accordance with national guidance, one option (119) was put forward for consideration. This option set out the criteria to guide the location of sites for Gypsy and Traveller provision. The criteria outlined are based on previous national guidance, and good practice guidance along with the current requirements sets out in the National Planning Policy Framework. This option would allow for the development of a criteria based policy to guide the location of permanent, transit and emergency stopping provision for Gypsy and Traveller sites in Cambridge. This will include the following criteria:

- The site should be accessible to local services by public transport, on foot or by cycle;
- There should be safe and convenient vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access to the site;
- The site should provide an acceptable living environment and the health and safety including the public health of the residents should not be put at risk. Factors to be taken into account include flood risk, site contamination, air quality and noise;
- There should not be an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents or the appearance or character of the surrounding area. The site should respect the scale of the surrounding area and appropriate boundary treatment and landscaping should be capable of being provided;
- Whether the needs of the residents of the sites could be met without putting undue pressure on local services;
- There should be adequate space for vehicle parking, turning and servicing, storage, play and residential amenity; and
- The site should be served or capable of being served by all necessary utilities including mains water, electricity, drainage and sanitation.

This approach is consistent with national guidance and allows for the needs of Gypsies and Travellers to be taken into consideration along with other factors including consideration of amenity of nearby residents. Without such an approach, the Council would not have an appropriate policy to assess any future proposals. It is considered that this criteria based approach should be taken forward.

In order to make provision for Gypsy and Travellers in Cambridge and find an

appropriate site, or sites, the Council has used the criteria listed in option 119 to guide the assessment of potential sites across the city. This approach is set out in the Gypsy and Traveller Provision in Cambridge – Site Assessment Process 2012. This document sets out relevant background to Gypsy and Traveller provision both nationally and locally, explains the methodology developed and includes information on all the sites that have been assessed as part of this process. This approach is consistent with the detailed approach the Council has taken to preparing the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and has resulted in a thorough assessment of land across the city.

The assessment did not identify any appropriate sites within the built up area of Cambridge for Gypsy and Traveller provision. The assessment did not look at land within the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge on the basis that previous national guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework consider that Gypsy and Travellers' sites are inappropriate development in the Green Belt and should only be approved in very special circumstances. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, only through the plan making process, and if to meet Travellers' needs sites should be allocated for Travellers only. The Issues and Options consultation asked whether the Council should consider sites within the Green Belt for Gypsy and Traveller provision. Whilst many respondents supported the need for pitch provision, concern was expressed about the potential for provision of sites for Gypsies and Travellers within the Green Belt.

Due to the interrelationship with land in South Cambridgeshire, the City Council remains committed to working in partnership with South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council in order to provide appropriate provision in suitable locations. It was noted that respondents were concerned about transport access to existing sites, with the potential to improve the connections between Fen Road and Cowley Road. This issue will be discussed with Cambridgeshire County Council, the highways authority.

A number of sites were identified within the urban area and in the Cambridge Green Belt during consultation. These sites include:

- Land off Coldham's Lane;
- A transit site near to Addenbrooke's;
- Area adjacent to the new station at Northern Fringe East;
- Beside Babraham Road Park and Ride site.

Land off Coldham's Lane adjacent to Cherry Hinton's lakes is heavily contaminated due to its recent history as a landfill site. This site is not considered suitable for use as a Gypsy and Traveller site. In relation to the sites in the Green Belt, the Council has carried out a broad appraisal of the inner Green Belt boundary areas in the context of recent land releases, and how those releases have affected the revised inner Green Belt boundary. This appraisal was undertaken in May 2012 and sits alongside the Local Plan - Towards 2031 Issues and Options Report (June 2012).

There is a need to consider whether any further development sites in the Cambridge Green Belt should deliver Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision. South Cambridgeshire's Issues and Options 1 consultation in 2012 included consultation on provision of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation. During consultation, South Cambridgeshire District Council asked whether the Local Plan should require site provision for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in all new settlements, and other allocated and windfall developments of at least 500 homes. Given the interdependence of the two authorities, a similar approach could be considered for the city, where within the criteria-based policy, it could state that any allocated or windfall development sites of at least 500 homes would be required to bring forward Gypsy and Traveller site provision in line with locally identified needs. Artificial subdivision of sites to avoid making provision of pitches for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation would not be permitted.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 119, which will set out the criteria to guide the location of sites for Gypsy and Traveller provision. The criteria outlined are based on previous national guidance, and good practice guidance along with the current requirements sets out in the National Planning Policy Framework and planning policy for traveller sites. This option would allow for the development of a criteria based policy to guide the location of permanent, transit and emergency stopping provision for Gypsy and Traveller sites in Cambridge. Given the ongoing need for pitches, Members are also asked to consider whether a policy should be developed that states that any allocated or windfall development sites of at least 500 homes would be required to bring forward Gypsy and Traveller site provision in line with locally identified needs. This could also state that any artificial subdivision of sites to avoid making provision of pitches for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation will not be permitted.

ISSUE: RESIDENTIAL MOORINGS

Total representations: 43	
Object: 14	Support: 29

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 120: Residential moorings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of respondents supported the need to identify areas for new moorings, despite having concerns about the reality of their development and potential for knock-on impacts in a given area. Reference was made to marina provision. Concern was raised that moorings should be provided within the city boundary with standards enforced, equivalent to those which would be required of land dwellings. For example, coal and diesel should not be burned emitting fumes at one to two metre height. • Many respondents supported the need for residential moorings;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New residential moorings should not be at the expense of short-stay tourist moorings; • New residential moorings should not be to the detriment of the riverscape; • Need to consider impact on parking in a locality; • Need to consider amenity of local residents; • Risk of air and water pollution. <p>Sites identified for residential moorings during consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fen Ditton; • Land to the west of the River Cam off Fen Road; • Land to the south-east of Clayhithe Bridge, Waterbeach; • North side of the River Cam, near Fen Road; • Further mooring on the south side of the river on Stourbridge Common.
--	---

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Respondents raised the need for site allocations to be made for residential moorings provision.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Residential moorings have the potential to make a limited contribution to increased housing supply, and when coupled with this option to ensure adequate services, access, and the protection of amenity, should contribute positively to communities and well-being. Criteria to ensure that the ecological value of waterways is maintained should positively influence biodiversity and protect water quality. Flood risk management of moorings will bring benefits, potentially helping to address flood risk issues in North and South Cambridge.

KEY EVIDENCE

- British Waterways (2011). Guidance for Development of new Residential Mooring Sites (England and Wales);
- Cambridge City Council (2006). River Mooring Policy.
- Cambridge City Council, Report to Community Services Scrutiny Committee 12/01/2011 on Riverside – Riparian Ownership and Mooring
- Cambridge City Council, Report to Community Development and Leisure Scrutiny Committee 24/03/2005 on River Moorings
- Cambridge City Council, Report to Community Services Scrutiny Committee 18/01/2007 on Review of Moorings Policy

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Part of Policy 3/9 Watercourses and Other Bodies of Water

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the requirement in paragraph 50 to deliver a wide choice of quality homes and to create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. Whilst representing a very small percentage of housing provision within Cambridge and only being suitable for the needs and housing expectations of a small sector of the population, residential moorings contribute both to the diversity of the city and to the supply of different forms of housing.

The Conservators of the River Cam are the statutory navigation authority, responsible for the maintenance of navigation of the River Cam from the Mill Pond, Silver Street to Bottisham Lock. Working with the Conservators and other stakeholders, the Council is responsible for the management of residential and visitor moorings on the River Cam and has set out its approach to this issue through the development of a moorings management policy. The existing Moorings Policy was initially approved by the Executive Councillor for Community Development and Leisure in March 2005 and was subsequently reviewed in 2006/2007. Within this Moorings Policy, the Council sets fees for residential and visitor mooring licences. The licensing process sets out the Council's expectations in terms of standards of riverworthiness, behaviour and occupancy. This is linked with the Conservators of the River Cam's navigation licensing process.

There is currently calculated to be space on the River Cam within the city for some 70 licensed boats to be moored with sufficient space between moored vessels. This is based on the capacity of the river having been calculated on the amount of available riverbank divided by the average length of a vessel (70ft or 21.34 metres) and an assessment made of the space needed by other river users to access the river. The overall figure of 70 boats includes allowance for 15 wide-beam boats of 2.15 metres or more. Only limited areas of the Cam are suitable for the mooring of boats of this size.

Over the course of the last two decades, the city has seen a gradual increase in the number of boatowners wishing to live permanently on the River Cam and the number of visitors spending time on the city's waterways. A change in mooring management policy in the 1990s gave rise to additional opportunities for residential mooring at Midsummer Common, Stourbridge Common and Jesus Green. Current mooring sites are shown on the Council's Boat Mooring Map (available via Google on the Council's website).

Existing areas for permanent residential moorings include Area B where mooring is permitted for 75 metres on Jubilee Gardens upstream of the weir; Area D2 adjacent to Jesus Green, Areas E1, G and H adjacent to Midsummer Common; and Areas K2 and M adjacent to Stourbridge Common.

Visitors wishing to moor a boat in Cambridge are subject to a maximum 48-hour stay, and are not permitted to return within seven days of leaving. Areas for visitor

moorings are marked with green markers and lines on the Council's Boat Mooring Map. These areas include Area C adjacent to Chesterton Road and Area E2 adjacent to Midsummer Common, outside the Fort St George public house.

Areas for temporary mooring are marked with yellow markers and lines on the Council's Boat Mooring Map. These areas include Area D1 where temporary mooring is permitted for up to two hours from 10am to 4pm upstream of the pump out, and Area K1 where temporary mooring is permitted for up to two hours from 8am to 6pm upstream of the pump out.

Areas where no mooring is permitted are marked with red markers and lines on the Council's Boat Mooring Map. These areas include Area A where no mooring is permitted upstream of the lock and includes 36 metres downstream of the lock. Visiting punts can stay for up to one hour. In Areas F, J, L and N, no mooring is permitted at all.

New residential moorings require planning permission and need access to adequate services including water supply, electricity, and disposal facilities for sewage and rubbish. Access is also required for emergency vehicles. New moorings should not have a negative impact on the amenity, conservation and ecological value of the river. Mooring facilities are defined as either on-line or off-line. On-line moorings are often merely linear moorings along the riverbank itself, whilst off-line moorings involve boats navigating into a separate engineered basin or larger marina separate from the river.

The majority of respondents supported the need to have a policy on provision of residential moorings and identify areas for new moorings, despite having concerns about the reality of their development and potential for knock-on impacts in a given area. Reference was made to off-line moorings in the form of marina provision. Concern was raised that any mooring provided within the city boundary with should have standards enforced, equivalent to those which would be required of land dwellings. For example, coal and diesel should not be burned emitting fumes at one to two metres in height.

Whilst there is demand for new residential and visitor moorings within Cambridge, it is recognised that there is limited suitable space available in the city. In addition to the need to continue to balance the needs of the long-term residential moorings against those of the short-term visitor moorings, which can support tourism in Cambridge, there is a balance to be struck between maintaining and increasing the number of areas available for residential and visitor moorings and the needs of other users of the river, including commercial operators, anglers, rowers and rowing clubs and other local residents. Notwithstanding the needs of other users of the river, other key issues for the provision of new residential moorings include the need to consider the potential impact on the river itself and the surrounding landscape/townscape; parking levels in the surrounding area; the amenity of other local residents. It is considered that the development of a criteria-based policy for residential moorings would address the potential to deliver further moorings whilst

recognising the need to maintain the quality of the riparian environment and safeguard local amenity. Such a criteria based approach would include reference to the following issues:

- Integration with the local landscape/townscape;
- Provision of appropriate servicing, e.g. water supply and disposal of sewage and refuse;
- Provision of appropriate pedestrian and vehicular access;
- Protection of the surrounding natural and historic environment;
- Proximity to existing services and amenities;
- Safeguarding of local amenity with no adverse effect on neighbouring properties;
- Protection of pedestrian and cycle routes and ongoing navigation of the River Cam.

Many of the sites identified for residential moorings during consultation are not situated within Cambridge's administrative boundary. As such, these sites cannot be allocated for residential moorings provision by Cambridge City Council. Sites put forward in South Cambridgeshire include:

- Fen Ditton;
- Land to the west of the River Cam off Fen Road;
- Land to the south-east of Clayhithe Bridge, Waterbeach.

Within Cambridge's administrative boundary, two sites were put forward for further consideration:

- North side of the River Cam, near Fen Road;
- Further mooring on the south side of the river on Stourbridge Common.

A site of 0.98ha on the northern bank of the River Cam, lying south-east of Fen Road, was allocated in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 for off-river moorings. This site is owned by the Conservators of the River Cam and has not come forward for development since 2006. This site has been consulted on as part of the Issues and Options 2 consultation (Site reference RM1 – Fen Road) for allocation as off-river moorings and lies directly adjacent to Option CF1 – Residential Mooring at Fen Road in South Cambridgeshire's Issues and Options 2, Part 2 consultation.

The provision of further moorings on the southern side of the River Cam at Stourbridge Common was also considered in drawing up sites for consultation as a part of Issues and Options 2 consultation. Officers responsible for managing moorings within the city confirmed that all possible mooring areas are already in use in this location. Further moorings may impact negatively upon the navigation of the river and its heavy recreational use. Consultation on the management of moorings on nearby Riverside is scheduled to take place in the near future, which may impact on the number of moorings available within the city.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue a criteria-based policy for residential moorings, which would include criteria suitable for development management use for both on-line and off-line moorings.

APPENDIX B - ANALYSIS, RESPONSES AND PREFERRED APPROACH TO HOUSING PLUS SUMMARIES OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.21

11416 Object

Summary:

The UK already has a very high share of social rental stock as a % of both total rental stock and total housing stock relative to other European countries and it doesn't seem to be doing the trick (in fact, it probably contributes to difficult housing market). But this is almost too difficult a debate to have at the City level.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 97 - Specified tenure mix

15883 Object

Summary:

It is not considered that a prescribed tenure mix would be appropriate, as this would place added constraints on the market. Any policy should be flexible enough to respond to site specific circumstances (for example, exceptional costs of development). The demand for private rented accommodation in Cambridge is thought to be increasing and this could form part of the solution to meeting Cambridge's affordable housing requirements. Land at Coldham's Lane, Cherry Hinton is available, suitable and deliverable as a new residential development. The proposed remediation strategy and the implementation of a new area of Strategic Open Space could impact upon the viability of the scheme. The policy should recognise the wider regeneration benefits of development and be applied on a flexible basis.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 97 - Specified tenure mix

17442 Support

Summary:

Affordable %s - The policy supporting a minimum of 75% of the 40% to be housing for rent should be retained

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 98 - Tenure mix

13936 Support

Summary:

Tenure mix should not be set out in the Local Plan since flexibility is required to take account of changes in housing requirements and also other factors such as funding provision and Central Government specifications.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.9

9199 Support

Summary:

Perhaps there could also be an overall quota for new student rooms, so they do not substantially reduce the figures arrived at in Options 2 to 5.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.9

17936 Object

Summary:

Yes - The University should consider more cost effective options to house their students, or look to substantially improve the current accommodation so it is more environmentally friendly.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

7691 Support

Summary:

I think there is a need for a policy, but that the 75%/25% mix is not right. More like 50/50 -- the ratio is very important to make it work.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

8109 Support**Summary:**

Policy desirable

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

9471 Support**Summary:**

We agree with this and therefore it is important to look beyond the city boundaries for housing.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

12031 Support**Summary:**

Yes, policy needed

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

13160 Object**Summary:**

There is no need for a policy addressing this issue. A fixed tenure mix does not allow for flexibility within new developments - to respond to site-specific demands and deliver a sustainable mix and tenure of residential uses, creating a mixed and balanced community.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

13285 Object**Summary:**

At present, the Council's Local Plan does not specify a tenure mix for new housing development which our client supports as being the most suitable option for moving forward to allow for full flexibility taking into account the individual circumstances of sites, their surrounding area and local housing needs, and their development viability. This would ensure that the Council complies with NPPF paragraph 21 which states that investment in business should not be overburdened by the combined requirements of planning policy expectations.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

15264 Object**Summary:**

Tenure mix is a nice idea but rent is only part of the equation. Council tax levels vary according to the sale value of properties in any location so a dwelling that would be band B in Arbury or Kings Hedges will be in a higher band up to Band F elsewhere for the same specification

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

15731 Support**Summary:**

We support a policy of both tenure mix and housing mix, in order to provide a variety of housing choice. Any policy would need to be flexible and capable of adjusting to other demands over the plan period. There is no point building homes that cannot be sold or let.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

17937 Support

Summary:

Yes - Option 98 which is the current policy

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

18230 Object

Summary:

We do not feel that there is a need for a new policy addressing this issue, and would support Option 98. Rather, it is better to keep this out of actual policy as it would be too prescriptive and not flexible enough.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

18314 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.11

12032 Object

Summary:

All housing needs to be affordable whether it is owned or not owned by the occupier. The relationship between tenure type and housing demand needs a greater range of ways of living. But all the forces on the economy and environment of Cambridge are complex and a fixed plan to last until 2031 will challenge its effectiveness.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.11

13164 Support

Summary:

Option 98 allows for future flexibility to respond to site-specific development needs.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.11

15735 Support

Summary:

The policy should be able to respond to the needs of particular areas where demand may well differ. The need in East Chesterton is to respond to the demand for market and affordable housing which will provide for existing families and developers should be discouraged from aiming to build expensive homes for wealthy incomers or an overreliance on one and two bed properties. Tenure and housing mix should contribute to the overall social and community character of the area.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.11

17938 Support

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.11

18315 Object

Summary:

All housing needs to be affordable whether it is owned or not owned by the occupier. The relationship between tenure type and housing demand needs a greater range of ways of living. But all the forces on the economy and environment of Cambridge are complex and a fixed plan to last until 2031 will challenge its effectiveness.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.12

8110 Support

Summary:

Support 98 as greater flexibility

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.12

9200 Support

Summary:

Option 98 - retains flexibility

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.12

9472 Support

Summary:

Option 98

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.12

12035 Support

Summary:

Option 98 - specified through the SHMA

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.12

14099 Support

Summary:

Option 98

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.12

17939 Support

Summary:

Option 98 which is the current policy in place.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.12

18316 Support

Summary:

Option 98 - specified through the SHMA

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.25

12548 Support**Summary:**

I think that this would potentially prevent Cambridge encouraging out-commuting and becoming a commuter town but the purchase and construction of housing must be seen to be at normal market rates - anything less would be challenged legally?

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 99 - Employment related housing

10426 Object**Summary:**

What happens when a person in employment related housing ceases to be employed in the qualifying posts? This just leads to difficulties and distress. Remember farm labourers cottages.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 99 - Employment related housing

12470 Support**Summary:**

This will go some way to preventing new housing simply being taken by London commuters.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 99 - Employment related housing

12553 Support**Summary:**

I broadly support this but it must be looked into very carefully - some of the emerging issues with the University's North West Cambridge site that are now surfacing (resentment about affordable housing etc) could surface again - but it would help encourage local working and reduce commuting.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 99 - Employment related housing

13001 Object**Summary:**

I don't agree with the idea of employment-related housing - most people want to live some distance from their employers, or at least don't want to be 'owned' by them; and in any case, people do not want to live next door to the people they work with (they probably see enough of them at work!). I also worry that changing key worker definitions could cause problems (everyone's jobs are important and everyone contributes to the economy in some way). Also, why is the 'high tech' economy specified as the area towards which an eligible business would have to contribute?

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 99 - Employment related housing

13907 Object**Summary:**

I strongly oppose this proposed policy. I think it would be divisive and split the city. Employers will gain too much power over too wider an aspect of the lives of their staff, to the detriment of those staff members' freedom.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 99 - Employment related housing

13940 Object

Summary:

There is clearly a need for affordable housing provision, given the extent of demand within the Cambridge area. However, at this stage there remains insufficient information and evidence that there are locally specific circumstances to require the delivery of affordable housing as a result of employment development.

The most appropriate way to address the need for affordable housing in Cambridge is to ensure that the new Local Plan provides sufficient housing to address this issue.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 99 - Employment related housing

15265 Support

Summary:

Specifying who should occupy particular housing should be avoided but there may be some cases where a 'tied cottage' is appropriate.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 99 - Employment related housing

16530 Object

Summary:

Would this requirement restrict the freedom of employers or institutions to provide for their own employees?

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 99 - Employment related housing

16902 Support

Summary:

This policy would complement that above (option 91) in requiring large local employers to secure housing for key workers, and we support it. We also believe that it might encourage larger firms to consider locations other than the city centre as well as their responsibility to the local economy.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.13

12025 Object

Summary:

Yes. Produce a framework and not a plan. Employment and housing need is in a constant state of flux. Monitoring and responding over much shorter time cycles than fixing it until 2031 would be a more robust approach.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.13

18231 Object

Summary:

A suggestion would be to tie in key workers to housing associations.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.13

18317 Object

Summary:

Yes. Produce a framework and not a plan. Employment and housing need is in a constant state of flux. Monitoring and responding over much shorter time cycles than fixing it until 2031 would be a more robust approach.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

7001 Support

Summary:

Yes, there is a need for such a policy - and I would support the policy entitled Option 99.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

9474 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

10726 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

11238 Support

Summary:

We would support such a policy framework as suggested by Option 99 and will expect further consultation with the City Council on this particular issue.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

12044 Support

Summary:

Yes, policy needed.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

12138 Support

Summary:

The University would support a policy encouraging the provision of key worker housing for specific institutions in Cambridge - which should include the University and Colleges as major employers within key employment sectors in the City.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

13003 Object

Summary:

No, I do not believe we need a policy on this.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

14104 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

14388 Support**Summary:**

There are a large number of low-paid key workers who cannot afford to live in Cambridge at the moment. As local transport gets worse (cutting of bus services to the villages) this becomes even more important.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

15740 Object**Summary:**

Option 99 in principal is sensible but would need to contain safeguards to ensure that there is provision for a full range of employees. North west Cambridge for example excludes most low paid workers from the planned university housing and this may well create an enclave which is not beneficial to the City or to a diverse and cohesive community.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

16186 Object**Summary:**

There should be no policy requiring employment development to provide key worker housing.

Having to provide key worker housing will be a disincentive to economic development and growth.

If such a policy is adopted there are very real concerns that businesses will be dissuaded from locating in Cambridge and may look to invest elsewhere, even outside of the UK. If this policy was allowed to develop and therefore to 'bite' on this and other employment sites it might very well deter new business investment into Cambridge and even existing employers from expanding their sites within Cambridge

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

16532 Support**Summary:**

Yes.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

16832 Support**Summary:**

Yes, employers should be required to provide some accommodation for workers by funding and working with registered housing providers. Romsey badly needs affordable three bedroom family houses and properties for the over 60s so that people can move on as they get older. This will help to make the area sustainable. Too much student housing has been built in Romsey since the last local plan.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

16885 Support**Summary:**

There are many areas of the workforce that are essential to the proper operation of the city and as such a policy should be used in seeking to provide affordable accommodation for those workers when and where it is needed.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

17445 Support

Summary:

Key worker housing - this policy should be secondary to enforcing requirements for affordable housing, so that lower paid workers who need affordable local rental accommodation are better protected.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

17940 Support

Summary:

Yes - as suggested.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

18232 Support

Summary:

It would seem sensible in Cambridge with regard to large employers such as the University and Addenbrooke's to adopt a policy such as Option 99.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

18318 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

7761 Support

Summary:

May need to specify key worker housing but have an option for opening up to a wider audience after a certain period if not taken up. Key workers are only a tiny proportion of those in housing need.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

9201 Support

Summary:

Should be restricted to those on nationally-agreed salary scales in either higher education, the NHS or the emergency services. Other employees, including the County Council for schools, and both City and County Councils and locally-based central government bodies for their own staff, should have to pay realistic wages and salaries to allow their employees to purchase or rent in the market and to live relatively close to their work.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

12057 Object

Summary:

The North West urban extension will be a good extension to employment led housing. However, we think it was a mistake to allow the University to completely remove the percentage requirement for affordable dwellings. Visiting scholars is not affordable housing; their need should have been taken from the general housing stock not as a substitute for affordable housing. This could have been a valuable contribution to the city's housing need, but it has pushed its burden to other places in the city and compounding the debate as to what is the appropriate percentage of affordable housing in general.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

12850 Object (W/drawn 2012-07-27)

Summary:

It is good that the universities, colleges and other employers are thinking of providing housing for their staff. But it should be noted that although we want to reduce transport costs and travel-to-work time, most people would not actually want to live on the same site as where they work - I believe this is especially true for those who work with children and youngsters. Therefore I would not wish to see staff accommodation being built on-site by any employers in Cambridge - any agreed employment-related accommodation should be elsewhere in Cambridge.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

13002 Object

Summary:

I don't agree with the idea of employment-related housing - most people want to live some distance from their employers, or at least don't want to be 'owned' by them; and in any case, people do not really want to live next door to the people they work with (they probably see enough of them at work!). I also worry that changing key worker definitions could cause problems (everyone's jobs are important and everyone contributes to the economy in some way). Also, why is the 'high tech' economy specified as the area towards which an eligible business would have to contribute?

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

13004 Object

Summary:

It is admirable that the universities, colleges and other employers are thinking of providing housing for their staff. But it should be noted that although we want to reduce transport costs and travel-to-work time, most people would not actually want to live on the same site as where they work; and even if some distance away, they may not want to be 'owned' by their employers. Indeed, I think many people would probably not want to live next to the people they work with. I do not think employment related housing is a good idea.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

14390 Support

Summary:

When considering the University of Cambridge, College employees should not be omitted from this category of key workers.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

16886 Object

Summary:

Land values may well dictate that such proposals do not come forward. We could suggest that this policy is taken a step further to require that a percentage of the overall affordable housing arising from a development, is given over to key workers and that University and College workers should be identified on the list of key workers eligible for affordable housing.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

17599 Object

Summary:

Once a proper analysis is made of WHO is living in Cambridge, then I agree that people who are working in Cambridge and, particularly those on low incomes associated with certain public sector jobs, should be given priority to newly built housing.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

17941 Support

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

18319 Object**Summary:**

It is inconceivable to think there is any other type. All housing that is not employment related, but is still needed, is either philanthropic or for economic stability (ie. key worker).

The North West urban extension currently being planned by The University will be a good extension to employment led housing. However, it is unfortunate that The University has been allowed by CCC to completely remove the percentage requirement for affordable dwellings; visiting scholars is not affordable housing. This could have been a valuable contribution to the city's housing need, but it has pushed its burden to other places in the city and compounding the debate as to what is the appropriate percentage of affordable housing in general.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.28

9481 Object**Summary:**

Priority should be given to three bedroom homes for families. We believe that Cambridge already has far too many "luxury" (although small) one and two bedroom apartments. We support development of UNIVERSITY student accommodation as it can release houses for family occupation. We also support the development of high quality, reasonably sized apartments for the elderly, such as the new development by Abbeyfield at Girton, as we believe they would also release existing family houses onto the market.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.28

11055 Support**Summary:**

A mixture is desirable, though I have no views on the precise way this is achieved.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 100 - Housing mix - general policy

6933 Support**Summary:**

Qualified support: it should not stop the development of symmetrical terraces and squares in a mix of tenures.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 100 - Housing mix - general policy

7692 Object**Summary:**

Again, housing mix is very important and very healthy for a city.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 100 - Housing mix - general policy

10986 Support**Summary:**

Bidwells supports the inclusion of Option 100 over Option 101, as it would allow local circumstances, needs and the housing market to determine the appropriate mix on each site, which would more successfully encourage mixed and balanced communities than Option 101, which would prevent flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 100 - Housing mix - general policy

12474 Support

Summary:

Mixed housing where appropriate, rather than a mandatory requirement. It avoids over-rigidity.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 100 - Housing mix - general policy

12562 Object

Summary:

For either policy that is adopted, I would argue that a strong vision for an area is developed in close consultation with the residents so that developers are not left to decide upon the layout, which will invariably be dense and tall.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 100 - Housing mix - general policy

13952 Support

Summary:

The Consortium supports the inclusion of Option 100 over Option 101, as it would allow local circumstances, need and the housing market to determine the appropriate housing mix on a development. Option 100 would successfully encourage a mixed and balanced community when compared to Option 101.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 100 - Housing mix - general policy

14102 Support

Summary:

support

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 100 - Housing mix - general policy

14230 Support

Summary:

Conditional support. Controls should ensure that mixed housing requirements do not lead to very high density and very tall buildings. This could be a danger when the developer is seeking to maximise profits out of the site.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 101 - Housing mix - specific levels policy

6934 Object

Summary:

This would undoubtedly lead to poor design.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 101 - Housing mix - specific levels policy

9951 Support

Summary:

I think we need to encourage 3 bed or more dwellings for families who have not been catered for in many recent developments.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 101 - Housing mix - specific levels policy

10620 Support

Summary:

There is a need for three bedroom family houses and for bungalows for the elderly, many of whom do not like lifts. Both housing types missing from much new development, and makes it difficult for communities to remain 'balanced'.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 101 - Housing mix - specific levels policy

10991 Object

Summary:

Bidwells supports the inclusion of Option 100 over Option 101, as it would allow local circumstances, needs and the housing market to determine the appropriate mix on each site, which would more successfully encourage mixed and balanced communities than Option 101, which would prevent flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 101 - Housing mix - specific levels policy

11619 Support

Summary:

Several new housing development mainly offer 1 to 2 bedrooms, targeted at the buy to let market. This does not help to create communities and does not allow families to settle in the city. This policy should help to revert this. However not only number of bedrooms should be specified, also the minimal sizes for a 3 bedroom house and a bedroom. On the continent we call a bedroom < 5m2 a cupboard

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 101 - Housing mix - specific levels policy

12563 Object

Summary:

For either policy that is adopted, I would argue that a strong vision for an area is developed in close consultation with the residents so that developers are not left to decide upon the layout, which will invariably be dense and tall.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 101 - Housing mix - specific levels policy

12990 Object

Summary:

It's good to have mixed and balanced communities where possible, though we also need to make sure the housing provided meets what is needed. Housing co-operatives generally provide mixed and balanced communities and I would like the Council to explore the options for how and where these could be developed in Cambridge. There are also some housing co-ops for older people and we could also look at building one of these in Cambridge (it could, for example, provide two-bedroom bungalows - allowing for a carer to move in, or family to visit etc). Co-ops also help people retain their independence.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 101 - Housing mix - specific levels policy

13957 Object

Summary:

The Consortium supports the inclusion of Option 100 over Option 101, as it would allow local circumstances, need and the housing market to determine the appropriate housing mix on a development. Option 100 would successfully encourage a mixed and balanced community when compared to Option 101. It is considered that Option 101 would prevent flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 101 - Housing mix - specific levels policy

14243 Support

Summary:

Conditional support. Controls should ensure that mixed housing requirements do not lead to very high density and very tall buildings. This could be a danger when the developer is seeking to maximise profits out of the site.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

8111 Support

Summary:

Need policy.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

9484 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

10727 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

11240 Support

Summary:

We consider that the character of the area, the character of the site itself, the market and the SHMA are critical issues and consider that the approach is basically to continue to use policy 5/10 within the local plan.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

11250 Object

Summary:

The types of accommodation to be provided on sites will vary dependent upon location. We consider it would be preferable to retain flexibility in relation to the types of provision on sites. Sites in the city centre, for example, are likely to be delivered at higher densities in accordance with the character of the area and more likely to see a higher level of apartments, whilst sites on the edge of the urban area may be at lower density and hence include a greater proportion of family homes housing.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

12064 Support

Summary:

Yes, policy needed

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

12092 Support

Summary:

Yes to having a policy.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

13168 Support

Summary:

The University supports a general policy for addressing this issue. The development of a general flexible mix of dwelling sizes and types is important to allow a range and to ensure good design quality can be delivered.

The mix in each particular development should be determined at the time of planning permission, by responding to market demands, housing need, development costs and viability, and the achievement of mixed and balanced communities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

14106 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

15266 Support

Summary:

I support the general policy that there should be a housing mix. Being prescriptive is unlikely to be successful as circumstances can change dramatically between the initial planning stage and actual delivery. The Vie development is an example of a development based mainly on large town houses with some smaller houses and flats that was faced with a town house market at saturation when it came to be built and most of the proposed terraces became blocks of flats. Arguably a better result for the City in terms of the number of units and the final mix.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

16534 Support

Summary:

Yes.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

17446 Support

Summary:

Housing mix - this should ensure adequate home sizes, including sufficient 3 bed+ homes, and provision of spare rooms like much other accommodation in the city already has, and not the bare minimum. Additional rooms are also needed so families can grow, particularly as newly built homes are not built with a view to further extension

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

17942 Support

Summary:

Yes - very important to ensure the mix is correct.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

18234 Support

Summary:

Yes there is a need for a policy addressing this issue.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

18320 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

8113 Support

Summary:

Support 101. Would want the majority of homes to be 3 bedroomed (a few more) homes for families. Cambridge already has a large number of one and two bedroomed apartments which are often marketed to encourage 'commuter' occupation. Whilst acknowledging that Cambridge is an attractive place to live for those who work in London, I believe that our first duty is towards those with young families whose work is within the city.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

9202 Support

Summary:

Keep the flexibility of Option 100, but consider Option 101 on larger developments (100 or more dwellings) to require more homes with 3+ bedrooms than at present.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

9485 Support

Summary:

Option 100

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

10729 Support

Summary:

Option 100

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

12077 Object

Summary:

Probably option 100 is preferred to give flexibility. However the more specific Option 101 could be adopted as guidelines rather than policy. This would allow the guidelines to be modified when local demand called for a change. While guidelines may not have the force of policy, we might get the best of both worlds.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

12384 Support

Summary:

Option 101 to apply in all areas. In particular, it is important to allow families to live in the town centre. The current mix is a design for "yuppies".

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

13172 Support

Summary:

The University supports Option 100, a general flexible mix of dwelling sizes and types is important to allow a range and to ensure good design quality can be delivered. The mix in each particular development should be determined at the time of planning permission, reflecting market demands, housing need, development costs and viability, and the achievement of mixed and balanced communities. A specific mix does not afford the level of flexibility that is required.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

13300 Support

Summary:

Our client would encourage the Council to continue with the approach set out in Option 100 which allows for a level of flexibility dependent on the individual circumstances of sites, their surrounding area and local housing needs, and their development viability. As above, this would ensure that the Council complies with NPPF paragraph 21 which states that investment in business should not be over-burdened by the combined requirements of planning policy expectations.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

14110 Support

Summary:

Option 100.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

16536 Support

Summary:

Option 100.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

16752 Support

Summary:

The requirement for developers to provide a large proportion of affordable housing would appear to be a recipe for too high density and too tall buildings on a site. Any policy should be tight enough to ensure that this does not happen, and, possibly, not to require the percentage of affordable housing where this danger is high

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

16835 Support

Summary:

Option 100 is preferred, and Policy 5/10 should be retained and strengthened, so that developers do not bring forward schemes with an inappropriate mix of units, for example at Cromwell Road 90% of the 124 units included 1 & 2 bed flats. This does not create mixed or cohesive communities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

17943 Support

Summary:

Option 101 - Housing mix - Specific levels policy

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

18235 Object

Summary:

It is difficult to choose either policy 100 or 101 to suit all cases. Relying on good design at the moment as Option 100 assumes, is not always going to create a mixed community where a developer is guided by market advice on dwelling size. However, although it would be useful to have some clear steer on market housing provision, option 101 would be too prescriptive on every site.

Preferring some action rather than leaving as is, Option 101 would be preferable.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

18321 Support

Summary:

Option 100

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.19

11802 Support

Summary:

Mixed housing developments must not lead to high density or over tall buildings. This leads to no-go estates.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.19

12636 Object

Summary:

Mixed and balanced communities are of course good, but we need to make sure we build the kind of properties that people actually need (rather than focus on mixed communities). One bedroom (and one-person) properties should have a minimum bedroom size of 12 sq m (in line with HCA recommendations - see Local Plan, Appendix D).

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.19

13914 Support

Summary:

I think its important to stress that control over the housing mix, is one way we can through the planning system influence the value, and therefore affordability, of homes built. This is a key lever to use to ensure affordable housing is provided, not just what is most profitable for developers.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.19

14113 Support

Summary:

Why is there such a fixation with the number of bedrooms? I suggest that, rather than focus on bedrooms, the council instead organise properties in terms of square feet. This would be a much better reflection of the property and would also pave the way towards ensuring Cambridge has an appropriate number of adaptable properties (e.g. a four bedroom house that could be adapted into two, two-bedroom flats and then back again, for example)

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.19

16537 Support

Summary:

Perhaps stress the need for more family housing, as well as for the elderly.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.19

17944 Support

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.19

18236 Object

Summary:

We would like to emphasise that occupancy levels are more important.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.19

18322 Object

Summary:

The UK has in recent years had one of the worst space standings compared to other countries. Policies in this area will be good such as in the London Plan.

However, building consumer awareness about the space they are buying (and specification in general) should also be considered. Developers like an ill-informed customer with a low design awareness. This should be challenged somehow.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.20

9203 Support

Summary:

Keep the flexibility of Option 100, but consider Option 101 on larger developments (100 or more dwellings) to require more homes with 3+ bedrooms than at present.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.20

12994 Object

Summary:

It's good to have mixed and balanced communities where possible, though we must also make sure housing provided meets what is needed. In Romsey and Petersfield I feel we don't need any more shared housing - rather we need one-bedroom flats for singles, flats/small houses for couples and larger properties for families. Housing co-operatives generally provide mixed and balanced communities and I would also like the Council to explore the options for how and where these could be developed in Cambridge (including the possibility of an older persons housing co-operative).

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.20

17945 Support

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.20

18269 Object

Summary:

Although a mix of accommodation types exists within the area, a large proportion is for students who live within their own campuses, and only a small proportion is for family use. Two features of the subject of housing merit attention:

-a- meetings are held between student representatives and councillors so it is assumed that any issues and options for the Local Plan are being submitted separately.

-b- several older properties accommodate students over shops in King Street. Bearing in mind the need for larger family accommodation rather than single bed-sits the opportunity exists here for more flexible conversion into flats for families. This should be considered as an option.

18323 Object

Summary:

Yes, greater awareness building.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.53

11425 Support**Summary:**

This is a very good idea with an aging population.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 111 - Lifetime homes standard applied to all new development

11015 Object**Summary:**

Bidwells objects to Options 111 and 113 as imposing a requirement for 100% Lifetime Homes and a proportion of housing to meet Wheelchair Housing Design Standards as this would result in an unnecessarily adverse impact on the viability of the development, and would increase the challenge of successfully developing constrained sites. The requirement for Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Housing Design Standards should reflect local needs and the characteristics of a site. Option 112 would be more appropriate, although additional flexibility should be incorporated to ensure that viability is not adversely affected, by including the wording "unless not viable".

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 111 - Lifetime homes standard applied to all new development

13968 Object**Summary:**

The Consortium objects to Option 111 since it imposes a requirement for 100% Lifetime Homes. This could result in an unnecessarily adverse impact on the viability of a development. The requirement for Lifetime Homes should reflect local needs and the characteristics of the site.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 111 - Lifetime homes standard applied to all new development

14024 Support**Summary:**

All new homes should be designed for safe and comfortable movement in and around them. If Cambridge were to adopt a Housing Design standard that required specific justification for raised thresholds, steps or narrow doorways, most of the Lifetime Homes criteria would become the norm, and people would not be excluded from parts of their own or their friends' houses by mobility problems.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 111 - Lifetime homes standard applied to all new development

15273 Support**Summary:**

Yes, definitely, nothing less should be acceptable.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 111 - Lifetime homes standard applied to all new development

16931 Support**Summary:**

We would support a policy to require new housing development to meet the lifetime homes standards even if the impact locally would be limited. Many residents would welcome the opportunity to move to homes readily adaptable to their changing circumstances and to have that option as part of a new development in the City would be valuable.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 112 - A proportion of new homes to meet lifetime homes standard

11018 Support**Summary:**

Bidwells objects to Options 111 and 113 as imposing a requirement for 100% Lifetime Homes and a proportion of housing to meet Wheelchair Housing Design Standards as this would result in an unnecessarily adverse impact on the viability of the development, and would increase the challenge of successfully developing constrained sites. The requirement for Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Housing Design Standards should reflect local needs and the characteristics of a site. Option 112 would be more appropriate, although additional flexibility should be incorporated to ensure that viability is not adversely affected, by including the wording "unless not viable".

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 112 - A proportion of new homes to meet lifetime homes standard
--	---

13438 Support

Summary:

Agree that a proportion of new homes should be built to Lifetime homes standards and a proportion of new homes should be suitable to be adaptable for wheelchair occupants. In order to ensure development is not hindered and the Council's LDF is in compliance with NPPF paragraph 21, we consider that Option 112 is a reasonable approach.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 112 - A proportion of new homes to meet lifetime homes standard
--	---

13971 Object

Summary:

While Option 112 is considered to be more appropriate than Option 111, flexibility should be incorporated to ensure that viability is not adversely affected in providing Lifetime Homes on developments.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 112 - A proportion of new homes to meet lifetime homes standard
--	---

15274 Object

Summary:

No, all new housing should be built to this standard.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 113 - A proportion of new homes that meet the Wheelchair Housing Design Standard
--	--

8897 Support

Summary:

Given the changing demographics and health needs, and the move to enable people to continue to live independently in their own homes, we should aspire to design homes that are as flexible as possible. In the longer term this is likely to represent better value for money and provide a better outcome for residents.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 113 - A proportion of new homes that meet the Wheelchair Housing Design Standard
--	--

9956 Support

Summary:

There are increasing numbers of disabled and elderly people.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 113 - A proportion of new homes that meet the Wheelchair Housing Design Standard
--	--

11020 Object

Summary:

Bidwells objects to Options 111 and 113 as imposing a requirement for 100% Lifetime Homes and a proportion of housing to meet Wheelchair Housing Design Standards as this would result in an unnecessarily adverse impact on the viability of the development, and would increase the challenge of successfully developing constrained sites. The requirement for Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Housing Design Standards should reflect local needs and the characteristics of a site. Option 112 would be more appropriate, although additional flexibility should be incorporated to ensure that viability is not adversely affected, by including the wording "unless not viable".

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 113 - A proportion of new homes that meet the Wheelchair Housing Design Standard
--	--

13447 Object

Summary:

Partly agree with option 113. We agree with the Council that policies providing adaptable housing to suit the needs of wheelchair users 'could be overtly prescriptive and not viable in certain circumstances' and therefore flexibility should be written into any policy.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 113 - A proportion of new homes that meet the Wheelchair Housing Design Standard

15275 Object

Summary:

No. You can go from fit to wheel-chair bound in a second. To then find you have to leave home because you cannot get into it should not be necessary.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.29

7118 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.29

7205 Support

Summary:

We consider that all new homes should include the provisions shown in http://www.lifetimehomes.org.uk/data/files/For_Professionals/lthdiagram.pdf
According to <http://www.lifetimehomes.org.uk/pages/costs.html> the costs of these are modest.
This will have the incidental effect of slightly increasing the minimum area of the homes. As homes in the UK are said to be the least spacious in Europe, the small increase in cost will also benefit everybody.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.29

8481 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.29

9507 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.29

12177 Support

Summary:

Yes, policy needed

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.29

14126 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.29

15438 Support

Summary:

Yes, there is a need for a policy.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.29

16546 Support

Summary:

Yes.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.29

17954 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.29

18246 Support

Summary:

There is a need for a policy addressing this issue.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.29

18332 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.29

18442 Object

Summary:

Option 111 to 113 suggest varying approaches to developing a policy requiring new housing to meet lifetime homes standard. Of the Options given, the County Council would support 112, as the percentage of new housing built to this standard could be varied and is less likely to undermine viability. Further consideration should be given to the possibility of modifying the policy to embrace the existing built environment, for example through redevelopment schemes. The comments made under Chapters 2 and 3 relating to an ageing population should also be brought into any explanatory text.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

7005 Support

Summary:

With an aging population there probably is a need for such a policy, and Option 113 seems most suitable.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

7119 Support

Summary:

I prefer Option 111

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

7206 Object

Summary:

It is not sufficient to require that only some fraction of new homes include these provisions. The object is to ensure that, when people become frail or are suddenly disabled, they can stay in their own homes for as long as possible. Therefore all new homes should include the provisions.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

8482 Support

Summary:

Option 113

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

9210 Support

Summary:

Option 112, possibly with further element of Option 113. Option 111 would add unnecessarily to the costs of construction and hence to the purchase or rental costs which are already high in the city.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

9509 Support

Summary:

Option 113

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

10735 Support

Summary:

Option 112

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

11439 Support

Summary:

Option 111

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

12194 Object

Summary:

Probably a combination of 112 and 113, say 10% wheelchair housing design standard and a further 15% to Lifetimes Home standard. This would improve our performance on this issue (an important one given our ageing population and historical failure to anywhere near meet the needs of the disabled), while not imposing too high a standard for developers.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

12762 Support**Summary:**

I think it's a good idea to make all (or almost all) new affordable housing meet the lifetime homes standard. As Option 111 points out "This option would help in providing flexible and adaptable housing to suit a range of needs and changing circumstances for all". This would mean people would be less likely to need to move if their circumstances change - this does (and rightly should) apply to people of all ages.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

14125 Support**Summary:**

Option 112

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

15440 Support**Summary:**

Option 113. Good quality housing should be readily available to all, including people in wheelchairs or otherwise having reduced mobility.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

15841 Support**Summary:**

We think that there is clearly a case for providing Lifetime Homes and all new development should be built to this standard (Option 111)

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

16548 Support**Summary:**

Option 113 preferred.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

17456 Support**Summary:**

Options 112 and 113 are both supported, and the current % on 112 increased

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

17955 Support**Summary:**

Option 111 - This provides vision for the future generations, so many houses do not have the versatile arrangements to accommodate the elderly or individuals that are disabled. Putting this in place now, will reduce future conversion costs.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

18247 Object

Summary:

We would want this standard to be modified, so that the expensive, onerous work to allow for a future lift is not always required. Housing providers rarely revisit to retrofit these lifts, but the expense at the outset is considerable to provide for the possibility. With this in mind, Option 112 would ensure some provision of Lifetime Homes in market housing.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

18333 Support

Summary:

Options 112 and 113

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

18443 Support

Summary:

Option 111 to 113 suggest varying approaches to developing a policy requiring new housing to meet lifetime homes standard. Of the Options given, the County Council would support 112, as the percentage of new housing built to this standard could be varied and is less likely to undermine viability. Further consideration should be given to the possibility of modifying the policy to embrace the existing built environment, for example through redevelopment schemes. The comments made under Chapters 2 and 3 relating to an ageing population should also be brought into any explanatory text.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.31

14210 Support

Summary:

Space needs are greater not only for physically disabled people but for people with other forms of disability eg learning disability, for example when they require a carer or carers all the time or for most of the time. Autistic people may not be able to go out very often because of the lack of adequate support and it has been known for some time that many disabled children (including autistic children) need extra room at home so that they can play.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.31

17956 Support

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.31

18334 Support

Summary:

This is a good criteria based assessment of housing. Perhaps the City should set mandatory assessment to be achieved as silver or gold.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.31

18444 Support

Summary:

Option 111 to 113 suggest varying approaches to developing a policy requiring new housing to meet lifetime homes standard. Of the Options given, the County Council would support 112, as the percentage of new housing built to this standard could be varied and is less likely to undermine viability. Further consideration should be given to the possibility of modifying the policy to embrace the existing built environment, for example through redevelopment schemes. The comments made under Chapters 2 and 3 relating to an ageing population should also be brought into any explanatory text.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.32

7179 Support**Summary:**

Fiscal incentives should be introduced to make attractive to many of those living in larger houses (e.g. single occupation of family homes) to downsize/smartsize, freeing up accommodation to those who have families.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.32

17957 Support**Summary:**

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.58

11441 Object**Summary:**

NOT supportive of grabbing gardens. We are a crowded city in a crowded country with not enough open, green space as it is. Gardens are proving to be an important wildlife refuge, as well.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.61

11442 Support**Summary:**

Yay for gardens.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.61

12391 Support**Summary:**

Developing gardens is inevitably on an ad-hoc basis and hence incoherent. It is usually opportunist and causes anger and inconvenience for neighbours. Proper planning control is required for back garden constructions of residential dwellings or offices.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.61

16550 Support**Summary:**

I agree with all these arguments against developing on gardens.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.61

17788 Support**Summary:**

We welcome recognition of the impacts and opportunities housing development can create for biodiversity and would look to relevant policies to seek to minimise impacts and maximise benefits for biodiversity where possible.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

6940 Support

Summary:

Good

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

7176 Object

Summary:

I consider gardens to be inner city Green Belt which should be preserved at all costs. This inner city Green Belt also provides habitats for bird and small mammal populations. Small scale development of gardens of existing properties will make a trivial contribution to Cambridge's housing needs and will lead to degradation of this inner city Green Belt and surrounding neighbourhoods and greatly increase housing density.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

7696 Support

Summary:

Only with high design standards!

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

9923 Object

Summary:

Gardens are a precious commodity- green lungs which if eroded by development will impact on the quality of our living environment. In some areas e.g. West Cambridge the large gardens are a defining quality of the Conservation Area. Would it not be better not to allow development unless certain criteria are met rather than permitting it subject to certain criteria.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

9957 Support

Summary:

This is a measured policy which does not restrict such development where appropriate.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

10292 Object

Summary:

gardens are a precious commodity- green lungs which if eroded by development will impact on the quality of our living environment. In some areas e.g. West Cambridge the large gardens are a defining quality of the Conservation Area. Would it not be better not to allow development unless certain criteria are met rather than permitting it subject to certain criteria. Option 115 preferable if a viable option?

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

11022 Support

Summary:

Bidwells supports Option 114 over Option 115, which does not provide sufficient flexibility to consider local circumstances for infill development in rear gardens. Option 114 provides adequate criteria to ensure such development is appropriate.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

12484 Support

Summary:

Qualified support with the proviso that the building of flats should be resisted - the Queen Edith way area has been damaged in this way. It should not happen that one day you have a family for neighbours and the next day fourteen (viz Wheatly Homes in QE Way).

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

12992 Object

Summary:

Cambridge will regret the loss of gardens. Family homes with gardens too valuable. Conservation areas need protecting.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

14864 Object

Summary:

The loss of amenity (loss of play area for children, loss of garden) coupled with the problems posed by flooding make this unwise, however many clauses are placed round it.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

15028 Support

Summary:

The provision of new additional residential units and replacement of aged substandard units should be encouraged within the city curtilage. It will:

- 1) Provide additional housing to meet some of the growth needed;
- 2) Provide a variety of designs enhancing the cities townscape;
- 3) Reduce the pressure to release Green Belt land.

Restrictions should not be over the top.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

15119 Support

Summary:

This is an area in which the city planners badly need clearer criteria. Agree that this is situation in which situations vary enormously, but some recent planning decisions on infilling in gardens defy understanding (viz 27 Madingley Road.) Agree not all infilling should be prohibited, but there should be clearer guidelines.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

16123 Object

Summary:

I object to garden grabbing because of the deterioration in quality of life that would be involved.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

6941 Object

Summary:

Bad

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

7177 Support

Summary:

I consider gardens to be inner city Green Belt which should be preserved at all costs. This inner city Green Belt also provides habitats for bird and small mammal populations. Small scale development of gardens of existing properties will make a trivial contribution to Cambridge's housing needs and will lead to degradation of this inner city Green Belt and surrounding neighbourhoods and greatly increase housing density.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

9582 Support

Summary:

Protection should be given to all gardens with mature trees. They should not be allowed to be cut down as the loss of biodiversity is massive.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

9925 Support

Summary:

If this can be achieved, if it has the effect of proving better protection. The way option 115 is presented appears virtually to rule it out for this local plan - is it genuinely offered as an option here? If not, then the alternative 114 might need to spell out more explicitly still what is meant by the prevailing character of a garden-rich area such as North Newnham (see the recent decision to refuse permission for an infill build on the Barton Road)

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

10301 Support

Summary:

if this can be achieved, if it has the effect of proving better protection. The way option 115 is presented appears virtually to rule it out for this local plan - is it genuinely offered as an option here? If not, then the alternative 114 might need to spell out more explicitly still what is meant by the prevailing character of a garden-rich area such as North Newnham (see the recent decision to refuse permission for an infill build on the Barton Road)

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

10822 Support

Summary:

Gardens are vital for wildlife and maintaining a liveable population density in urban / suburban areas.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

11025 Object

Summary:

Bidwells supports Option 114 over Option 115, which does not provide sufficient flexibility to consider local circumstances for infill development in rear gardens. Option 114 provides adequate criteria to ensure such development is appropriate.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens
--	---

11443 Support

Summary:

We need gardens in a crowded city in a crowded country where the green belt is being eaten away.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens
--	---

12603 Support

Summary:

Yes, I think this should be broadly discouraged in policy as it encourages loss of greenspace which is important for future occupiers, wildlife (gardens are now a major reservoir for the UK wildlife) and also for flood-prevention. It would also reduce the traffic generated by extra developments.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens
--	---

14865 Support

Summary:

Since flooding is now a problem in Cambridge, gardens, which allow water to drain away safely, need protection.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens
--	---

15277 Support

Summary:

There is now a presumption against this and we should recognise that gardens are an important part of the green infrastructure of Cambridge.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens
--	---

15369 Support

Summary:

Garden-grabbing often reduces materially the quality of life of residents in the vicinity as well as, in many instances, destroying the architectural integrity of a neighbourhood.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens
--	---

15500 Object

Summary:

We object to Option 115 for the reasons stated by the Council, i.e. that this does not result in a balanced approach, and simply having an overall embargo on infill development in rear gardens would have a serious potential impact on the overall housing supply of the City.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens
--	---

15815 Support

Summary:

Very specific local circumstances could be brought up to justify the approach. There could be provision for such building in exceptional circumstances but a general ban - presumption against. Cambridge's gardens are vitally important for quality of life and should be protected so the the city's great-great-grandchildren can still benefit from them, especially since current developments make scant provision. They contribute to quietness, foster wildlife, encourage physical activity, allow families to grow fruit and vegetables, benefit the soul. They are an asset we should not lightly undermine.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

16114 Support

Summary:

Support. No development in back gardens.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

16124 Support

Summary:

Support

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

16906 Support

Summary:

We would favour a tougher policy on infill development in rear gardens and would support a general presumption against such development. We would welcome nevertheless a standalone policy as proposed to allow small scale residential development on derelict sites or where existing buildings have been demolished or have no alternative use.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Question 9.33

8114 Support

Summary:

I support having a policy

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Question 9.33

8483 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Question 9.33

9510 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Question 9.33

9926 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

10307 Support

Summary:

Yes to protect residential gardens from development.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

10628 Support

Summary:

The Wildlife Trust supports the development of a policy, as gardens form an important part of the ecological network of Cambridge, and in some parts of the city are the dominant form of green space. As the climate warms the maintenance of undeveloped land will become much more important in reducing the urban heat island effect.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

10736 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

11518 Support

Summary:

Support

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

12146 Support

Summary:

A policy based on Option 114 and subject to the criteria identified would be supported.

Option 115 is not supported.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

12203 Support

Summary:

Yes, let's have a policy

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

12604 Support

Summary:

Agreed.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

12767 Support

Summary:

Yes - we need a policy restricting infill development in rear gardens.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

14130 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

15276 Support

Summary:

Yes there does need to be a policy but neither suggested policy is the best way forward. There should be a hierarchy to 'sites' based on back gardens. If the garden is too large then sub-division into garden and allotment should be the first consideration. If there is a general agreement in an area that their gardens are too large amalgamation to provide public open space or amenity, e.g. tennis courts, should be the next consideration. This would preserve the benefit of green space within the city without making demands on infrastructure.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

15837 Support

Summary:

While there is clearly scope for small-scale development on unused site, East Chesterton has suffered from some rear of garden development to its detriment. As stated earlier, the area is deficient in open space and recreation areas and gardens can provide much needed private amenity space. We would echo the points made in paragraph 9.61. We support the development of back gardens only in exceptional circumstances and where it does not detract from the urban grain of the area.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

16551 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

16697 Support

Summary:

Family homes and gardens should not be destroyed and replaced by flats!

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

16844 Support

Summary:

Yes there should be a policy on this issue.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

17958 Support

Summary:

Yes - most certainly

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

18248 Support

Summary:

A policy addressing this issue would be useful.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

18335 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

7006 Support

Summary:

Given that I do not believe that the population of Cambridge should be encouraged to increase, I would favour Option 115.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

8115 Support

Summary:

Support 114. The criteria are strict enough to allow only reasonable development. A blanket ban would seem to be over the top.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

8484 Support

Summary:

Option 114

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

9211 Support

Summary:

Option 114. Whilst Option 115 has attractions, especially in Conservation Areas, it might reduce the number of sites available to meet new housing construction targets.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

9499 Support**Summary:**

Option 114

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

9511 Support**Summary:**

Option 114 preferred by some of us and 115 by others.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

9928 Object**Summary:**

115 if it can be achieved. If not then 114 but need to spell out what is meant but the prevailing character of an area -rich area such as North Newnham (see recent decision to refuse permission for infill build on Barton Road)

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

10305 Support**Summary:**

114

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

10309 Object**Summary:**

115 if it can be achieved. If not then 114 but need to spell out what is meant by the 'prevailing character of such a garden-rich area such as North Newnham (see recent decision to refuse permission for infill build on Barton Road)

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

10438 Support**Summary:**

Support policy 114 as this is most likely to encourage more sympathetic building within the city and make use of unused space.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

10626 Support**Summary:**

Option 114 but not if it means that existing areas of high density housing (especially streets of 19th century terraces off Mill Rd) become even higher density due to loss of badly needed garden space which future residents will need.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

10738 Support

Summary:

Option 115. This option should be used for areas such as the city core and surrounding historic neighbourhoods and conservation areas such as Newtown. Garden infill should be presumed non viable in these areas. The Local Plan needs to provide specific provision for developments in particular areas of Cambridge so that they can be decided within the context of their historic and local environment.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

11523 Support

Summary:

Support option 114, noting that often the only means to improve housing stock on a city site is to demolish and rebuild. While infill is something we should be cautious about, the policy should not mean that shoddy housing remains because it cannot be replaced with an equivalent new-build property.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

12000 Support

Summary:

Option 114. Properties with back gardens suitable for such development are most likely to be older properties where eg conversion for climate /water efficiency could be uneconomic. Developing on such gardens is likely to be less ecologically disadvantageous than large-scale building on green spaces.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

12219 Object

Summary:

Option 114. Provided the safeguards as set out in the suggested criteria are rigorously enforced, we should not oppose in filling but rather see it as a small but not insignificant contribution to our housing needs. The point about prevailing character of the neighbourhood is particularly important and should be given more prominence; we need to avoid new buildings being shoehorned into tiny spaces to maximise owners profit

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

12400 Support

Summary:

I support Option 115. The real demand for back-garden development will be in the most valuable areas and these tend to be close to the city centre and provide a welcome variety in what is already a very crowded location. Infill would be less damaging in the less-dense regions of the city, but there is less desire for development more than 10 minutes walk from the city centre.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

12606 Support

Summary:

115 - restrict

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

12772 Object

Summary:

I prefer Option 115. This is because 'garden grabbing' could have a serious negative impact on our City. There is little enough green space as it is, this would further exacerbate problems. Infill developments in gardens may make a contribution to housing supply, but they also (negatively) contribute towards our quality of life. We should have a strict policy that restricts (or disallows) infill development in rear gardens.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

13990 Support**Summary:**

I support Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens. The pressures towards over-development of sites within existing residential neighbourhoods should be reduced. Otherwise the character of many areas we now value will substantially change for the worse.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

14128 Support**Summary:**

Option 115

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

16553 Support**Summary:**

Option 114 preferred, but people should not be forced to give up their large gardens for development.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

16845 Support**Summary:**

We prefer option 115, which would restrict development in back gardens and infill sites. Romsey has suffered from inappropriate development of gardens and backlands and this policy would help to restrict densification and over-development.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

17459 Support**Summary:**

Back garden development - a policy combining features of the two options 114 and 115 is needed, to ensure effective protection of areas where back garden development is not appropriate

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

17959 Support**Summary:**

Option 115 - Far too many gardens are or have been developed. If we allow this to continue it will be of real detriment to the city.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

18249 Support**Summary:**

Option 114 permitting small scale residential development and infill development in rear gardens is our preference.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

18336 Support

Summary:

Option 115

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.35

9512 Object

Summary:

The amount of green space in a residential area needs to be addressed.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.35

10627 Support

Summary:

Need for a policy to restrict infill in areas of existing high density. These areas will need garden space for future generations but as long as speculators think they can make a quick profit today they are not bothered about the future.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.35

10631 Object

Summary:

The first policy option (114) fails to consider the impacts of loss of gardens on the wider ecological network across Cambridge or the potential for mitigation of the urban heat island effect in light of climate change.

In this context the biodiversity part of the policy is unworkable as planners and developers will only consider protected species, which are covered by other policies. This approach completely misses the biodiversity value of the network of gardens in Cambridge, providing for the common wildlife and bird song that enriches everyday lives. This must be addressed.

If policy option 114 is adopted i

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.35

10747 Object

Summary:

It is very important to view any development holistically in its context. That is why infilling garden spaces especially in conservation areas such as Newtown or areas close to the centre where green spaces are so valuable and are vital to retain. Provision must be made in the Local Plan for historic areas of Cambridge with specific reference to conservation areas and how any work in the area should consider its historic and visual context. Effects of any works to the local and surrounding environment should also be addressed. These issues should be included in the Local Plan.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.35

12774 Object

Summary:

A list of reasons has been given as to why gardens are important. This is a good list, but has missed one important item - the fact that gardens are important for our mental health and well being - health is of paramount importance.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.35

13704 Object

Summary:

Need to use the Local Plan to close an apparent planning loophole which permits a permitted development in a back garden to be converted to a residential building without having to seek planning permission.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.35

15515 Object

Summary:

I would prefer a presumption against building in back gardens, allowing it only if there are very strong grounds, and resisting development especially strongly in areas where it would damage the character of the area if "everyone did that"

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.35

17960 Support

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.35

18250 Object

Summary:

It should not be too easy to demolish existing buildings outside a Conservation Area, where a building might still be of interest.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.36

18595 Support

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.64

13828 Object

Summary:

The designation of 3 stories seems out of date now that so many houses have attic conversions in cambridge.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.65

16973 Object

Summary:

Inhabitants of large HMOs are often transient and some landlords do not keep their properties in a good state of repair.

Want to avoid HMOs outnumbering local family homes so support the proposed policy. Also like to see a specific policy that deters the conversion of large family homes to HMO's.

Like to see a policy protecting areas of large family homes in the Mill Road and Glisson Road/Newtown Conservation Area from conversion to HMOs.

Concerned this proposed policy does not cover smaller properties in our residential area. The threshold criteria requiring planning permission for conversion from single family to multiple occupation should be lowered.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 116 - Criteria based policy for HMOs

11065 Support

Summary:

This seems a sensible idea. I know parking is often a vexed issue so to have some thinking about that before HMOs are permitted would be good.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 116 - Criteria based policy for HMOs

11072 Object

Summary:

HMOs are an important part of the housing market in Cambridge. Cost of housing prices many young people out of the market. There is a shortage of affordable housing and 8,210 people on the Council's waiting list. HMOs play an important role in meeting housing needs and enabling workers who can not afford to buy to live in the city close to where they work.

Restrictions on HMOs will worsen affordability and push rents up.

Restrictions on HMOs are likely to price out support service workers and employees of institutions such as the universities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 116 - Criteria based policy for HMOs

11129 Support

Summary:

HMOs are an essential sector of the housing stock at the lower end of the housing market. A positive approach should be taken to provision. Para 9.67 states 20% of HMOS are occupied by students. Therefore HMO policy should link in to a supportive policy for the provision of new student accommodation as the demand for both types of housing increases.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 116 - Criteria based policy for HMOs

12487 Support

Summary:

HMOs are becoming an active nuisance in some areas, particularly when occupied by students. Regulation is required.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 116 - Criteria based policy for HMOs

13379 Object

Summary:

I am against the development of larger HMOs, I live next to a "smaller" HMO and there are serious issues with noise, rubbish and parking as it is. There should be a cap on the number of HMOs in an area due to the attendant problems they cause.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 116 - Criteria based policy for HMOs

13481 Support

Summary:

HMOs are an essential sector of the housing stock at the lower end of the housing market. A positive approach should be taken to provision. Para 9.67 states 20% of HMOS are occupied by students. Therefore HMO policy should link in to a supportive policy for the provision of new student accommodation as the demand for both types of housing increases.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 116 - Criteria based policy for HMOs

16766 Support

Summary:

It is important that any HMOs be subject to suitable scrutiny to ensure that the accommodation offered to tenants is of a decent quality, properties are maintained properly and associated shared spaces are in good order and to ensure that the impact on neighbours is minimised.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 116 - Criteria based policy for HMOs

16896 Object**Summary:**

We agree that it is important to retain a mix of housing stock to meet the requirements of a diverse community, and would support the inclusion of a specific policy on HMOs. However the current draft appears not to give sufficient weight to their possible cumulative impact on established residential area. We should prefer to see an additional criterion introduced which explicitly took into account the existing number of HMOs already in the street and the impact an additional HMO would have on the mix of tenure and on available accommodation for larger families. The assessment should also include the consequences of a high turnover of residents and empty properties at particular times of the year: this can weaken community ties and lead to a democratic deficit locally. We have a similar view on conversions (option 118).

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 116 - Criteria based policy for HMOs

16974 Object**Summary:**

Inhabitants of large HMOs are often transient and some landlords do not keep their properties in a good state of repair.

Want to avoid HMOs outnumbering local family homes so support the proposed policy. Also like to see a specific policy that deters the conversion of large family homes to HMO's.

Like to see a policy protecting areas of large family homes in the Mill Road and Glisson Road/Newtown Conservation Area from conversion to HMOs.

Concerned this proposed policy does not cover smaller properties in our residential area. The threshold criteria requiring planning permission for conversion from single family to multiple occupation should be lowered.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

7007 Support**Summary:**

Yes, there is a need for a policy regulating HMOs - and I would support the policy entitled Option 116.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

7609 Support**Summary:**

The lack of criteria is unhelpful.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

8485 Support**Summary:**

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

9513 Support**Summary:**

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

10753 Object

Summary:

Yes, it is important to have a policy addressing the issue of houses of multiple occupancy. Numbers per street/area should be restricted particularly in areas such as Newtown surrounding the city centre. A maximum number of HMOs in proportion to the density of the population in an area should be established. The type of HMOs should also be addressed. There should be a limit to the number of larger HMOs and restrictions on the smaller HMOs. The Local Plan must provide clear guidance for specific areas of Cambridge such as conservation areas so that any work can be done in context.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

11076 Object

Summary:

Policy not needed.

HMOs are an important part of the housing market in Cambridge. Cost of housing prices many young people out of the market. There is a shortage of affordable housing and 8,210 people on the Council's waiting list. HMOs play an important role in meeting housing needs and enabling workers who cannot afford to buy to live in the city close to where they work.

Restrictions on HMOs will worsen affordability and push rents up.

Restrictions on HMOs are likely to price out support service workers and employees of institutions such as the universities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

11086 Object

Summary:

The policy is unnecessary. It will affect housing supply and affordability issues.

The matters identified in the criteria, such as provision of bins, and numbers of occupants and amenities are not matters for the planning system to address, but are management matters and should be controlled through the licensing system

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

11526 Support

Summary:

Support

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

12230 Object

Summary:

This is one area where we do not support having a policy, even though it is an important issue and is being abused at present.

The problem is that the City cannot easily monitor or have the resources to provide enforcement. Having a policy we don't enforce is worse than no policy

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

12993 Support

Summary:

Support. Some HMO are exploited.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

14133 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

15278 Support

Summary:

Criteria for limiting the spread of HMOs and consequential displacement of family homes is desirable.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

15842 Support

Summary:

With regard to HMOs, East Chesterton has many shared houses and HMOs. We agree that a policy is necessary and that there should be controls to prevent inappropriate multi-occupation where the building or location is unsuitable and to ensure that impact on an area is adequately assessed and considered

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

16893 Object

Summary:

Whilst the Colleges are committed to provision of accommodation, in or nearby to Colleges, a flexible policy approach is required to allow for accommodation to be provided, when this is not possible. Such a policy approach would allow for the provision of new HMOs, it would also allow for HMOs to be used as and returned to other types of residential accommodation.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

17961 Support

Summary:

Yes - current policy is sufficient.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

18337 Support

Summary:

Yes, however.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.38

9514 Support

Summary:

Option 116

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.38

11078 Object

Summary:

Policy not needed.

HMOs are an important part of the housing market in Cambridge. Cost of housing prices many young people out of the market. There is a shortage of affordable housing and 8,210 people on the Council's waiting list. HMOs play an important role in meeting housing needs and enabling workers who cannot afford to buy to live in the city close to where they work.

Restrictions on HMOs will worsen affordability and push rents up.

Restrictions on HMOs are likely to price out support service workers and employees of institutions such as the universities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.38

17962 Support

Summary:

Only one listed? Current policy is sufficient; do not foresee the need for change.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.38

18338 Object

Summary:

Do not set a policy the City cannot police or have the resources to provide enforcement.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

7608 Support

Summary:

There is a need to address the following situation: a large house on two floors with room for more than 6 residents. This is neither a Small HMO (since there are more than 6 residents) nor a Large HMO (because it is not on 3 floors). There need to be clear criteria set out for a potential developer of such a property -- it is unhelpful if too many cases fall under the vagaries of the 'sui generis' heading.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

9212 Support

Summary:

There should be a requirement for all licensed HMOs to lodge contact details for their owners and managers with local police or on the City Council website, so neighbours can have immediate access in cases of anti-social behaviour or emergencies.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

9515 Object

Summary:

Car parking

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

11542 Object

Summary:

HMO more sustainable than a block of tiny flats. Family accommodation vs small HMO - merely whether the residents are related. HMO landlords tend to care less for their properties than owner-occupiers.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

11937 Object**Summary:**

I believe that restrictions on car ownership should be considered as a means of dealing with some of the problems. I believe there is still such a policy for college accommodation and have always included such restrictions in the tenancy agreements for my own house.

One important consideration, however, is that non-resident landlords should be able to buy visitor's parking permits for use by people working on the house, so that it can be kept in good repair.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

12790 Object**Summary:**

We don't need any more HMOs in Cambridge, as people do not really require them - they just live in them as they have no alternative choice. Although for developments that are university-only then they could be allowed if need dictated.

I am happy to see HMO licensing and space standards for HMOs - many of our existing HMO's are poorly maintained by landlords, in fact some pose serious ongoing health hazards. I'd like the Council to do regular checks of all HMOs.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

13978 Support**Summary:**

There needs to be a clear policy against pushing house sharers out of Cambridge.

House sharing is an important aspect of the housing provision in Cambridge.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

14229 Support**Summary:**

Most of the actual HMOs in Romsey aren't even classified as HMOs because the accommodation is only on 2 storeys. For example a very small 3 bedroom house where the third bedroom is only 7' square may have five adults living there. Many of these small houses are overcrowded and this type of property in multiple occupation, with a non-resident landlord, is also in need of regulation.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

16894 Object**Summary:**

A specific issue that does not appear to be addressed is that if a policy is too restrictive, there is a danger that this could discourage proposals to house more than 6 occupiers, when the property is capable of accommodating more. This would result in inefficient use of housing stock and place unnecessary demands upon that housing stock.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

17463 Support**Summary:**

The largest properties need improved regulation, but without limiting the contribution that flexible shared housing makes to local housing provision. There also needs to be a review and improvement plan for the private rented sector.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

17963 Object

Summary:

A further option?

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.40

11082 Object

Summary:

Policy is not needed.

HMOs are an important part of the housing market in Cambridge. Cost of housing prices many young people out of the market. There is a shortage of affordable housing and 8,210 people on the Council's waiting list. HMOs play an important role in meeting housing needs and enabling workers who cannot afford to buy to live in the city close to where they work.

Restrictions on HMOs will worsen affordability and increase rents.

Restrictions on HMOs are likely to price out support service workers and employees of institutions such as the universities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.76

16555 Support

Summary:

Support

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 117 - Specialist housing

14837 Support

Summary:

I think it very important for residents of nursing homes or residential homes to have access to safe and secure open space. However frail, mentally or physically, someone is, going outside where you can hear the birds singing or smell flowers or just be quiet is vital, I think.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 117 - Specialist housing

16054 Object

Summary:

Support the need for a specific policy encouraging the provision of specialist accommodation for the elderly.

Request the Council exercise caution if they choose to specific amenity space requirements for accommodation for the elderly.

Council should not restrict evidence of need for specify accommodation for the elderly to specific Council documents.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 117 - Specialist housing

16968 Support

Summary:

We specialise in the development of specialist older person accomodation and are currently developing a number of schemes.

We are keen to ensure a sound policy position is established for Cambridge should any potential development opportunities arise and that the Local Plan adequately reflects the evidence-base documents. Our attached representation outlines the key benefits of the development of specialist older person housing including:

dwelling mix, design & goverment aims

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

8117 Support

Summary:

Need policy, especially because of the need to match services with the housing.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

8614 Support

Summary:

The Trumpington Residents' Association supports Option 117 about the need for a policy on specialist housing. We are concerned that there should be the provision of facilities such as care homes within easy access of each neighbourhood. There is very limited provision within Trumpington at present and there appear to be no plans for new care homes within the agreed developments across the Southern Fringe. We think this will become a serious issue in the future when families will look for local provision for relatives who are in need of care.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

9516 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

12235 Support

Summary:

Yes, we need a policy

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

12800 Support

Summary:

Yes we need a policy on specialist housing.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

13177 Support

Summary:

The University supports provision of accommodation for specialist needs and to meet the requirements of an aging population. Any policy relating to specialist housing provision must take into account the market's ability to deliver such provision and other site-specific demands.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

13966 Support

Summary:

The Local Plan should help people to live near their extended families if they want to, as this has many benefits for the individuals and the communities concerned. Older people particularly find it difficult to travel far to keep in touch with friends and family, so it is important for them to be able to find suitable housing, moving house if necessary, but not moving neighbourhood. When older people wish to move into Cambridge to join relatives already living here, there should be suitable accommodation available throughout the City.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

14135 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

15279 Support

Summary:

Agree, especially with the need to be close to a local centre for the largest need group, older people, who may enjoy limited mobility but can manage short local trips with little or no assistance from carers.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

15843 Support

Summary:

We support a policy for specialist housing, in particular for older people. East Chesterton is already home to a number of such developments. We agree with Option 118

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

16556 Support

Summary:

Yes.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

17964 Support

Summary:

Yes - current policy is sufficient

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

18339 Support

Summary:

Yes, however.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

18533 Support

Summary:

We support Option 117 about the need for a policy on specialist housing. We are concerned that there should be the provision of facilities such as care homes within easy access of each neighbourhood. There is very limited provision within Trumpington at present and there appear to be no plans for new care homes within the agreed developments across the Southern Fringe. We think this will become a serious issue in the future when families will look for local provision for relatives who are in need of care.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.42

8118 Support

Summary:

Perhaps support (within the boundaries set out above) for larger, high quality, retirement homes such as the new Abbeyfield development at Girton, could be specified in the plan. There is an opportunity here to reclaim some family housing for the younger city dwellers (providing the retirement housing didn't actually attract people from outside the city, of course).

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.42

9517 Object

Summary:

Car parking

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.42

10636 Support

Summary:

Yes. Need for bungalows for the elderly who want to leave houses with stairs but do not like flats with lifts. Especially often need with this group for small private garden space as in Seymour St. Despite much new development in Romsey in the last decade no new bungalows and often existing bungalows demolished for more high density development. This means those seeking bungalows move to villages, away from support of friends and away from proximity to much needed facilities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.42

12008 Support

Summary:

As I get older this issue is becoming increasingly important to me. The views of Trumpington Residents' Association echo mine.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.42

12245 Object

Summary:

We need to separate specialist housing from affordable housing. In one nearby new development, the developer negotiated out of any commitment to build affordable housing by building a specialist housing scheme. Is this acceptable or not. Our view would be that specialist should be allowed to be a substitute for affordable. The important thing is to be clear on this.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.42

12799 Object

Summary:

I would like to see an older persons housing co-operative developed in Cambridge. This could be similar to the one mentioned above (which is in Birmingham) and would promote independence whilst providing a necessary support network and allowing for changes in circumstances (e.g. for a carer to move in).

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.42

17525 Object

Summary:

Major improvements need to be made with regard to provision of care especially for the elderly. The aging population will mean that more care homes will be needed. Private care homes do not always maintain acceptable standards. Voluntary organisations should be more involved.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.42

17965 Support

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.42

18340 Object

Summary:

Policies in this are should be unpicked from other affordable housing categories.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 118 - Opportunities for providing new housing

16909 Object

Summary:

We agree that policies are needed to address conversions and the loss of housing of particular sorts, but the emphasis should be less on the need to create new units of accommodation and more on the need to retain the existing variety of stock suitable for different household sizes. We would resist, for example a policy which appeared to encourage the few larger houses in this area to be converted into smaller units, unless there was clearly no demand from larger households and the impacts properly assessed and mitigated. Not only are conversions often poorly carried out and lead to a loss of scarce larger properties, but they increase the likelihood of more traffic and can have adverse impact on the community and its character.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.44

8119 Support

Summary:

Yes I would support such policies

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.44

9518 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.44

10755 Support

Summary:

Yes there is a need for the policy re opportunities for new housing.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.44

12148 Support

Summary:

The University would support a policy seeking to increase the opportunities for new housing, including the conversion of large properties, which would serve to increase the housing supply within the City.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.44

12252 Support

Summary:

Yes to a policy

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.44

14136 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.44

15280 Support

Summary:

Agree with a policy but it should be designed to discourage short-term thinking and ensure that opportunistic developments do not result in any deleterious skewing of the overall housing mix in a particular area.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.44

16558 Support

Summary:

Yes.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.44

17966 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.45

9214 Support

Summary:

Loss of housing to other uses should not be permitted in Conservation Areas, and elsewhere only where there is a clearly demonstrable need. Conversion of large properties should only be allowed where new housing results.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.45

10328 Support

Summary:

Would the policy stop existing supported housing being emptied of residents and left at risk of crime and decay?

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.45

10765 Object

Summary:

There should always be the presumption particularly for buildings of historic interest and in conservation areas such as Newtown that any conversion returns the house or building to its original use. The priority must always be the context of the buildings and areas rather than commercial gain. Again this emphasises the need for specific policies concerning areas and types of buildings. It is crucial that development is carried out in context and holistically. For historic and conservation areas especially there must be a requirement within the Local Plan to refer to heritage guidelines for development above any commercial interest.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.45

12718 Support

Summary:

Two more options which should be considered:

- 1 Identify empty houses to be repaired and brought back into use (perhaps using council loans to be paid back once a house is let or sold).
- 2 Identify derelict sites on residential streets which could be used for small amounts of housing (e.g. the old tapes shop on Gwydir Street).

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.46

10339 Support

Summary:

Cohousing communities are intentional communities created and maintained by their residents. Cohousing creates neighbourly support required for sustainable communities to work. Planning policy should encourage cohousing as a sustainable and affordable housing option which simultaneously provides community amenities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.46

10771 Object

Summary:

We suggest that older buildings and those not in use should be renovated to address housing needs before there are schemes for large scale housing developments that lack community infrastructure. The Cambridge Local Plan requires different area policies that are contextual to prevent inappropriate piecemeal development. The conversion and sympathetic adaption of properties in conservation and historic areas of Cambridge should always work to tough guidelines to preserve the historic environment. There should be a requirement to use the national and local plan heritage policies as a priority when determining any planning application.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.81

14127 Object

Summary:

Concerned Traveller population is being under-estimated and that this will increase the level of unmet need for Traveller provision, including land, locally.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.81

14386 Object

Summary:

Gypsies and Travellers are the largest minority group comprising 1% of the population in our region, yet Cambridge City Council suggests only 1 pitch is required between 2011-2031.

We are particularly concerned because we believe this is based on the Cambridge Sub-Region Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTAA) 2011) which seriously underestimates the need for permanent pitches in Cambridgeshire. The Assessment was carried out by the local authorities themselves as an internal technical exercise. It reported only to politicians, ignoring strong guidance for involving the wider community and specifically the Gypsy and Traveller communities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.82

14076 Support

Summary:

However, the gradient of inequalities may be steeper than reported here. The recent inequalities report from the DCLG includes the following statement in relation to life expectancy:

"...a recent study stated that the general population were living up to 50% longer than Gypsies and Travellers."

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/2124046.pdf>

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.82

14156 Object

Summary:

Whilst I support the acknowledgement of inequalities I think the wording could be more careful in relation to the expression 'not all of them actually travel' which is misleading and widely misunderstood. Also the level of inequalities of health and education may be more severe than reported here and should reflect recent government reports indicating very severe health and life-expectancy inequalities for instance.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.82

14415 Support

Summary:

The desk-based arithmetic modeling in the 2011 GTAA approach is highly dependent on the assumptions which do not reflect the evidence and our knowledge of the Gypsy and Traveller communities. We dispute the 40% reduction in unauthorised (caravan) need, unreliable counts for caravans on unauthorised sites or encampments, overcrowding on private pitches and the demand for pitches by G&Ts wishing to move out of bricks&mortar into private sites. Discounting need shows a complete misunderstanding of the culture and way of life of this group. Travellers choose to live in large extended family groups not in arbitrarily designated sites.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.83

14088 Support

Summary:

Travellers want to be able to access education for their children and this is often compromised by lack of stability of accommodation, caused by insufficient land allocation for Traveller sites. This must be addressed to allow Traveller children proper access to education.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.83

14158 Support

Summary:

Travellers want to be able to access education for their children and this is often compromised by lack of stability of accommodation, caused by insufficient land allocation for Traveller sites. This must be addressed to allow Traveller children proper access to education. The evidence on inequality related to educational outcomes is strong and stated in the recent DCLG document on inequalities facing the Gypsy/Traveller community:

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/2124046.pdf>

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.84

14177 Object

Summary:

This statement does not sufficiently recognise the extent to which Travellers have been forced into council accommodation against their wishes and in a way which erodes their culture, and nor does it reflect the detrimental effects of being forced into council housing, especially in a climate where racism against Travellers is rife. Council housing spells the breakdown of Traveller communities. No other ethnic minority in this country is forcefully broken up or undermined in this way.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.84

14436 Support

Summary:

In the 2011 GT Sub-region NA, the turnover of pitches on public sites is the only part of the model which takes account of movement between bricks & mortar housing and caravans. Our experience is that a significant part of the demand for new pitches is from Gypsies & Travellers moving from bricks & mortar into private sites. We consider the numbers seriously underestimate the numbers involved. Since despite strong guidance there was no consultation with either the wider community or Gypsies and Travellers, we have no confidence in the statements of need.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.85

14203 Object

Summary:

Recent assessment procedures for the local need for Travellers sites are invalid and require reconsideration. There needs to be independent consultation with the Traveller community to properly assess need and without this the current needs assessment are insufficient and likely to be open to legal challenge.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.86

13753 Object

Summary:

The 2011 needs assessment is not robust; almost certainly underestimates needs. The Councils have ignored the guidance at paragraph 6 of Planning policy for travellers and at paragraphs 40, 41,46, 49, and 50 of the DCLG guidance note on assessments on the central importance of engaging the Traveller communities. The low assessment of need in Cambridge is also the failure by the City Council to make provision over many years. It is self realising.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.86

13946 Object

Summary:

Given that point 9.81 accepts that 1% of the population are travellers the provision of one pitch is shockingly inadequate. How was this figure reached? It is not enough to base the figure on current numbers given that hugely disproportionate numbers of travellers are currently homeless or without adequate housing provision

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.86

14222 Object

Summary:

There should be sites in Cambridge city. The current needs assessment are inadequate and are leading to gross unmet need across the region. If there is to be the release of local land to allow for growth in the local population and to provide sufficient social housing, parts of this land must also be made available for permanent Travellers sites, to prevent homelessness and increasing inequalities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.87

7499 Object

Summary:

There are competing demands, but Travellers always come at the bottom of the pile. The northern fringe east & Cambridge east areas would appear to be eminently suitable to accommodate new Traveller sites, as would the potential green belt release sites on the fringes of the city. For the answer always to be no when specific sites are considered questions how inclusive and committed to equality is the City.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.87

8020 Object

Summary:

The Milton area is overloaded with Gypsy and Traveller provision and any further sites should be located elsewhere.

We would also like consideration for a transit site located near Addenbrooke's hospital.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.87

10408 Support**Summary:**

It is very important to identify a mechanism/policy to provide further accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers. 9.82 clearly sets out that this community experiences poorer health outcomes and suitable accommodation is a pre-requisite for good health. The current Cambridgeshire G and T strategy includes an objective to increase Traveller accommodation. It is a sensible approach to work closely with SCDC on this.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.87

11548 Support**Summary:**

While sites should be provided, controls should be in place such that G&T provision is not a 'back door' to for-profit development. For example, conversion of agricultural land to individual G&T residence to building land sold on the open market.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.87

13959 Object**Summary:**

This does not explain why there has so far been a failure to provide sites for travellers? The current suitability requirement allows for discrimination against the gypsy traveller community whose applications for sites are turned down at an unacceptable rate and without any efforts being made to help them find alternative sites.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.87

14061 Support**Summary:**

The Local Plan should indeed guide the location of Traveller sites if people put in a planning application for a small one in the City. However, in view of the competing demands for land for homes, the reality is that the Council cannot find a suitable site in the City to provide one.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.87

14270 Object**Summary:**

Cambridge city should provide for Travellers - if land can be found for social housing, some of it should be made available also to Travellers and to reflect the scale of the local Traveller population and the great unmet need for accommodation currently faced by the Traveller population.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 119 - Criteria based policy for the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites

9583 Support**Summary:**

Protection of amenity for nearby residents should be paramount. Existing gypsy and traveller sites must be protected from possible landgrabs as they are in a desirable area, or in an area that becomes desirable, eg if a station is built nearby so the site becomes attractive for commuter housing. The existing residents should not feel forced to move on if they are living on legal pitches that have been there for many years.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 119 - Criteria based policy for the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites

13927 Object

Summary:

The requirement that 'There should not be an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents or the appearance or character of the surrounding area.' allows for racist prejudice to determine objections by other residents. Specifically the phrase 'unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents' assumes that the presence of travelling people will affect an area 'adversely'. This is a racist assumption. It would never, for example, be possible to object to the presence of Jews or Asians in an area because it has 'unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents.'

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 119 - Criteria based policy for the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites

13975 Object

Summary:

The approach to Traveller sites should be as similar as possible to that for housing. The approach to housing is effectively to accommodate as much housing as possible within the city, that towards Traveller sites to ask them to meet a series of criteria. In particular the criterion about impact on residential amenities and the appearance and character of the area may make it difficult for any site to be acceptable.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 119 - Criteria based policy for the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites

15281 Support

Summary:

Agree with policy but there needs to be adequate access and services to any site. Suggest land off Coldhams Lane might actually be suitable.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 119 - Criteria based policy for the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites

16028 Object

Summary:

Green Belt should not be used for purpose. Possibly the wildlife area in Option 40 could be used.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Question 9.47

7287 Support

Summary:

Was very pleased to see that this issue is given a proper airing, and think that there should be explicit policy to support needs of Travellers / Gypsies.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Question 9.47

8120 Support

Summary:

I believe this is necessary, but note the great difficulty which is always encountered in finding suitable sites.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Question 9.47

8486 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Question 9.47

9519 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

10409 Support

Summary:

Yes it is important to have a policy - see response 9.87 (below)

It is very important to identify a mechanism/policy to provide further accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers. 9.82 clearly sets out that this community experiences poorer health outcomes and suitable accommodation is a pre-requisite for good health. The current Cambridgeshire G and T strategy includes an objective to increase Traveller accommodation. It is a sensible approach to work closely with SCDC on this.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

11549 Support

Summary:

Support

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

14046 Support

Summary:

Clearly the needs of the travelling community are not currently being met. Policy which adequately deals with the cultural specificities of the requirements of travelling people and counters the entrenched and systemic racism against travellers that currently influences planning decisions must be developed if Cambridge is to stop failing travelling people.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

14138 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

14369 Support

Summary:

Yes, and that policy must be built on independent consultation of the Traveller community and consultation with Traveller support groups. The current policy is inadequate and will fail to meet the needs of Travellers locally, just as they have failed to meet these needs historically. Council legal costs will remain high while Traveller needs will remain unmet. This is a poor outcome and must be avoided through much more careful policy which addresses local prejudice.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

14870 Support

Summary:

Yes. Support Option 119

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

15046 Support

Summary:

Yes, support.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

15844 Support

Summary:

At present the area (Chesterton Fen) falls far short of the criteria set out in option 119. The continual designation of these sites as temporary has resulted in poor planning and inadequate service provision for the residents. There is inadequate and unsafe road access, no near access to public transport, no mains drainage, high flood risk and site contamination.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

16559 Support

Summary:

Yes.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

17464 Support

Summary:

Policy supported, and further site assessment needed.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

17967 Support

Summary:

Yes - as suggested.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

18369 Object

Summary:

The Needs Assessment shows a need in Cambridge for 1 permanent pitch and suggests that given the tight administrative boundary and competing demands it is difficult to find land that is suitable for site provision and refers to work with SCDC to identify suitable land. Given the need in the wider Cambridge area it will be important that the Council's work together to meet needs, which could include provision within city boundaries.

The Councils are already working together on the specific issue of identifying a suitable site to deliver new pitches utilising a jointly secured government grant.

The 'Site Assessment Process 2012' explores a range of site options identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, and outlines why sites are not suitable. It does not consider opportunities that may arise from new land allocations, to achieve delivery as part of major schemes, an issue identified for consultation in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan issues and options report.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.48

9986 Support

Summary:

An area should be set aside for this use on the edge of new additions to the city envelope.

A transit site for limited duration should be found near to Addenbrooke's Hospital, possibly beside the Babraham Road P&R site.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.48

11551 Support**Summary:**

Efforts should be made to integrate the communities on both sides, rather than a 'them and us' culture which sometimes prevails.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.48

13861 Object**Summary:**

It is not acceptable to depend on a criteria based policy. Specific allocations should be made. The Council's refusal to identify sites also risks losing the grant allocation of £0.5m that has been made to the City jointly with S Cambs. We understand HCA is requiring a site to be identified; have planning permission by December 2012 or the funding will be lost.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.48

14064 Object**Summary:**

The current policies do not take into account the fact that the current system fails to adequately account for travellers needs - the fact, for example that most of the population is illiterate, due to historical conditions of discrimination which have made it difficult for them to learn to read. It does not adequately take account of the racism against travellers which causes other residents to object to any plans that mean travellers will be residing near their property. For proof of this, see the comments below any online article that mentions travellers in Cambridge Evening News.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.48

14410 Support**Summary:**

There is a desperate need for speedy allocation of land for permanent Traveller sites - the constant delays in decisions which lead to positive provision is exacerbating the level of unmet needs and increasing the deprivations experienced by the local Traveller community. Meeting the needs of this community needs to be treated as a priority.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.49

15846 Support**Summary:**

The area is adjacent to the planned new station development and should be included in the overall strategic plan for the area and considered jointly by three Authorities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.88

13896 Object**Summary:**

The national guidance has clearly thus far been insufficient given the failure to provide adequate site provision so far.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.88

14364 Object

Summary:

The criteria are prejudiced against Travellers. Criteria for Traveller sites should be no different for criteria for the provision of social housing. Hundreds of thousands are wasted annually on legal costs fighting planning applications and an impoverished Traveller population continues to spend thousands attempting to authorise sites to overcome homelessness. This money could be better spent, to improve circumstances for local Travellers and to improve relations between the Traveller and remaining local population. The criteria offered exacerbate and do nothing to overcome these issues.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.90

14031 Object

Summary:

This is not an acceptable outcome.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.90

14449 Object

Summary:

It is incomprehensible that this is stated as a bald fact. When will appropriate sites be found. There should be provision alongside new housing developments for sites.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.50

11448 Object

Summary:

No.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.50

12802 Object

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.50

14139 Support

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.50

14871 Object

Summary:

No. Absolutely not.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.50

16562 Object

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.50

17968 Support

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.91

11453 Object

Summary:

I do not believe the green belt should be released for this purpose.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

7008 Object

Summary:

In my opinion, there is no way that land in the green belt should be used for gypsy/traveller sites. The green belt is for leaving as green fields, not for use for buildings, caravans, or anything other than farming and walking.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

7120 Object (W/drawn 2012-07-15)

Summary:

Green Belt land should not be disfigured with the type of settlement/encampment favoured by the travelling community, especially as experience shows that they cannot be trusted to keep them tidy and free from rubbish.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

7207 Object

Summary:

It is important that the Green Belt be retained as far as possible and so Gypsy and Traveller provision should be in South Cambs beyond the Green Belt

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

9215 Object

Summary:

Green belt should be retained as it is.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

9520 Object

Summary:

Not in the green belt since such a location would destroy the whole idea of the green belt.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

10772 Object

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

11457 Object

Summary:

No.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

12259 Object

Summary:

No. If encroachment onto green belt land for house building is not allowed (as we have argued earlier) similar bans should apply to travellers.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

12806 Object

Summary:

As there is no space in the city for a suitable site, then we do need to look at other areas. As I would prefer not to build on the green belt, I think we need to look at other sites further afield (i.e. outside the green belt).

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

14003 Support

Summary:

Yes, in the sense that the planned release of Green Belt land to provide significant areas of housing development capacity on the fringe of the city should also specifically allocate sites for Travellers.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

14006 Support

Summary:

Yes. Given the failure to find urban locations, the green belt must surely be considered.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

14141 Object

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

14371 Support

Summary:

Yes, just as local green belt land is being considered for housing. Where ever land is offered up for the expansion of the population Travellers must be part of that provision to ensure equality - just as with social housing there are requirements for portions of land in each development to be made available for social housing. Anything less reflects prejudicial mistreatment of the needs of the local Traveller population.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

14873 Object

Summary:

No. Definitely not.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

15048 Object

Summary:

Do not support.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

16050 Object

Summary:

A very dangerous situation would be created should the Green Belt become a target for Gypsies and Travellers, easier that it is at present. Where they have purchased Green Belt, in some cases there has been illegal settlement on the land. Cambridge is a rather vulnerable area to this abuse.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

16563 Object

Summary:

No. No more land in the Green Belt should be used for any development except for leisure and recreation purposes.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

17970 Object

Summary:

No - previous policy should be adhered to

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

18371 Object

Summary:

National policy is that Green Belt boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances, but could be altered through the plan making process to meet identified need.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.52

9217 Object

Summary:

In South Cambs or elsewhere in the county

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.52

9987 Support

Summary:

Beside Babraham P&R

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.52

11455 Object

Summary:

No - green belt should be protected and this seems like a particularly detrimental use.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.52

13706 Support

Summary:

Near park and ride sites?

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.52

14143 Object

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.52

14378 Support

Summary:

I am not fully familiar with all the available greenbelt land. However, I understand that there is land which does not even fall within the greenbelt which could and should be made available for permanent Traveller sites, at Northstowe (land owned by the Homes and Communities Agency), Meadow Lane in Willingham (which was previously an authorised site), and in Bassingbourn.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.52

14874 Object

Summary:

No. If the Council approves inappropriate Traveller sites it risks facing legal action from homeowners whose property values are adversely affected.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.52

17971 Object

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.53

14403 Support**Summary:**

I have identified three sites and also think that the Smithy Fen Traveller site could be expanded.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.53

16067 Object**Summary:**

Support for planning permission for the Smithy Fen Cottenham Traveller Site is vital for the council to fulfil its pledges in Cambridge Local Plan.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.53

17972 Object**Summary:**

Consider improving current sites & ensuring transport links to these sites are improved.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.92

14387 Support**Summary:**

Large sites should be possible to allow the Traveller community to thrive in large, mutually supportive, extended family groupings. Amenity blocks and provision for chalets as well as trailers and caravans are all necessary. Without permission for sufficient amenity blocks proper sanitation will not be possible leading to inhumane living circumstances.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.93

13029 Support**Summary:**

The Chesterton Fen is a long established traveller site in South Cambs. Unfortunately the sole road access, within the City boundary, is entirely inappropriate for the weight of existing traffic.

The City Council could substantially enhance the prospects for traveller development through a policy to connect the Fen to Cowley Road, providing more direct connection to the trunk road network for heavy vehicles. Given the presence of the railway sidings this is likely to be along the northern boundary of network Rail's land.

Extra trains serving the new Science Park Station will make the existing level crossing unworkable.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.93

14025 Object**Summary:**

South Cambs have a history of rejecting traveller planning applications on spurious grounds. They recently rejected planning permission by travelling family living within the travellers site at Smithy Fen without adequate justification. They it would adversely affect the character of the surrounding area, despite the fact that the plots in question are completely surrounded by sites which have already gained permission. They do not have a good track record and any cooperation with them should bear this in mind. 10 sites is also a pathetically small number of sites given the size and needs of the population.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.93

14389 Support

Summary:

It is essential that this money is spent on the provision of new permanent sites with proper amenities to meet the needs of homeless Travellers locally - at the moment no land has been identified. Identifying this land is a priority or the money will be lost or will not be spent in ways which meet the needs of local homeless Travellers who are in dire need of stable accommodation for health and educational reasons.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.93

14453 Object

Summary:

We are very concerned that while Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Council have been successful in securing £1m of funding from the Homes and Communities Agency, they have yet to identify any 'acceptable' land for pitches in either area despite the fact that they continue to refuse planning permission for permanent sites for Irish Travellers at Smithy Fen and provide for clear unmet needs for sites in our area. We wonder what purpose was served by bidding for HCA funding and whether Cambridge City will be returning the money received?

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 120 - Residential moorings

9584 Object

Summary:

New residential moorings should not be at the expense of short-stay tourist moorings or to the detriment of the overall riverscape.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 120 - Residential moorings

11067 Support

Summary:

The biggest issue seems to be parking - river boat residents often leave vehicles for long periods of time. When residents parking schemes are being considered, perhaps the boat people should also be considered for eligibility.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 120 - Residential moorings

12608 Object

Summary:

Needs to include the amenity of local residents (if appropriate) too i.e. loss of light, bin space, extra traffic etc.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 120 - Residential moorings

14073 Support

Summary:

The present approach to residential moorings has much to recommend it, and its inclusion in the Local Plan would be sensible.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 120 - Residential moorings

14795 Support

Summary:

The River Cam is quite a fragile environment, and while it's great to welcome narrow boats, there's a risk of air and water pollution already with the recent increase in houseboats (and I mean over 10-15 years).

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 120 - Residential moorings

15282 Support

Summary:

These should be more tightly controlled to give back to City residents access to the riverbank at Midsummer Common. There should be no additional encroachment on Stourbridge Common. The idea of a purpose-built marina is worth pursuing but the only site identified so far would require a solution to the Chesterton Fen access problem.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.54

9221 Object

Summary:

In South Cambs or elsewhere in the county

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.54

9521 Object

Summary:

Typographical error? Not exclusively about gypsies.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.54

12808 Object

Summary:

PLEASE NOTE: ERROR ON FORM - NO RESPONSE BOX NEXT TO QUESTION 9.53, SO ANSWERING IT HERE.

I have seen other examples of Gypsy & Traveller sites that work well. For example, one site where the outer boundary is fully tree-lined and internal space is mostly green space (helping avert adverse impact on local residents who may live nearby, as well as provide a nice space for living). Also, there is a specific block of toilet/shower facilities for residents + another block with basic kitchen washing facilities. Residents are free to come and go as they wish. Works well, well maintained.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.54

14148 Support

Summary:

Identification of brown land sites (not contaminated)

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.54

15049 Object

Summary:

This question is misleading. The City Council needs to regard residential boaters as a separate household group which is distinct from 'Gypsies and Travellers'. Most of the residential boaters would be horrified to be categorised as 'Gypsies and Travellers'! Not one person living on board a City-based boat is a member of the 'Gypsies and Travellers' community. Many of these people are white collar professionals such as University workers who have chosen to live on board boats for short periods of time (up to 5 years). Others are genuine 'hard luck' cases who cannot get onto the property ladder or afford rent or simply do not wish to conform with the restrictions of living on land.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.54

15283 Object

Summary:

This question is clearly inspired by "The Golden Compass" or AP Herbert. I am not aware of any extensive use of houseboats by 'gypsies and travellers'. Houseboats are occupied by a broad sample of the population.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.54

15852 Object**Summary:**

We do not understand question 9.54 and consider it an error. Boat dwellers come from a diverse range of cultures and backgrounds

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.54

17974 Object**Summary:**

Ensuring that transport links are available & improved to current sites and moorings providing access to amenities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.55

9219 Object**Summary:**

Not appropriate for gypsies and travellers

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.55

9522 Support**Summary:**

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.55

14149 Support**Summary:**

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.55

15050 Support**Summary:**

Yes, the City Council needs a specific policy for residential moorers because their needs are unique.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.55

16564 Support**Summary:**

Yes.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.55

17976 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.56

6942 Support

Summary:

Yes, we should consider a marina

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.56

9222 Support

Summary:

Yes, subject to strict criteria

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.56

10130 Object

Summary:

No moorings should be provided within the City boundary without standards enforced, equivalent to those which would be required of land dwellings. For example coal and diesel should not be burned emitting fumes at one to two metre height.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.56

10774 Object

Summary:

Despite the safeguards outlined in Option 120, moorings should be limited to protect the river which is a major amenity for people in Cambridge and especially for those living close by.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.56

14150 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.56

14393 Support

Summary:

Yes, but most of all permanent sites are needed - this is what the Gypsy and Traveller community need. They are happy to buy this land, but need to be able to get planning permission for the development of sites and would benefit from access to funding to support the development of these sites to make them of a high quality. Permanent provision is much more important than moorings - but since this is an area where Travellers pass through, it is also important that they can do so without being moved on by police.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.56

15051 Support

Summary:

Yes. Consideration must be given to the provision of 'offline' moorings (e.g. a marina).

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.56

17977 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.57

9224 Object

Summary:

No - not in City, anyway

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.57

13711 Support

Summary:

Fen Ditton

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.57

15052 Support

Summary:

There are two other possible sites for a marina but these would require joint planning with SCDC because they lie outside Cambridge. 1. Land to the west of the River Cam off Fen Road formerly designed as a Waste Transfer Station under the Cambs & Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan 2009. Low lying floodplain. Limited excavation required. Significant capacity for moorings. 2. Land to the south-east of Clayhithe Bridge, Waterbeach, owned by the Conservators and let for seasonal cattle grazing. Probably Green Belt.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.57

17979 Support

Summary:

Yes - to the North side of the river Cam, near Fen road. Further mooring on the south side of the river could be provided on Stourbridge common, but a better path should be provided

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.58

13997 Support

Summary:

I think the council should seek and consider evidence of who is actually living on "travellers" sites. It appears to me that they are becoming sites providing poor quality housing for economic migrants from Eastern Europe, Russia and elsewhere.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.58

14015 Support

Summary:

I think there ought be more diversity in moorings. I don't think the council should restrict its moorings entirely to full time residential boaters. I would like to see more recreational and visitor's moorings.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.58

14406 Support

Summary:

I think language around intensification of Traveller sites is deeply prejudicial and that the idea that Travellers sites should be small in relation to the remaining local population should be challenged on the basis of racial prejudice.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.58

14796 Support

Summary:

Some kind of policy re: potential increase of general river use as well as moorings to protect the fragile environment of the Cam.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.58

15055 Support

Summary:

Residential boats must comply with future policies on pollution.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.58

15855 Support

Summary:

There are many costs associated with living on a boat including mooring, license navigation insurance and boat maintenance fees/cost. Mooring fees charged by the Council are well below market rates. There are 70 moorings in Cambridge available to residential boaters on Stourbridge and Midsummer Commons as well as just below Jesus Lock. The City Council should monitor these moorings as the riparian owner. There is little scope for additional residential moorings and a paucity of visitor moorings and inadequate provision for boaters generally. All these matters need to be the subject of a strategic study proposed in Option 23 it cannot be dealt with piecemeal through a policy outlined in option 120.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.58

17980 Support

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.59

15056 Support

Summary:

Charge mooring fees which are in line with rates elsewhere nationally to 'raise the bar' for the standard of vessels moored on the Cam and the quality of the people making use of these vessels.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.59

17982 Object

Summary:

Only as above.

'Yes - to the North side of the river Cam, near Fen road. Further mooring on the south side of the river could be provided on Stourbridge common, but a better path should be provided'

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix C: Analysis, responses and preferred approach to employment, plus summaries of representations received

ISSUE: STRATEGIC PRIORITY

Total representations: 18	
Object: 11	Support: 7

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 121: Building a strong and competitive economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essential that the Council continues to support the University of Cambridge which supports Cambridge's economy, social and cultural life and environment; • Sustainable development for homes and jobs close to Cambridge will help build a strong and competitive economy; • Should plan for growth outside Cambridge, close enough to benefit from links to the University; • Need for growth should not be assumed at this stage; • The report downplays Anglia Ruskin University's role; • Cambridge's economy too skewed towards public sector; • The number of people and jobs need to be balanced; • Emphasis on strong sectors will exacerbate city's imbalance; • Encourage affordable employment space; • Limited land means much employment growth will have to go in surrounding districts; • Need to support economy of Cambridge sub-region; • Good transport links between employment sites important.

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Most representations did not propose new options but instead sought to change the proposed option, nevertheless some representations wanted to replace the option with an alternative option that did not seek to grow the economy.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

This Option should help maintain the City's position as one of the UK's most competitive cities by capitalising on its existing strengths in higher education, research and knowledge based industries. The city centre is likely to benefit from the focus on strengthening its retail and tourism offering. The extent to which it will reduce education and employment inequalities and manage potential growth in transport is unclear.

KEY EVIDENCE

- SQW (2011). Cambridge Cluster Study 2011;
- Cambridge City Council (2008) Employment Land Review 2008;
- Cambridge City Council. Employment Land Review Update 2012;

- Cambridgeshire County Council. Cambridgeshire Local Economic Assessment 2011;
- GVA Grimley(2008). Cambridge Sub-Region Retail Study;
- Shopping surveys carried out by Cambridge City Council – 2011/12;
- Hotel Solutions for Cambridge City Council (2012). Cambridge Hotel Futures Study

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Not applicable.

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 19 states the Government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system. Paragraph 21 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that Local Plans should set out a clear economic vision and strategy for their area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth.

Many of the objections sought changes to the priority, rather than opposing it outright. Some work around developing the detail of the priority will be needed prior to the next stage of consultation. The priority will avoid excessive detail, but needs to ensure it captures what makes Cambridge’s economy special and how the economy can be best supported.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 121 subject to minor amendments.

ISSUE: Selective Management of the Economy

Option 122: Total representations: 30	
Object: 3	Support: 27
Option 123: Total representations: 24	
Object: 9	Support: 15
Option 124: Total representations: 10	
Object: 3	Support: 7

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 122 – Continue with selective management of the economy unamended	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should apply only to new buildings, not conversions, or retrofitting existing buildings; • Unduly restrictive and restricts employment growth in the city; • Amend slightly to allow manufacturing and HQ development associated with the cluster; and

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on looking back and playing it safe. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for employment uses which provide a service for the local population; • The current policy is working; • Focus on strengths and locate larger, land hungry, businesses outside Cambridge; • Reserve land for uses that support high tech industry; and • Only relax if local economy is stalling.
<p>Option 123 – Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High tech HQs could just contain back office staff; • High tech HQs and manufacturing should be considered separately; • High tech manufacturing growth needs to be coordinated with surrounding districts, Alconbury is a potential location; • Existing policy allows for high tech HQs to locate to Cambridge; • High tech manufacturing growth will impact on traffic in Cambridge; • Will increase pressures on land supply, increasing prices and rents; • Should apply only to new buildings, not conversions, or retrofitting existing buildings; and • Unduly restrictive and will continue to restrict employment growth in the city. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High tech HQs should be encouraged, will encourage employment diversity and organic growth; • Support the wider economy; • Promote high end manufacturing; • Increased flexibility may help retain commercialisation of research; and • HQ operations are important to grow large companies.
<p>Option 124 – Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should maintain focus on high tech service sector; • Free for all would allow industrial sprawl; and • Encourage businesses with real roots in Cambridge that will remain through the bad times as well as the good. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Let the market decide;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current policy discourages development of employment space that no longer meets modern standards, restricting supply of office space; • Current policy too restrictive; • Current policy contrary to the spirit of the Use Class Order; and • Current policy unfairly discriminates against non-local users.
<p>Other additional key issues raised in paragraphs 10.7-10.10 & questions 10.3-10.6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should look at growth of professional, service and retail industries commensurate with high tech growth; • Amend policy to allow small scale companies involved in research, development and production to support commercialisation of research; • Existing policy isn't restrictive enough, growth should be encouraged in other areas of the country; • This policy has helped keep Cambridge a nice place to live; • High tech manufacturing and HQs require major investment in rail and road infrastructure to be competitive; • Manufacturing development is unlikely to be viable given high costs in Cambridge; • Need to preserve Cambridge's special character; • Should support live-work units and studios for inner areas; and • Building higher, where existing buildings are only one or two storey would help create capacity.

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

It was suggested that the policy of selective management of the economy should only apply to new buildings and not to conversions or retrofitting of existing buildings.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

It is not clear the extent to which the Selective Management Option is responsible for Cambridge's historic and current economic success. However, it is likely that this Option would contribute positively to Cambridge's economy and City Centre. The amended selective management Option should provide additional flexibility, also capitalising on contribution to the local economy from high tech industries which is not currently realised.

A market based approach would free up investment in new employment land and may result in a more efficient use of employment space. However, this approach may not be the most economically efficient for the city as a whole.

KEY EVIDENCE

- SQW (2011). Cambridge Cluster Study 2011;
- Cambridge & South Cambridgeshire (2008) Employment Land Review 2008;
- Cambridge & South Cambridgeshire Employment Land Review Update 2012;
- Cambridgeshire County Council. Cambridgeshire Local Economic Assessment 2011.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 7/2 (Selective Management of the Economy)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Cambridge has a long established policy of 'Selective Management of the Economy', whereby employment uses that have an essential need for a Cambridge location or provide a service for the local population are given positive support. This ensures that the limited supply of land in Cambridge is reserved for businesses that support the Cambridge economy.

Paragraph 21 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states local planning authorities should

“plan positively for the location, promotion and expansion of clusters or networks of knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries”

The Cambridge Cluster Study 2011, looked at the health of the Cambridge Cluster fifty years after its formation. It noted that the policy of Selective management of the Economy may be having unintended consequences: discouraging large scale, high value manufacturing as well as high-tech headquarter functions from locating in the area. It made a number of recommendations with regard the policy of Selective Management of the Economy:

- Stop the net loss of manufacturing land and, and remove the cap on the scale of high value manufacturing facilities that can be developed – other planning considerations can be used to prevent intrusive activities;
- Remove the constraint on HQ functions setting up in Cambridge, whether these are the HQs of local firms or inward investment;
- Allow the development of more open B1 space, in and around Cambridge whilst maintaining the restrictions on science parks to R&D uses (B1(b)).

The Employment Land Review 2012 also made a number of recommendations regarding the policy of Selective Management of the Economy, these are summarised below:

- The assumption that demand for employment land exceeds supply in the Cambridge area is arguably no longer the case and care should be taken to avoid slowing growth;
- The market is helping to keep out low value activities that do not need to locate in Cambridge.

- There is a shortage of B1a office permissions in Cambridge.
- Size restrictions for office and manufacturing appear to be arbitrary.
- If a distinction needs to be made between what is allowable close to Cambridge and further out, the inner limit of the Green Belt seems a logical boundary.
- There appears to be little point in requiring research establishments new to the area to show a “special need to be located close to existing major establishments in related fields”.

It is apparent that circumstances have changed since the policy of Selective Management of the Economy was last reviewed in 2006. Furthermore the policy is having a number of unintended negative impacts on the economy: discouraging some high value business functions from locating to the area, discouraging redevelopment of offices going past their prime and discouraging new office development. While the Employment Land Review 2012 does recommend a number of changes that could be made to improve the policy, the evidence would appear to suggest that it is no longer needed, and the market will safeguard against large, low value, land hungry uses.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 124 and discontinue the policy of Selective Management of the Economy.

The policy of Selective management for the Economy has existed around Cambridge in one form or another for a long time and there are risks to discontinuing this policy. If in terminating this policy this leads to a large increase in business development unrelated to the Cambridge Cluster such that R&D and other high tech employers are harmed (e.g. by being unable to find employment land, or indirectly through the businesses that serve the local area being unable to find land), then this policy could be reintroduced. Careful monitoring of the effects of discontinuing this policy will be needed.

Promoting research uses on specific sites, through masterplans and area based development frameworks, will remain an option open to the Council. This will help to ensure that Cambridge remains a centre for research in the future and strengthen the Cambridge Cluster.

ISSUE: Protection of industrial and storage space

Option 125: Total representations: 13	
Object: 4	Support: 9
Option 126: Total representations: 15	
Object: 7	Support: 8
Option 127: Total representations: 13	
Object: 4	Support: 9

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
<p>Option 125 – Continue with protection of industrial and storage space unamended</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge’s strengths lie in service sector; • These uses have significant transport impacts, should be relocated outside Cambridge; • Empty sites could have office uses on them; • Some protected industrial sites do not have much industry on them; and • Fails to provide sufficient flexibility. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effectiveness of its implementation should be enhanced; • Critical to success of Cambridge economy; • Traffic generated by these uses tend to be outside rush hours; and • Once lost potential is gone forever.
<p>Option 126: Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will allow redevelopment to residential, adding to congestion, and reducing employment opportunities for low skilled workers; and • Once sites are lost from employment use, they are lost forever. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Also amend criteria to assess sites; • Increased flexibility where employment sites are surplus to requirements; and • Cambridge’s strengths lie in service sector.
<p>Option 127: Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of best industrial sites; • Important to sustainable live / work plans; • Cambridge’s strengths lie in the service sector; and • Still not sufficiently flexible. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should apply where there are persistent vacancies; • Improve job diversity; • Increased flexibility; and • Counter productive to enforce unviable uses to remain on a site.
<p>Other additional key issues raised in paragraphs 10.11-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without protection no industrial site can fight off residential land values; • Plans should be able to rapidly respond to changing

10.13 & questions 10.7-10.10	<p>circumstances;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies should not seek to protect sites where there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for that purpose; • Increased flexibility, but not to change to offices, but for cultural activities or even housing; and • Vital need for small workshops as initial homes for new businesses.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
Not applicable.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT
<p>Option 125 should contribute positively to ensuring a diversity of work opportunities with good transport accessibility. However, it will be important to ensure that protection status should match the identified need.</p> <p>Applying a citywide approach (Option 126) to protection of industrial storage space would enable a more efficient use of available land while still offering a degree of protection through the use of existing criteria. Option 126 could help deliver higher levels of low skilled job opportunities compared to Option 125 helping address issues relating to income and employment deprivation.</p> <p>Providing additional flexibility based on specific criteria which would address the misapplication of Option 125 (this policy has not succeeded in preventing the loss of industrial floorspace in the past) should provide greater opportunities to address community and well being and economy related issues, particularly whereby criteria allow change of use to reduce employment inequalities.</p>

KEY EVIDENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SQW (2011). Cambridge Cluster Study 2011; • Cambridge & South Cambridgeshire (2008) Employment Land Review 2008; • Cambridge & South Cambridgeshire Employment Land Review Update 2012; • Cambridgeshire County Council. Cambridgeshire Local Economic Assessment 2011.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 7/3 (Protection of industrial and storage space)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that:

“Local Plans should meet objectively assessed need, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:

- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
- specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.”

Paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that:

“Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Land allocations should be regularly reviewed. Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities.”

Paragraph 51 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should:

“normally approve planning applications for change to residential use and any associated development from commercial buildings (currently in the B use classes) where there is an identified need for additional housing in that area, provided that there are not strong economic reasons why such development would be inappropriate.”

Option 125 proposes that development within a protected industrial cannot result in the loss of floorspace in B1c, B2 or B8 use under any circumstances. Paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework precludes carrying forward option 125, as the approach does not distinguish between circumstances where there is a reasonable prospect of that use continuing. Empty land and buildings benefit no one.

Evidence from the Employment Land Review 2012 and the Cluster Study is that loss of industrial land continues to be an significant issue for Cambridge, and they both recommend that manufacturing sites within and close to Cambridge should be protected from loss to housing or retail, but equally it is important to recognise that market factors dictate that this will not be possible in all cases. The Employment Land Review notes that allowing hybrid buildings, that enable flexibility of use, could be one way of addressing this issue.

Top industrial rents in Cambridge stand at around £8 - £9 per square foot, outside the city centre this drops to £5.50 - £6. Research by Halifax in 2011 found that

Cambridge residential prices were £2,783 per square metre, or £259 per square foot. Even allowing for the difference in the size of industrial buildings and residential buildings, this is still a significant difference. Without some form of protection, land and buildings in industrial use in Cambridge cannot fight off the residential land values that compete with them.

However, the Employment Land Review notes that safeguarding of industrial land may not be possible in all instances. As older sites become functionally obsolete, and making them attractive to users requires their redevelopment, the low value of industrial buildings can make their redevelopment unviable. In this instance allowing the development of alternative employment uses, such as offices or 'hybrid buildings' (buildings combining office functions, but also Research and Development and production facilities all under one roof), would be a way of making the redevelopment more viable and retaining the site in employment use.

The transport impacts of redevelopment would be considered at the planning application stage. Once sites are lost from industrial use they are unlikely to go back into this use, however the National Planning Policy Framework requires the policy to be flexible, the policy will still seek to retain the site in employment use.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH
The recommendation is to pursue a combination of option 126 and option 127, deleting the specific protected employment areas and amending the policy to allow more flexibility over the type of employment development that replaces the industrial and storage uses.

ISSUE: Protection of other employment space

Option 128: Total representations: 15	
Object: 0	Support: 15
Option 129: Total representations: 11	
Object: 1	Support: 10

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 128: Do not protect office space	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No arguments in favour of protecting offices. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not necessary, market forces can achieve a sustainable balance; Allow market forces to decide; Increased flexibility for owners; and Many existing empty offices, and new offices going up near station; no need to protect offices.
Option 129:	ARGUMENTS AGAINST:

Protection of office space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not necessary, market forces can achieve a sustainable balance; • Reduced flexibility for owners, impacting on Cambridge economy; • Allow market forces to decide; and • Many existing empty offices, and new offices going up near station; no need to protect offices. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to sustainable live / work plans.
Other additional key issues raised in paragraphs 10.14-10.15 & questions 10.11-10.14	<p>Responses to the questions show a mix of support and objections for a policy to protect offices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on supporting redevelopment / upgrading of existing stock; and • Increased offices in the historic core will impact congestion and the environment.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
Not applicable.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

There is likely to be a medium term shortage of office space in Cambridge. By not protecting office space this situation could be exacerbated. The extent to which this would impact the Cambridge economy is not clear and would depend on the value added by other proposed uses.

Protecting office space would ensure provision for small and growing businesses (an identified need) adding to the diversity of the Cambridge economy.

KEY EVIDENCE

- SQW (2011). Cambridge Cluster Study 2011;
- Cambridge City Council (2008) Employment Land Review 2008;
- Cambridge City Council. Employment Land Review Update 2012;
- Cambridgeshire County Council. Cambridgeshire Local Economic Assessment 2011.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Not applicable.

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that:

“Local Plans should meet objectively assessed need, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:

- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
- specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.”

Paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that:

“Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Land allocations should be regularly reviewed. Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities.”

Paragraph 51 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should:

“normally approve planning applications for change to residential use and any associated development from commercial buildings (currently in the B use classes) where there is an identified need for additional housing in that area, provided that there are not strong economic reasons why such development would be inappropriate.”

The Employment Land Review 2012, using the Cambridge Econometrics Local Economic Forecasting Model (LEFM), translated the baseline and policy-based LEFM projections, into floorspace requirements, by use type. For B1a offices in Cambridge this translated into a requirement of 45-59,000m² by 2031 (or 6.7-8.7ha), and for South Cambridgeshire 98-100,000m² (or 30.0-30.6ha). The review notes that, in principle these figures should be adjusted upwards to create some flexibility.

In looking at the current supply of B1a land, the Employment Land Review 2012 compares a number of different sources. Information from Savills Commercial Limited identified 97,266m² of grade A office space where there is known potential for development in the short term, it should be noted that this excludes strategic allocations such as Northstowe and North West Cambridge.

The Employment Land Review notes that at March 2011 there were sites with planning permission for 157,281m² (or 29.16ha) of B1a in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. However the Employment Land Review notes:

“the apparent plentiful supply of land for B1a offices in the City almost certainly reflects the fact that past completions have been constrained by limited supply, not market demand. Table 3-9 shows a net loss of B1a land over the last decade, which if continued into the future, and in the light of the forecast increase in demand for office premises from professional, business and financial services, would cause supply shortages”

The Employment Land Review also notes that in the last few years demand has contracted into the most popular locations, the City Centre (including Hills Road down to the Station) and the Science and Business Parks around the Northern Fringe.

It also notes that there is currently very little availability of offices in prime city centre, and much of the vacancies lie within secondary locations in Cambridge and the wider area. When looking at the policy of Selective Management of the Economy the Employment Land Review notes:

“There is a shortage of offices with B1a permissions in Cambridge. Unless this is addressed through a combination of intensification and making more land available in the more attractive locations, it could adversely affect projected employment growth, which is mainly in office sectors. The evidence suggests that a combination of applying local user restrictions and making space available beyond the immediate environs of Cambridge is not going to solve the problem of the demand/supply imbalance in the city”

County monitoring data for March 2012 notes that there are net commitments for 43,712m² (or 3.98ha) of B1a floorspace in Cambridge and 45,726m² (or 10.93ha) in South Cambridgeshire. This is substantially lower than the sites with planning permission identified in the Employment Land Review 2012. New allocations at Cambridge Northern Fringe will help meet demand and provide choice to businesses, however if substantial numbers of offices are lost then there is a risk that levels of jobs growth will be adversely effected.

The risk in leaving it to market forces is that secondary offices will see land values decrease relative to residential in the short to medium term, and there will be pressure to redevelop them. This could hinder job growth in the longer term, when the wider economy improves, and leave capacity to meet demand undermined.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 129, and seek to protect office development in Cambridge. This will take the form of a criteria based policy that has inbuilt flexibility to allow for loss when there is no reasonable prospect of that use continuing.

However having policies protecting industrial uses and offices and no policy protecting other land employment use (B1b & other B use classes) could have the unintended consequence of discouraging R&D development it is therefore proposed

to protect all land and buildings in employment use (B use class).

ISSUE: Promotion of cluster development

Option 130: Total representations: 18	
Object: 1	Support: 17
Option 131: Total representations: 4	
Object: 3	Support: 1

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 130: Continue to promote cluster development	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cluster should grow naturally. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides reassurance to potential occupiers that sites will be occupied by related uses; Justifies the principle of development on some sites; and Carry forward existing policy.
Option 131: Do not promote cluster development	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carry forward existing policy. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should look at what businesses are actually doing.
Other additional key issues raised in paragraphs 10.16-10.17 & questions 10.15-10.18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discontinue policy as of no apparent previous value; Strong support for cluster development, especially knowledge-driven, creative or high tech industries; The new station will help the cluster expand; Clusters assist networking; Promoting clusters is in line with the NPPF; Provision of incubator units can help some entrepreneurs; Provides a positive statement of the type of development the Council wishes to see; and Needs to mention growth of SMEs.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
Not applicable.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

This Option should help to facilitate development and support Cambridge as an internationally recognised high tech centre where it is used. However if it were to be discontinued is unlikely to have any significant effect on the sustainability topics due to the infrequency of its application.

KEY EVIDENCE

- SQW (2011). Cambridge Cluster Study 2011;

- Cambridge City Council (2011). Cambridge Annual Monitoring Report 2011.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 7/4 (Promotion of Cluster Development)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Paragraph 21 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states local planning authorities should

“plan positively for the location, promotion and expansion of clusters or networks of knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries”

While the policy has not been well used in planning decisions it gives a clear steer to business as to the strengths of the Cambridge economy, and promotes particular forms of development to support the cluster, as well as particular locations. Responses were largely in favour of retaining the policy.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 130, and continue to promote cluster development; this could be through a strategic objective. Promoting research uses on specific sites, through masterplans and area based development frameworks, will remain an option open to the Council. This will help to ensure that Cambridge remains a centre for research in the future and strengthen the Cambridge Cluster.

ISSUE: Shared social spaces as part of employment areas

Option 132: Total representations: 19	
Object: 0	Support: 19
Option 133: Total representations: 6	
Object: 4	Support: 2

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 132: Promote shared social spaces	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No arguments against the option. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot be left to market forces, will only be of interest to developers with a long term interest; • Requires a long term commitment to them; • Community is important in workplaces; and • Support for residential over commercial premises to enliven areas after hours.
Option 133: Do not promote shared social spaces	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires a long term commitment to them; and • Support for residential over commercial premises to enliven areas after hours.

	<p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No arguments against the option.
Other additional key issues raised in paragraphs 10.18 & questions 10.19-10.22	<p>Responses to the questions show a mix of support and objections for a policy provide shared social spaces in employment areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a matter for local plan policy; • Not necessary or desirable; • Lack of facilities on commercial developments leads to extra journeys during the day; • Gardens for communal lunches; • Only realistic on larger employment sites; • Occupiers may have to subsidise; and • Increased costs to developers will increase rents.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
Not applicable.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

The promotion of social spaces involving a mix of uses could potentially contribute to a diverse economic and social mix through provision of a variety of employment / social spaces tailored to particular local need. Provision of attractive shared social spaces could help reduce pressure on city centre office space. Whether the attractiveness of peripheral employment sites will improve with time is not known, and the likely success of this Option on meeting sustainability objectives is unclear without further detail on what form the shared social spaces could take.

Compared to the above Option 132, a market based approach may mitigate the risk of unintended consequences or financial implications for developers, particularly given the uncertainty over what shared social spaces would take.

KEY EVIDENCE

- SQW (2011). Cambridge Cluster Study 2011.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Not applicable.

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The Cluster Study 2011 recommends that Cambridge’s new developments are designed as social spaces, not just as locations for business and research.

There was some concern expressed in the representations that this would lead to increased costs for the development of new employment areas, which would be passed onto occupiers. If the policy was worded such that it promoted but did not require social facilities this concern could be addressed, then the sites would only provide them if they felt there was a business case to them making the site more attractive.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 132, and promote shared social spaces as part of employment sites, this could be through a more general, mixed-use policy.

ISSUE: Densification of existing employment areas

Option 134: Total representations: 24	
Object: 0	Support: 24
Option 135: Total representations: 8	
Object: 5	Support: 3

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 134: Densify existing employment areas	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No arguments against the option. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support with adequate weight given to possible detrimental effects (traffic, noise, visual intrusion); Will reinforce transportation, density and sustainability goals; Preferable to erosion of green spaces and Green Belt; and Makes best use of employment land supply.
Option 135: Do not densify existing employment areas	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional pressure to erode green spaces and Green Belt. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When a cup is full, it is full.
Other additional key issues raised in paragraphs 10.19-10.21 & questions 10.23-10.26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should be planned in coordination with the transport strategy; Densification should be complemented by fast connecting transport links, particularly at peripheral locations; Smarter use of land;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Densification should not undermine value of open spaces and social areas, should be considered on a case by case basis, not a blanket policy; • Higher densities promote walking and cycling; • Densification where good public transport exists or can be provided; • Care must be taken of the historic environment in Cambridge; • Brownfield development is better than Greenfield; • Increased traffic from denser developments; and • Criteria based policy may be effective.
--	---

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Not applicable.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Cambridge faces significant development constraints and opportunities to maximise the sustainable development of employment sites should be pursued. Densification would likely result in reducing pressure on Cambridge’s landscape/townscape and green infrastructure. Through increasing density in peripheral employment sites, this Option would also enable greater opportunities to develop inclusive and attractive shared spaces on employment sites.

Concerns regarding change of use as a consequence of densification could be mitigated by applying protective criteria. Densification of employment sites is likely to increase the viability of new sustainable transport provision but overall, could also contribute to greater pressure on surrounding transport infrastructure. This Option (135) could result in reduced opportunities to develop more social spaces due to increased pressure on land values.

KEY EVIDENCE

- SQW (2011). Cambridge Cluster Study 2011;
- Cambridge City Council (2008) Employment Land Review 2008;
- Cambridge City Council. Employment Land Review Update 2012;
- Cambridgeshire County Council. Cambridgeshire Local Economic Assessment 2011.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Not applicable.

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

One of the principles underlying planning set out in paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework is that planning should:

“encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value”

The Issues & Options 2 consultation has consulted on a number existing employment sites where they may be potential for intensification as buildings come to the end of their life. No decision on these sites has been taken.

Linking densification of employment uses to existing or potential high quality public transport routes would help minimise the traffic impact of any additional employment onsite.

Whether densification of employment uses on a site is appropriate or not will depend on the site specific issues of the site. The National Planning Policy Framework already encourages effective reuse of land; a policy seeking densification of employment areas would not add anything that would help in the determination of planning applications.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 135 and not have a specific policy that seeks to densify existing employment areas. Individual allocations and proposals will be considered on their merits, and a general strategic objective can seek to make best use of land by encouraging densification in suitable locations across the city in highly accessible locations.

APPENDIX C - ANALYSIS, RESPONSES AND PREFERRED APPROACH TO EMPLOYMENT PLUS SUMMARIES OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.1

8309 Support

Summary:

'Sensibly managed growth' might well be a state of no absolute growth but of dynamic equilibrium which can encompass desirable change.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.1

16163 Support

Summary:

The Vision set out on pages 221-222 is strongly supported, and clearly it is important to put the right policies in place to further this vision.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.2

8311 Support

Summary:

It is important to support district and local centres.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.3

8312 Support

Summary:

We welcome the statement that development of tourism should not adversely impact on the quality of life of residents.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.3

11769 Object

Summary:

This paragraph does not mention the attraction of the city itself, the narrow streets, the market, the river etc. The conservation areas such as Newtown are also a vital part of what makes Cambridge an attractive place to visit. These are a major part of the tourist attraction and should be part of a long term local plan.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

7208 Support

Summary:

The limited land available within the City boundary dictates that a significant proportion of employment growth will have to be located in surrounding districts. It is essential that Cambridge City's policies give adequate weight to the needs of the surrounding new communities, as they make a crucial contribution to sustaining the overall quality of life throughout the Cambridge sub-region and its economic competitiveness. The economy within the City needs to be considered together with that in South Cambs. In particular, good transport links need to be provided between all the employment sites, so as to facilitate cross-fertilisation of expertise.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

8121 Object

Summary:

It may be necessary to strengthen the economy, but I find it difficult to see how further growth can take place within the city. The 2006 Local Plan stated that the city had twice as many jobs as working residents, resulting in commuting into the city. It was for this reason that land was removed from the green belt to provide housing. Any further increase in jobs will lead to a greater need for housing. Both jobs and housing must be developed together, close enough to Cambridge to benefit from links with the University etc, but outside the city boundary.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

8313 Object

Summary:

We would replace the phrase 'to strengthen and grow' with the phrase 'to maintain the strength of'. Need for growth should not be assumed at this stage.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

10915 Object

Summary:

The Issues & options report downplays Anglia Ruskin's role. The university performs a significant role, which is not limited to "the needs of the Region". It has a number of important specialisms, including international links and relations. Its Department of Optometry, for example, carries out world leading research into diseases such as glaucoma. Its role in health and social care education and training is significant and growing internationally.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

12192 Support

Summary:

I consider that Strategic priorities, option 60 (p. 136), option 67 (p. 150), option 121 (p. 218), option 163 (p. 260) and option 182 (p. 284) are the correct ones

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

12264 Support

Summary:

we support this strategic priority

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

12267 Support

Summary:

In addition to delivering excellence in teaching and research, the University has a major impact on Cambridge's economy, social and cultural life, and environment. It is essential therefore that policies in the plan should continue to encourage and enable the future development of the University and its related activities.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

12492 Object

Summary:

The local economy will grow of its own accord. The real question is how much it will/should grow and what price will be paid for it? You can't grow for ever, so it seems silly to have it always as a goal. Why not equilibrium?

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

13194 Support

Summary:

We would support the development of a policy supported by guidance setting out design and locational criteria in order to assess the suitability of development proposals for tall buildings on a case by case basis. This would be supported as it will allow flexibility for developers by not limiting building heights across the city or part thereof. Where developable land is at a premium, tall buildings not only create important landmark features within the city, but also allow increased density and encourage the best use of land.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

13937 Object

Summary:

- * Option 121 needs to refer to this issue to build a strong and competitive economy through sustainable development for homes and jobs together and close to Cambridge.
- * This approach is the most sustainable option rather than new homes and jobs growth in surrounding settlements where new development will add to the increase in longer distance vehicle movements.
- * Planning new growth at distances from Cambridge is unsustainable, is a drain on resources of energy and time thereby reducing the effectiveness of the Cambridge economy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

13976 Object

Summary:

Option 121 does not recognise the crucial need for a proper balance between existing jobs (together with new jobs expected to be created) and the need for new homes within the City, and the cumulative impact that this could have both on the Cambridge sub-regional economy and on 'UK plc' if this balance is not fully and effectively achieved.

The Option should refer to the benefits of building a strong and competitive economy through sustainable development of both homes and jobs together, in close proximity to the City of Cambridge.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

15300 Object

Summary:

Cambridge economy is insufficiently diverse to be sustainable, too dependent on the public sector, too skewed to a 16-26 demographic and failing to meet the needs of many residents.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

16565 Object

Summary:

I question the need for further growth of the economy over and above what was decided in the 2006 Plan.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

16871 Object

Summary:

Support a policy: On the business front it is interesting to note that Mitchams Corner is one of the 3 District Centres in the City and yet park and ride won't stop here! The document ignores the big issue of business rates which is a central government tax and is a serious disincentive to start ups. The City has little interest in negotiating 'rate free periods as landlords do with rent as they do not get the money. The obsession with preserving A1 retail use is based on the past...England is no longer a nation of shopkeepers...it is still a nation of small business based on a little footfall but very much on service and the internet!
Provision for developing a river walk on the north bank of the Cam.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

17780 Support

Summary:

John Lewis supports the Council's strategic priority, Option 121, to maintain and strengthen the city's regional role as a centre for shopping and tourism.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

18254 Object

Summary:

We feel that the over emphasis on the 5 stand out business sectors is likely to exacerbate the city's imbalance in availability of employment space and thus not provide what is spatially and socially required for Cambridge - genuine mixed use, dynamic, lively and affordable employment sites.

A significantly weak section in the report is the lack of thought on mechanisms to improve the quality of existing employment sites. Expansion of employment in the city is being encouraged, to run in parallel with housing growth, however, apart from hotel locations there is little thought given to the best location for any new premises. The CAA suggest that Mill lane, Newmarket road and some other existing "protected industrial storage space! sites would be suitable sites for employment focus.

The plan should encourage "affordable employment space" and seek mixed use sites combining housing, social and employment space.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

18391 Support

Summary:

Support this option. Please refer to the full text of submission.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

18584 Object

Summary:

Not surprisingly, the majority of Chamber businesses are not rushing to respond to these consultations. Generally they feel that if the area is to achieve the desired economic growth and prosperity the plans need to be coordinated and to cover a much larger area than Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, ideally in one single plan. For consultation to deliver any meaningful conclusions there needs to be much closer collaboration across local authority areas and much better connection between different issues. For example, the question of how many homes should be built in and around Cambridge is quite obviously linked to how will the growing population get around? Realistic answers to these questions can only be made if major road and rail infrastructure developments, as well as walking, cycling and use of public transport are part of the consultation.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Key facts

11773 Object

Summary:

Objectives Employment in Box. First bullet to Promote the growth of and linkages....
Integration of public transport planning within and outside the city is vital.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Key facts

12609 Object

Summary:

I'm not sure where Cambridge Retail Park and the Beehive fit into this and would argue that there should be a separate plan for retail warehouse provision in Cambridge to discourage in-commuting which is creating huge problems in these areas.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Key facts

15057 Object

Summary:

Key attractions for visitors also include the River Cam.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Key facts

16162 Object

Summary:

Under the headings 'Key Facts' and 'Objectives', Higher and Further Education should be moved to sit between Employment and Retail, to reflect its level of importance and the interaction between Employment and Higher and Further Education.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Objectives

7209 Support

Summary:

The vitality and viability of centres in Cambridge needs to be considered together with that of those in the wider sub-region.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Objectives

10917 Object

Summary:

The report downplays Anglia Ruskin's role. The university performs a significant role, which is not limited to "the needs of the Region". It has a number of important specialisms, including international links and relations. Its Department of Optometry carries out world leading research. The University is a major provider of education and training in Health and Social Care and its role internationally is growing.

The 3rd objective under Higher and Further Education be amended to read "To support the growth and development of Anglia Ruskin University and the upgrading and enhancement of its campus and facilities."

The final objective under Higher and Further Education should be deleted. The provision of student accommodation helps to relieve the pressure on existing homes used as shared houses and reduces the pressure on affordable housing stock. Its attractiveness to developers is irrelevant.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Objectives

10918 Object (W/drawn 2012-10-30)

Summary:

The final objective under Higher and Further Education should be deleted. The provision of student accommodation helps to relieve the pressure on existing homes used as shared houses and reduces the pressure on affordable housing stock. Its attractiveness to developers is irrelevant.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Objectives

12500 Object

Summary:

Tourism needs no encouragement; if anything, the reverse, if it were possible. Visitor nummbers have increased by c. 30% at least since the mid-1980s. It was well-nigh intolerable then. I do support the proposals to try to reduce the pressure on the centre.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Objectives

12611 Object

Summary:

I broadly agree with this but there needs to be stronger wording around retail to include "sustainable". I would argue that not all retail centres are operating effectively (Cambridge Retail Park and the Beehive) because of this and the emphasis should be on "improve" rather than just "maintain".

Support the assertion that Cambridge has lost valuable industrial sites. All current sites should be protected.

Object to comment about Cambridge Retail Park and Beehive Centre. these sites emphasise how restrictive land use policies have prevented appropriate out of town development, which could have reduced congestion.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	Objectives
---	-------------------

12615 Support (W/drawn 2012-10-30)

Summary:

Completely support the assertion that Cambridge has lost valuable industrial sites, despite protection, and I would argue that this is therefore a failure to implement the existing protection, which must be a key goal of this new plan. All current sites should be protected - even the less occupied ones that could be turned over to office use etc perhaps - if they are de-protected we will lose all of this land to housing.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	Objectives
---	-------------------

12618 Object (W/drawn 2012-10-30)

Summary:

Cambridge Retail Park and the Beehive emphasise how the restrictive land use policies around Cambridge fringe have prevented appropriate out-of-town development of supermarkets etc that would significantly reduce the inward commuting of shoppers to these areas that is currently causing serious congestion. I would argue therefore that in some areas there should not be further future development (as would be encouraged in the wording currently) until these existing issues have been resolved and out-of town sites should be considered instead.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	Objectives
---	-------------------

15948 Object

Summary:

And whilst we're on the subject of the city centre, is there now too much tourism? Perhaps. As a long-term resident of Cambridge, I'm happy enough to share its sights and history with visitors, but there are many times of the day now when it's a real trial to make your way around the city centre. We're not talking Venetian levels of disruption or intrusion, thank heavens, but even so.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	10.5
---	-------------

13170 Object

Summary:

The lack of land is surely an argument against further growth. The compact nature of the city should be preserved to that end, the plan should encourage regional employment growth and seek to spread Cambridge's reputation for excellence beyond the city boundaries to outlying towns.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	10.6
---	-------------

8315 Object

Summary:

We see the two components of the 'vision' as mutually incompatible. We do not believe that the emphasis on 'growth' can also allow for the quality of life in the city to be maintained.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	10.6
---	-------------

11834 Support

Summary:

We agree with the vision expressed in Paragraph 10.6 and add to the statement that the "quality of life in the city that makes it an attractive place to live...will be protected and enhanced" should explicitly include references to the green spaces and compactness of the City. This is consistent with the Vision proposed in Option 1 and, we believe, essential to the continued success of the City in attracting leading academics from around the world.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.6

12172 Object

Summary:

For the new Cambridge Local Plan to continue its current focus on higher, further and university education, at the expense of recognising the role of the entire education sector would be wrong.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.6

15489 Support

Summary:

We agree with the vision expressed in paragraph 10.6 and add to the statement that the "quality of life in the city that makes it an attractive place to live...will be protected and enhanced." Should explicitly include references to the green spaces and compactness of the City. This is consistent with the Vision proposed in Option 1, and, we believe, essential to the continued success of the City is attracting leading academics from around the world.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.6

16196 Support

Summary:

We agree with the vision expressed in paragraph 10.6 and add to the statement that the "quality of life in the city that makes it an attractive place to live...will be protected and enhanced." Should explicitly include references to the green spaces and compactness of the City. This is consistent with the Vision proposed in Option 1, and, we believe, essential to the continued success of the City is attracting leading academics from around the world.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

6943 Support

Summary:

yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

7009 Object

Summary:

NO, I definitely do not agree with the vision.

Cambridge's attractiveness is largely due to its compactness, and the proximity of countryside to the university within walking distance. Cambridge cannot cope with further expansion of its industry without expansion of its residential accommodation or increasing the already excessive commuter traffic. Growth cannot go on for ever without damaging what is good about the city.
Cambridge University - alone - needs to be permitted to grow at a reasonably low rate, and the rest of Cambridge's industry needs to experience an incentive to locate elsewhere.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

7121 Support

Summary:

Yes. I have reservations about encouraging the development of the city as a regional shopping centre and would actively discourage tourism.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

7697 Support

Summary:

Vital.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

8124 Object

Summary:

I think the two parts of the vision statement are incompatible. I don't think that 'expansion' of the economy can happen except at the expense of the quality of life in the city.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

8316 Object

Summary:

Don't agree. We see the two components of the 'vision' as mutually incompatible. We do not believe that the emphasis on 'growth' can also allow for the quality of life in the city to be maintained.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

8487 Support

Summary:

yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

9361 Support

Summary:

I support the vision so long as it is understood that it can and must be achieved within existing parameters (including the science developments envisaged for North-West Cambridge). The city should go for quality not quantity even in the hi-tech field, and for compactness as an enabler in research and high value economic growth. It should NOT become a shopping centre for the East of England, nor a dormitory town for London. Most of the housing projected for the city and certainly for the Green Belt is undesirable and will destroy the 'vision'.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

10823 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

10927 Support

Summary:

The Vision for the local economy is supported. It will be important that the local plan translates the vision into policies which supported the continued growth and success of the City's universities and the economy, and ensures sufficient new homes, both market and affordable housing, are delivered.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

11776 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

11835 Support

Summary:

We agree with the vision expressed in Paragraph 10.6 and add to the statement that the "quality of life in the city that makes it an attractive place to live...will be protected and enhanced" should explicitly include references to the green spaces and compactness of the City. This is consistent with the Vision proposed in Option 1 and, we believe, essential to the continued success of the City in attracting leading academics from around the world.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

12210 Support

Summary:

I agree with the vision stated at the top of p. 222.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

12266 Object

Summary:

Broadly agree but while our economic success may be largely built on 'hi tech' and the usually highly qualified key staff who populate those companies, we need to find or create jobs for those with lower level qualifications and skills and achieve a more balanced economy as well as avoid unemployment.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

12275 Support

Summary:

The vision in this section is supported but the wording 'continue to develop' should be incorporated in the elements of the vision set out at Option 1

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

12419 Object

Summary:

Agree with Prof Kerrigan

"I support the vision so long as it is understood that it can and must be achieved within existing parameters (including the science developments envisaged for North-West Cambridge). The city should go for quality not quantity even in the hi-tech field, and for compactness as an enabler in research and high value economic growth. It should NOT become a shopping centre for the East of England, nor a dormitory town for London. Most of the housing projected for the city and certainly for the Green Belt is undesirable and will destroy the 'vision'." And finally, to allow the University of Cambridge alone to prosper would be utterly self-indulgent and a "non-optimal" use of the the public money on this University has been set up and continues to operate.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.1**

12427 Object (W/drawn 2012-10-30)**Summary:**

Support: In addition, I strongly disagree that the city is for the exclusive benefit of the University of Cambridge (or a few in the University). For the University to benefit the country, it needs to interact with and start new hi-tech companies. Support strongly the Cambridge cluster - do not rest on laurels.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.1**

12446 Support (W/drawn 2012-10-30)**Summary:**

And finally, to allow the University of Cambridge alone to prosper would be utterly self-indulgent and a "non-optimal" use of the the public money on this University has been set up and continues to operate.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.1**

12507 Object**Summary:**

I don't agree with the vision because its aims conflict. Expanding the economy, and all the 'growth' and people and housing that will bring, will not protect or enhance the quality of life here. You can't grow and expect to stay the same.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.1**

14118 Object**Summary:**

I think that 'continuing to develop as a world leader' implies an expansion and densification of the City that will in due course destroy the very assets that the Council seeks to protect and enhance. Cambridge is a small city, and sometimes we cannot compete for new business with much larger ones. We can adapt and innovate, but if we expand in some areas, we may have to be at the expense of others. E.g. if Marshalls were to move out, this would create opportunities for new development, but the land supply is limited

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.1**

14124 Support**Summary:**

Must continue to develop but there are obvious constraints on physical expansion

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.1**

14153 Support**Summary:**

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.1**

14207 Object**Summary:**

Not everyone is suited to work in a knowledge based economy. For sure it's important, but need there be so much emphasis on it?

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.1**

14875 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

15058 Object

Summary:

Support:

Yes, but second sentence of the Vision statement reads awkwardly and needs to be drafted.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

15301 Object

Summary:

Very pretty words but develop means growing the whole not just one section of the community at the expense of the rest. More attention should be given to making life better for the non-academic people who actually make the academic monster work and who actually make Cambridge a place worth living in. Academe should be a jewel in the crown of a more balanced economy but appears to risk becoming an economic cancer sucking the life-blood out of the rest of the city.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

15491 Support

Summary:

We agree with the vision expressed in paragraph 10.6 and add to the statement that the "quality of life in the city that makes it an attractive place to live,...will be protected and enhanced." Should explicitly include references to the green spaces and compactness of the City. This is consistent with the Vision proposed in Option 1, and, we believe, essential to the continued success of the City is attracting leading academics from around the world.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

16197 Support

Summary:

We agree with the vision expressed in paragraph 10.6 and add to the statement that the "quality of life in the city that makes it an attractive place to live,...will be protected and enhanced." Should explicitly include references to the green spaces and compactness of the City. This is consistent with the Vision proposed in Option 1, and, we believe, essential to the continued success of the City is attracting leading academics from around the world.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

16567 Object

Summary:

The Vision sets out two incompatible aims.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

16846 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

17458 Support

Summary:

I agree with the vision that Cambridge should develop as a leader in the fields of higher education and research but this has to be done within the constraints of a finite water supply

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

17487 Support

Summary:

We fully support the statement that there is a need to strengthen and grow Cambridge's economy, to build upon existing strengths and to enhance the city's regional role. The need to plan positively for economic growth is a requirement of the NPPF, whilst the NLP report which is appended to these representations also underlines the importance of planning sufficiently for the economic development needs of the area. The importance of applying a cross-boundary approach to planning for the economic development needs of Cambridge, in conjunction with South Cambridgeshire, should also be stressed.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

18446 Support

Summary:

The County Council supports the vision as outlined in 10.6 and suggests further consideration of the barriers to investment over the life of the Plan could be added, for example, the identification of priority areas for infrastructure provision. Forthcoming census data on commuting patterns and economic activity will facilitate our understanding of the Travel to Work Area (TTWA) of the sub-region.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.2

8317 Support

Summary:

The idea of change without growth has not been considered.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.2

11836 Support

Summary:

We agree with the vision expressed in Paragraph 10.6 and add to the statement that the "quality of life in the city that makes it an attractive place to live...will be protected and enhanced" should explicitly include references to the green spaces and compactness of the City. This is consistent with the Vision proposed in Option 1 and, we believe, essential to the continued success of the City in attracting leading academics from around the world.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.2

11939 Object

Summary:

I support the development of the tourism industry and the encouragement of longer stays (though repeat visits are an alternative which should also be encouraged). Particular attention should be paid to encouraging visitors to venture outside the city using sustainable transport, which entails better public transport, more traffic free walking and cycling routes, and better information and marketing which emphasises the availability of sustainable transport modes. The last is crucial as many visitors may not have easy access to the Internet during their stay.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.2

12274 Object

Summary:

The second objective under Higher and Further education should read 'To support the University of Cambridge and the Colleges in maintaining their pre-eminent position nationally and internationally.'

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.2**

12281 Support**Summary:**

the words 'whilst also seeking to develop the diversity of jobs' after 'knowledge based economy'. We need to reflect the 2nd bullet point of employment objectives as set out on p220.

While our economic success may be largely built on 'hi tech' and the usually highly qualified key staff who populate those companies, we need to find or create jobs for those with lower level qualifications and skills and achieve a more balanced economy as well as avoid unemployment.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.2**

14155 Support**Summary:**

I would remove the reference to 'prosperity'.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.2**

14215 Support**Summary:**

What about training, employment opportunities in such things as sustainable building, making existing building more energy efficient, water conservation and grey water use, heat pumps, solar, local power
Also appliance repair, recycling
Also care for green spaces etc

I may have missed it, but I have not seen much in this plan about employment opportunities in these kinds of areas.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.2**

14538 Support**Summary:**

I suggest redrafting the vision to make clear that the "research" in: "world leader in the fields of higher education and research" includes commercial research and development (largely in some way linked to and/or derived from the academic activity in the city).

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.2**

15060 Support**Summary:**

The River Cam needs to be part of that vision. The City should be viewed as the hub of a larger catchment.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.2**

15492 Support**Summary:**

We agree with the vision expressed in paragraph 10.6 and add to the statement that the "quality of life in the city that makes it an attractive place to live,...will be protected and enhanced." Should explicitly include references to the green spaces and compactness of the City. This is consistent with the Vision proposed in Option 1, and, we believe, essential to the continued success of the City is attracting leading academics from around the world.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.2**

16201 Support

Summary:

We agree with the vision expressed in paragraph 10.6 and add to the statement that the "quality of life in the city that makes it an attractive place to live,...will be protected and enhanced." Should explicitly include references to the green spaces and compactness of the City. This is consistent with the Vision proposed in Option 1, and, we believe, essential to the continued success of the City is attracting leading academics from around the world.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.2

17461 Support

Summary:

The point about development not exceeding environmental constraints is missing from the vision

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.2

17489 Support

Summary:

We fully support the statement that there is a need to strengthen and grow Cambridge's economy, to build upon existing strengths and to enhance the city's regional role. The need to plan positively for economic growth is a requirement of the NPPF, whilst the NLP report which is appended to these representations also underlines the importance of planning sufficiently for the economic development needs of the area. The importance of applying a cross-boundary approach to planning for the economic development needs of Cambridge, in conjunction with South Cambridgeshire, should also be stressed.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.2

17596 Support

Summary:

South Cambs are proposing to create between 14-30K new jobs and the City 10-20K over the next 20 years, how far have these plans been coordinated?

A large proportion of jobs created in S Cambs are likely based on businesses created in the City, who are forced to move out as they grow. There are currently a large number of vacant business premises at the Science park and Waterbeach, these could accommodate City businesses without impacting on infrastructure.

Small units should be provided in the City on small sites with good transport links to University sites and the station.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.2

17984 Support

Summary:

There is mention only of the knowledge based economy. Cambridge should foster also the highly skilled technical sector - emphasising the synergy between the universities and City- such as precision engineering. C has a strong tradition here e.g. Cambridge Instrument Co, Pye This sector offers skilled employment and a skilled workforce; likely to benefit innovative entrepreneurs

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.2

18251 Support

Summary:

It is good the options report identifies the 5 key business sectors in the city however there is not enough effort placed in the report on strengthening the other sectors that a city needs in order to generate a promote a diverse city - the city needs to attract top people, does it?

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.7

8318 Support

Summary:

We agree that it is important to give positive support to employment uses which provide a service for the local population.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

7122 Support

Summary:

I support this option (Option 122)

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

8947 Support

Summary:

Continue with the current policy. It is working.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

11863 Support

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the city, where transportation links are better, distribution cost lower and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

12509 Support

Summary:

This is better than the alternatives.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

13196 Support

Summary:

We would suggest that this policy be applicable only to new buildings and not to conversions or retrofitting of existing buildings.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

13234 Support

Summary:

We support Option 122.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

13792 Object

Summary:

The current policy is unduly restrictive and restricts employment growth in the city.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

13904 Support

Summary:

Management is a good idea. Amendment may become necessary.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

14539 Support (W/drawn 2012-10-30)

Summary:

This policy appears to me to be in both Cambridge's and the wider national interest. I support it.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

14543 Object

Summary:

This policy appears to me to be in both Cambridge's and the wider national interest. I generally support it, but think it ought be slightly relaxed to address the concerns raised that it could prevent or deter certain related manufacturing or HQ from locating in Cambridge even though their presence would be synergistic with the city's established businesses.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

15302 Object

Summary:

Selective management is always based on looking back and playing it safe by repeating what appeared to work well last time rather than encouraging genuine initiative. We do not have the space for large scale manufactures so outsource production to places that do, a process that has been the source of much of the land released for redevelopment in recent years in Chesterton and other parts of the city. The idea of cluster development is supported but we should have diversity and build on solid foundations not hot research money.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

15499 Support

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower, and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

16202 Support

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower, and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended**

16903 Support**Summary:**

We support a policy which seeks to manage the local economy in such a way that it reserves scarce land in the City for firms that complement the nature of the economy, with its emphasis on high tech and vital service jobs. Relaxing this policy as in option 123 would be justified only if the local economy were to stall significantly or if sites elsewhere were clearly unsuitable.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended**

16938 Support**Summary:**

ARM also supports 'Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy Unamended' of the Cambridge Local Plan IOR which reserves new employment land in Cambridge for uses that support the high tech cluster or provide a service for the local population. By limiting employment land to those firms that benefit from locating in Cambridge and benefit the Cambridge Phenomenon or those that serve the local economy, the policy ensures that there is enough land for these firms and that they are not priced out of the market by more generic, but higher value, uses.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended**

17714 Support**Summary:**

I cannot see any reason to change the management of the economy and therefore support Option 122.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses**

7123 Object**Summary:**

I am wary of the reference to high tech headquarters if such headquarters would simply accommodate back office staff

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses**

7210 Support**Summary:**

Headquarters and large-scale high-value manufacturing need to be considered separately. Encouragement should be given for high-tech firms to keep their headquarters in the Cambridge sub-region (including the city) when they grow. This will contribute to employment diversity and avoid disruption to organic growth. Space needs to be available in a variety of sized units at a variety of locations so that firms have a range of choices. Consideration of appropriate locations needs to be co-ordinated with South Cambs, East Cambs and Huntingdon (particularly bearing in mind the potential role of the enterprise zone at Alconbury).

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses**

7551 Support**Summary:**

Whilst it is sound economics to support clusters, the wider Cambridge economy must profit too from the commercialisation of research into larger employment providers

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses**

7698 Support

Summary:

The Holford report's effects are still visible in the shape of the local economy. It would be good to see high end mfg promoted.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

11871 Object

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the city, where transportation links are better, distribution cost lower and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. Option 122 allows for high technology headquarters to be located in Cambridge, provided they support the local cluster or provide local services. We do not see the need to create a new policy for this.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

12436 Support

Summary:

Support views of Cambridge Past, Present & Future.

Country needs its start-ups to grow. Relocating office / manufacture outside Cambridge will lead to reverse commuting.

Do not encourage head office location of non-Cambridge companies. Cambridge has a role which it needs to fulfil for the nation (hi-tech, leading R&D and then innovation and commercialisation) but Cambridge is not big enough to sustain everything that might want to locate to this lovely place (financial services etc).

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

12514 Object

Summary:

High tech firms don't have to be here. Nor do we want 'big players' coming in with the consequent inflation of land values, rents and property values. Nor do we want large-scale anything, if the Cambridge we know is to survive.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

13197 Support

Summary:

We would suggest that this policy be applicable only to new buildings and not to conversions or retrofitting of existing buildings.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

13239 Support

Summary:

There is some merit in Option 123.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

13795 Object

Summary:

This option is unduly selective and will restrict employment growth in the city.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

14144 Support

Summary:

More flexible approach might mean the City keeps more of the commercialisation of its research

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

14876 Support

Summary:

Support

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

15303 Support

Summary:

It is important to have headquarter operations in Cambridge if you want enterprise to survive hard times. Our clusters should be the centre of design and development for much wider networks as both Marshalls and ARM have become. Pure R&D, with rare exceptions, does not grow large enterprises; it is dependent on successful enterprise for funding, e.g. Bell Labs and Microsoft for two.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

15513 Object

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City in South Cambridgeshire District, where transportation links are better and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing pressure on the City's green spaces. Option 122 already allows for high technology headquarters to be located in Cambridge, provided they support the local cluster or provide local services. We do not see the need to create a new policy for this. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

16214 Object

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City in South Cambridgeshire District, where transportation links are better and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing pressure on the City's green spaces. Option 122 already allows for high technology headquarters to be located in Cambridge, provided they support the local cluster or provide local services. We do not see the need to create a new policy for this. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

17646 Object

Summary:

The City Council Property Services Department considers that this policy approach may need to incorporate some flexibility, to protect specific areas but allow others to be released for other high value manufacturing or high-tech office uses by inserting additional criteria similar to those listed in Policy 7/2 of the current Local Plan. There may be some merit in allowing higher value or high tech companies on certain sites, or allowing B1a (office) and B1c (light industry) that have direct links to companies that need a Cambridge location or widen the range of local employment opportunities. It is considered this would be of benefit to Cambridge, and is something that could be considered at Northern Fringe East (see separate comments from the Council in respect of Option 33).

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 124 - Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy

7124 Object

Summary:

I do not support this option

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 124 - Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy

11872 Object

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the city, where transportation links are better, distribution cost lower and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. Option 122 allows for high technology headquarters to be located in Cambridge, provided they support the local cluster or provide local services. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 124 - Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy

12517 Object

Summary:

Letting the market decide would mean a free-for-all and the rapid ruin of Cambridge. That is how 19th century industrial sprawls happened.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 124 - Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy

13244 Object

Summary:

We do not support Option 124.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 124 - Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy

13721 Support

Summary:

Let the market decide.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 124 - Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy

13797 Support

Summary:

The current policy discourages the development of employment space that no longer meets modern standards and consequently restricts the supply of office space in the city.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 124 - Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy

15305 Object

Summary:

We do need to be selective but manufactures are as important as biochemicals and design and development as important as research. We do need to get smarter and seek to encourage businesses with real roots in Cambridge that are likely to remain in bad times as well as good.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 124 - Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy

15516 Object

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City in South Cambridgeshire District, where transportation links are better and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing pressure on the City's green spaces. Option 122 already allows for high technology headquarters to be located in Cambridge, provided they support the local cluster or provide local services. We do not see the need to create a new policy for this. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 124 - Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy

16215 Object

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City in South Cambridgeshire District, where transportation links are better and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing pressure on the City's green spaces. Option 122 already allows for high technology headquarters to be located in Cambridge, provided they support the local cluster or provide local services. We do not see the need to create a new policy for this. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 124 - Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy

18392 Support

Summary:

We also wish to express our support for Option 124. Whilst our client fully supports the concept of promoting what Cambridge excels at and providing support to local enterprises, there is concern that the existing policy is too restrictive and contrary to the spirit of the Use Classes Order. In our view, the policy currently unfairly discriminates against non-local users and distorts the market accordingly.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.3

7125 Support

Summary:

Undoubtedly. I urge the pursuit of existing policies which should include allowing the growth of professional, service and retail industries commensurate with the growth of the high tech sector.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.3

8320 Support

Summary:

need policy

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.3

11778 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.3

11864 Support

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the city, where transportation links are better, distribution cost lower and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.3**

12280 Object**Summary:**

The view of University Estate Management Officers is that the policy should be amended to allow for small scale companies involved in research, development and production to allow for the commercialisation of academic research to take place in Cambridge.

This would assist business start ups and spin out companies that would encourage the development of the hi-tech Cambridge cluster and benefit the local economy.

This matter needs further discussion within the University before a definitive response can be given.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.3**

12285 Support**Summary:**

yes, we need a policy

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.3**

14161 Support**Summary:**

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.3**

15501 Support**Summary:**

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower, and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.3**

16206 Support**Summary:**

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower, and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.3**

16569 Support**Summary:**

Yes.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.3**

16847 Support

Summary:

Yes - support.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.3

17470 Support

Summary:

There is need for a policy addressing the selective management of the economy

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.3

17985 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.3

18448 Support

Summary:

The County Council supports the need for a policy addressing the selective management of the economy (options 122-4)

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

7010 Object

Summary:

Definitely there is a need for selective management of the economy. Of the three options 122 to 124 presented, Option 122 seems far the most preferable, but in my view it doesn't go far enough in limiting local increase in employment. Other parts of the country already have sufficient housing stock, much of it unwanted, and rather than ruin further parts of the country (e.g. Cambridge), it seems far preferable to have gradually and naturally increasing disincentives for more businesses to locate here.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

7639 Support

Summary:

Option 122. Absolutely this is a reason why Cambridge is a relatively nice place to live and has been successful. Only an idiot would change things.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

7791 Support

Summary:

Option 122.

Given the limited growth consistent with the vision of Cambridge as a compact city we should focus on those activities that most benefit from locating in Cambridge.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

8321 Support

Summary:

support option 122

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

9363 Support

Summary:

Option 122

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

10360 Support

Summary:

122 because with limited land it should go to start ups and research sites that need good links with the university to prosper.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

10442 Support

Summary:

Support policy 123 because this looks more flexible and likely to achieve better results.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

11780 Object

Summary:

option 122. Cambridge should continue doing what is unique to Cambridge and what we do best. High value manufacturing and high tech headquarters will need a major investment in rail and road infrastructure to be competitive and these jobs are needed more elsewhere. The 'Cambridge Phenomenon' because of the talented people here, is agile and will move with the times whereas manufacturing is much less so.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

11865 Support

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the city, where transportation links are better, distribution cost lower and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

12296 Object

Summary:

On balance we support Option 123 but with some modifications
1 we query whether large scale manufacture is even feasible given Cambridge's high cost base;

2 we do strongly support is encouragement of high value manufacturing - pre and pilot production and final assembly of complex systems. Here unit costs are less important but employee skills are paramount. Marshall's aerospace is an excellent example
Supporting Head Office employment may also help the diversity of jobs

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

14162 Support

Summary:

Option 122

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

14540 Support

Summary:

I support option 122, with elements of option 123.

I think the current selective policy ought continue, but be changed (relaxed) slightly to allow, and encourage, high tech manufacturing and headquarters functions, which relate to, serve, or show a need/benefit to being co-located with Cambridge's existing academic and commercial skills and expertise.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

15502 Support

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower, and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

15859 Object

Summary:

The vision for the Cambridge economy needs to be consistent with maintaining essential character of the City and the quality of life of its inhabitants. The economy thus should be managed to meet those aims. It follows that of the options put forward, Option 122 is one we would favour, namely continuing with the current selective management of the economy rather than expanding the scope (option 123) discontinuing a policy of selective management (option 124).

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

16193 Support

Summary:

Option 123 is generally supported. The policy set out in the current Local Plan (Policy 7/2) is too restrictive in that it does not currently allow for uses which could potentially support an important primary use. We do not support option 124 as there is a continued need for a policy on selective management of the economy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

16207 Support

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower, and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

16573 Support

Summary:

Option 122 preferred on the whole. Option 123 would certainly be preferable to Option 124, which could lead to unregulated development of business.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.4**

16848 Support**Summary:**

We prefer Option 123, which would provide more flexibility. The policy should also include reference to live-work units and studios for inner areas of Cambridge, where artists and craftspeople can be encouraged to set up creative businesses within residential neighbourhoods.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.4**

17466 Support**Summary:**

Economy - Option 123 supported including high value manufacturing, and support for wider under-provided employment categories. Policies also need to assist the expansion and retention of successful businesses. Transport integration of major new housing sites and major job locations also needs to be given far more priority and attention

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.4**

17486 Support**Summary:**

It would be best to continue with Option 122 and continue with the selective management of the economy. Unless larger scale development can be shown to be water neutral it should not be encouraged.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.4**

17637 Object**Summary:**

Whilst we support proposals to assist SMEs, we accept that the re-location of a major company to Cambridge would enhance the City's reputation and may attract other large companies. However, many large companies already have a presence in Cambridge through sponsorship of laboratories, either through funding the building of a laboratory or by sponsoring a research project. So it is unlikely that a major company will re-locate its research and development function to Cambridge city. However, a policy that does not permit this to happen seems shortsighted. We therefore support Option 123 to allow for this to happen.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.4**

17989 Support**Summary:**

Option 123

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.4**

18449 Support**Summary:**

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses is supported

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.5**

9364 Support**Summary:**

The places to try option 123 are existing or new Science Parks etc, outside the City boundary but easily accessible by good public transport.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.5**

10232 Support**Summary:**

We would like to see the local economy diversify to make better use of local resources. A great deal more of our basic needs should be provided for efficiently from local sources. This promotes resilience against global crises such as fluctuations in fuel prices and other world markets.

In general we support small businesses which benefit the local community. From now through to 2031 we expect expansion in following areas:

- * Local food production
- * Local production of natural materials, such as willow, wood for fuel
- * Education in how to create and provide goods and services locally
- * Research in methods to utilise local resources efficiently

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.5**

11866 Support**Summary:**

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the city, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.5**

15504 Support**Summary:**

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower, and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.5**

16198 Support**Summary:**

Option 123 refers to the possibility of allowing 'large scale, high value manufacturing and high tech headquarters to locate in Cambridge' which is supported but the policy should be relaxed further to allow for uses with a clear 'support link' to well-established employment uses which are essential to the continuing success of the Cambridge economy, such as sales and marketing uses. The policy also needs to recognise the importance of other support functions including things such as warehousing and distribution as all are important to sustain a vibrant and sustainable knowledge based economy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.5**

16209 Support**Summary:**

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower, and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.5**

17007 Support

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.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.5

17468 Support

Summary:

Economy - Option 123 supported including high value manufacturing, and support for wider under-provided employment categories. Policies also need to assist the expansion and retention of successful businesses. Transport integration of major new housing sites and major job locations also needs to be given far more priority and attention

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.5

17488 Support

Summary:

Water consumption has not been taken into account in considering the selective encouragement of national rather than local businesses.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.5

17606 Support

Summary:

Marshalls is the only major industrial employer in the City and one with a world class reputation. However they seem to have reached a steady state in their expansion programme and are unlikely to generate any significant number of new jobs over the coming plan period, either through aviation engineering or airport operation. Any provision for growth in the industrial sector therefore seems to be based on small to medium sized companies.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.5

17990 Support

Summary:

Firms that did not benefit from locating in Cambridge would be unlikely to locate here, squeezing out others, given the high land costs. Firms' headquarters would compete for office locations rather than industrial areas.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.5

18450 Support

Summary:

Option 123 The County Council believes that the additional uses allowed should be restricted to those downstream and headquarter uses linked to the high tech sector and excludes more general financial and business service headquarters.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.6

11867 Support

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the city, where transportation links are better, distribution cost lower and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.6

12303 Support

Summary:

There are significant opportunities to make better use of existing high tech clusters by both redevelopment and building higher - often existing buildings are 1 or at most 2 storey. This would make better use of existing land rather than use up scarce new land. The main thrust should be to help develop the successful hi tech / innovation / research sectors by creating the right environment for them to flourish. To some extent, growth would then be self generating

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.6

15505 Support

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower, and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.6

16211 Support

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower, and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.6

17490 Support

Summary:

Developments should only be considered if they can be shown to be water neutral

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.6

17991 Support

Summary:

Given the likely changes in industrial organisation and production over the next twenty years, and the wish to encourage innovation, policies should not be restrictive

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.11

14560 Support

Summary:

The Rattee and Kett site at the bottom on Purbeck Rd (later National Extension College, now Homerton Business Centre) is very suitable for light industrial and workshop premises. The site is an important part of the artistic and industrial heritage in Cambridge. It features publicly funded artwork and gardens, currently hosts a print workshop and a bookshop, a cookery school, and could become a center for craft, masonry, iron, woodwork, glass, print related economic activity. It would be ideally suited to become a "low-tech" counterpoint to the high-tech centres which so far dominate local planning.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 125 - continue with protection of industrial storage space unamended

7211 Support

Summary:

The effectiveness of its implementation should be enhanced.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 125 - continue with protection of industrial storage space unamended

11875 Object

Summary:

Oppose. We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. We believe that storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. We believe these spaces once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 125 - continue with protection of industrial storage space unamended

12621 Support

Summary:

This is an absolutely critical requirement for the future success not only of Cambridge as an economy, but it is essential to the execution of the live/work local strategy outlined in this plan. Another critical element is that even if these businesses do generate traffic, it is during the day when many workers will be away, so that it is not clashing with existing rush hours as would be created by any residential developments on these sites. Traffic is therefore balanced better.

The argument that sites with empty plots should be deprotected is also incorrect in my opinion as why cannot these be turned to a different use such as office space? Any de-protection would significantly weaken the Cambridge economy and the entire central strategy of this plan.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 125 - continue with protection of industrial storage space unamended

12624 Support (W/drawn 2012-10-30)

Summary:

One this land is lost it's potential use for the Cambridge economy is gone forever. The argument that sites with empty plots should be deprotected is also incorrect in my opinion as why cannot these be turned to a different use such as office space - of which this very report says we need more? Once gone we can never use this land again. Any de-protection would significantly weaken the Cambridge economy and the entire central strategy of this plan.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 125 - continue with protection of industrial storage space unamended

13166 Object

Summary:

We object to Option 125 because it would unnecessarily retain Homerton Business Centre as a protected industrial/storage site.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 125 - continue with protection of industrial storage space unamended

14879 Support

Summary:

Support

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 125 - continue with protection of industrial storage space unamended

15306 Support

Summary:

We must not allow alternative uses to be sacrificed to the great god Housing but the emphasis should be on encouraging local enterprises to grow rather than allowing in satellite operations that can close down at the hint of economic recession.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 125 - continue with protection of industrial storage space unamended

15521 Object

Summary:

Oppose. We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 125 - continue with protection of industrial storage space unamended

15590 Object

Summary:

We consider that Option 125 ('Continue with protection of industrial and storage space unamended') fails to provide sufficient flexibility for the future redevelopment of existing employment sites, given that it seeks to safeguard those sites designated under the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted 2006).

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 125 - continue with protection of industrial storage space unamended

16218 Object

Summary:

Oppose. We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 126 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites

11878 Support

Summary:

Support We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. We believe that storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. We believe these spaces once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 126 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites

12626 Object

Summary:

Totally disagree with this option - there will simply be no chance that this land will do anything other than become residential. This will add congestion on the roads in rush hour, rather than adding traffic throughout office hours when most industrial businesses are open i.e. adding further to rush hour congestion. Local people will lose their jobs, and potential value land will be lost that could be used for office space? Industrial land could be contaminated, making only dense garden-less developments possible which will add disproportionately to local traffic. Please don't take this option!

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 126 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites

13181 Support

Summary:

We support Option 126, provided the current policy protection on the site (for light industry, general industrial and warehousing) is removed, and replaced with an allocation for mixed use residential development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 126 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites

13649 Support

Summary:

We support Option 126 so that all protected industrial and storage sites are deleted, including land to the north of Cambridge Leisure.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 126 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites

14027 Support

Summary:

We support Option 126 so that all protected industrial and storage sites are deleted.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 126 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites

14882 Object

Summary:

Object

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 126 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites

15307 Object

Summary:

No this would release land that would be gobbled up for housing but then what? The diminished real economy would leave many local option but to become underpaid servants of the universities or quit Cambridge for places which offer opportunities for the non-academically gifted.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 126 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites

15526 Support

Summary:

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 126 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites

15589 Support

Summary:

Therefore, we favour this policy as it would allow the greatest flexibility for employment sites to come forward for redevelopment for alternative uses including mixed use or residential led developments, where appropriate. In drafting the Policy, we are of the opinion that the policy should explicitly state that where employment spaces are surplus to requirements (including those that are protected) that they are encouraged to come forward for mixed use or residential led developments where it is demonstrated that there is no demand for continued use or the premises are no longer commercially suitable for employment use.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 126 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites

16222 Support

Summary:

Oppose. We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 127 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development

11877 Object

Summary:

Oppose. We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. We believe that storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. We believe these spaces once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 127 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development

12632 Object

Summary:

I would disagree with this for the very reason that you've outlined which is that some of the best sites in Cam could come under pressure if protection is not strong. There are certain things that are critical to the execution of the central live/work local strategy running through this report and the protection of existing sites is one. Why has the existing protection failed? This should be looked at rather than admitting nothing can be done. Cannot re-designation of use be done whilst also protecting sites too? Are these really mutually exclusive?

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 127 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development

14166 Support

Summary:

Qualified to apply when there are persistent vacancies. Should improve the diversity of jobs

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 127 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development

14776 Support

Summary:

As the report highlights, whilst sites are required for employment in Cambridge, it is counterproductive to force sites to remain in a use which are not viable. However if planning policy showed flexibility and sensitivity to each case then viable uses of existing sites could be achieved at the same time as improving the sites.

To assist in this process I consider that there needs to be an ability to introduce alternative types of employment onto sites and consider mixed use developments which will maximise the use of existing sites and enable schemes to be economically viable.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 127 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development

15308 Support

Summary:

This looks like a good approach, especially in the context of encouraging design and development enterprises.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 127 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development

15535 Object

Summary:

Oppose. We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 127 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development

15593 Object

Summary:

Similarly, we consider Option 127 ('Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development') also fails to provide sufficient flexibility for the redevelopment given that this policy seeks to retain all existing employment land in employment uses, including those sites not designated under the Local Plan.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 127 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development

16223 Object

Summary:

Oppose. We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 127 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development**

17648 Support**Summary:**

The Property Services Department at the City Council support Option 127 and suggest inclusion of additional criteria where changes of use to other employment generating development would be acceptable, such as the characteristics of the proposed use compared with B1c, B2 or B8 uses, the amount of employment the proposed use generates and the value of those jobs to the local economy. It would also be relevant to consider what alternative locations exist for the proposed use, and whether they are available and suitable. The City Council Property Services Department understands that there are examples where companies, such as a taxi firm, have not been able to locate on protected sites because of this current policy approach. We suggest that additional criteria might be added to the wording implicit in current Local Plan Policy 7/3 to support other employment uses. The Northern Fringe East / Cowley Road Area could be a location where a less restrictive industrial policy could apply and other types of employment could be located, although this needs to be assessed on a more comprehensive basis. The Council owns land within this area (see representations under Option 33).

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.7**

11553 Support**Summary:**

Support

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.7**

11781 Support**Summary:**

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.7**

11879 Support**Summary:**

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. We believe that storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. We believe these spaces once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.7**

12308 Support**Summary:**

yes, good to have a policy here

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.7**

12634 Support**Summary:**

Yes, this is critical to the execution of this policy and local jobs rely on it. Without protection no industrial site can hope to fight off residential developers forever - certain things like this and green space need protection.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.7**

15527 Support

Summary:

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.7

16225 Support

Summary:

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.7

16958 Support

Summary:

In line with the NPPF, Councils should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century. Policies should therefore be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances (NPPF, paragraph 21).

The local plan policy addressing this issue needs to include the flexibility to consider sites on an individual basis, based on their location and specific circumstances. The policy should avoid applying a blanket protectionist policy where there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for that purpose, or where the site is able to fulfill other strategic functions. This approach is supported by national guidance contained within the NPPF - where applications for alternative uses of land or buildings on such sites should be treated on their merits, having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities (paragraph 22).

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.7

17992 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.7

18451 Support

Summary:

The County Council supports the need for a policy addressing the protection of industrial and storage space.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.8

9365 Support

Summary:

Option 127, especially in cases of persistent or prolonged vacancy

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.8

11785 Support

Summary:

Option 126; need flexibility to use unused space creatively, but NOT necessarily for office space but for socially useful, cultural activities or even housing.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.8

11881 Support

Summary:

Option 126

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. We believe that storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. We believe these spaces once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.8

12309 Object

Summary:

either option 125 or 127; the latter does give flexibility and encourages employment of all types but Option 125 is OK.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.8

12638 Support

Summary:

Very strong protection, but surely there's a way of doing this but having flexibility for employment use at the same time. Just please don't open these areas up to the developers!

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.8

14175 Support

Summary:

Option 125

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.8

15529 Support

Summary:

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.8

16228 Support

Summary:

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.8**

16960 Support**Summary:**

We would support option 126, which seeks to amend the policy by removing the protected industrial and storage sites and using a criteria based policy to assess the loss of any industrial sites within the City.

This approach will provide flexibility to use or re-use sites for the most appropriate and sustainable purposes, responding to market conditions and changing needs and demands, and will prevent industrial units standing empty or under utilised. This enables the planning authority to be pro-active and positive in its management of land use and promotion of sustainable development.

A set of criteria will also give the protection where needed to ensure a balance and mix of uses within the city for example, promoting employment uses as part of larger mixed-use schemes.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.8**

17633 Support**Summary:**

The number of industrial sites within the City has decreased and we support the proposal, Option 127. We also suggest that small parcels of land to be considered to provide sites for groups of small industrial units, for example on land released by building multi-storey car parks at the retail sites on newmarket road and/or Beehive centre. some of these could be ground floor units below residential units.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.8**

17993 Support**Summary:**

Option 125

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.8**

18452 Support**Summary:**

The County Council supports option 127 Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development with provisos. It is critical that expanding the criteria does not result in an accelerated loss of industrial floorspace particularly of the type which can accommodate the noisier and less attractive types of employment uses and/or can provide relatively cost effective facilities for start up industrial concerns, both of which are necessary to provide a mix of employment uses in a city the size of Cambridge.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.9**

8322 Object**Summary:**

We were unable to respond to this section because we did not understand what was implied by the phrase 'industrial and storage space'. This needs to be made clear.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.9**

11882 Support**Summary:**

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. We believe that storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. We believe these spaces once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.9**

12635 Support

Summary:

Traffic would be worse at rush hour times if these areas were turned over to housing as they currently generate most traffic during the day when people are at work.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.9

15530 Support

Summary:

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.9

16229 Support

Summary:

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.9

17994 Support

Summary:

There is a vital need for small workshops on 'cheap' sites as initial homes for new businesses if C is to foster innovative entrepreneurs. Some protection of these sites is therefore important. This also promotes a variety of enterprises offering varied employment

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.10

11883 Support

Summary:

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. We believe that storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. We believe these spaces once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.10

15532 Support

Summary:

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.10

16231 Support

Summary:

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.10

16961 Support

Summary:

Economically, Cambridge functions as a city-region, providing employment for the sub-region. It is therefore reasonable to assess employment land opportunities across the administrative boundary with South Cambridgeshire. There may be appropriate and available sites that lie within South Cambridgeshire District Council, yet would assist in meeting the needs of both local authorities.

Paragraph 181 of the NPPF expects local planning authorities to work collaboratively and in a "continuous process of engagement".

Development plans will also be expected to demonstrate evidence of "having effectively cooperated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts".

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.10

18608 Support

Summary:

We agree there is need for a policy. We believe that

Policies on industrial units, warehousing and failing business should be relaxed to allow re-development of selected units

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.14

12639 Object

Summary:

I'm not sure that I agree entirely here - the Intercell site has stood empty for years?

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 128 - Do not protect office space

11885 Support

Summary:

We do not believe a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 128 - Do not protect office space

13198 Support

Summary:

We would support a policy which continues not to protect office space from change of use. This would continue to allow the market to determine loss of office space to conversion to alternative uses as dictated by demand. This allows flexibility for the owners of such buildings to apply for change of use should offices remain vacant for extended periods of time.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 128 - Do not protect office space

15539 Support

Summary:

We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 128 - Do not protect office space**

16234 Support**Summary:**

We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 128 - Do not protect office space**

17730 Support**Summary:**

As far as offices are concerned, there are so many empty offices and a new office block in Station Road that I cannot think that there is a need to build yet more. I therefore oppose any proposals to build more or to preserve offices. Let the market determine what other use is appropriate for an empty office. I therefore support Option 128.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 129 - Protection of office space**

11888 Object**Summary:**

We do not believe a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 129 - Protection of office space**

12640 Support**Summary:**

Yes, I think that similarly to the protection of industrial space this is a key requirement of the live/work local strategy

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 129 - Protection of office space**

13200 Object**Summary:**

We would not support the protection of office floorspace in Cambridge. This would reduce flexibility for the owners of such buildings which would impact on the Cambridge economy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 129 - Protection of office space**

15540 Object**Summary:**

We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 129 - Protection of office space**

16236 Object**Summary:**

We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 129 - Protection of office space**

17732 Object

Summary:

As far as offices are concerned, there are so many empty offices and a new office block in Station Road that I cannot think that there is a need to build yet more. I therefore oppose any proposals to build more or to preserve offices. Let the market determine what other use is appropriate for an empty office. I therefore oppose Option 129.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

8323 Support

Summary:

need policy

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

11787 Support

Summary:

yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

11889 Object

Summary:

We do not believe a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

12288 Object

Summary:

The University occupies a number of former residential buildings that are now used as offices. We are concerned to ensure that Local Plan policy for the use of office space is sufficiently flexible to enable change of use of this type of space.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

12311 Support

Summary:

yes to a policy

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

12641 Support

Summary:

Yes, it's key to the central live/work locally premise.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

15309 Object

Summary:

It is probably best to leave this to the market to decide but focus on making it relatively easy to upgrade/replace office space no longer capable of meeting modern demands. conversion to other uses, e.g. student accommodation could be considered if it would contribute to the release of housing currently occupied by students back into the housing market and not feed growth in the number of students.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

15541 Object

Summary:

We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

16238 Object

Summary:

We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

17995 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

18453 Support

Summary:

The County Council supports the need for a policy addressing the protection of other employment uses.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.12

8324 Support

Summary:

support option 128

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.12

9366 Support

Summary:

Option 128, but only marginally

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.12

11788 Support

Summary:

Option 128

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

11890 Object**Summary:**

We do not believe a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

11941 Support**Summary:**

I believe that office space should be protected at relevant locations.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

12316 Object**Summary:**

we support option 129 rather than 128.

We recognise a number of employers like the city centre and it can be convenient for employees (once they have travelled to work). But, do we really want to encourage office space in the centre of Cambridge? Better for office space to be further out, like CB1 or even on the edge of the city next to retail parks, science parks etc

this would help to avoid further city centre congestion, where, for example the volume of buses at peak times is a major contributor to congestion

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

12642 Support**Summary:**

129- protect

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

14171 Support**Summary:**

option 129 except where non sustainable in structure or location

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

14176 Support**Summary:**

Option 128

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

15544 Support**Summary:**

Support Option 128. We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

16239 Support**Summary:**

Support Option 128. We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

17628 Support**Summary:**

we oppose the creation of yet more office space within the City and therefore see no case for option 129 since it does not seem necessary. We therefore support Option 128. Judging by the number of empty office blocks (City/Unix House on Hills Road and new office development at the Station) we cannot see any justification for more accommodation. The position would be different if a headquarters of a major insurance/finance institution were to move in, although they may prefer to be situated near the M11.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

17996 Support**Summary:**

Option 128

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

18181 Support**Summary:**

Support Option 128. We do not object to Option 129, albeit request that we can get involved with and be consulted on the evolution of this type of policy so that we can properly understand the implications for USS and the potential future redevelopment of Mount Pleasant House.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

18454 Support**Summary:**

The County Council supports Option 129 Protection of office space.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.13**

11795 Object**Summary:**

Planning for out of town offices should be integrated with residential development to lessen transport needs, and transport should be integrated in planning decisions. Allowances should be made for home working that may well diminish the need for office space and transport. Alternative work sites in nearby towns should be considered. The city planners should work closely with other authorities and the Local Plan should be integrated with region wide transport plans. New work spaces in the historic and conservation areas of Cambridge should primarily be found by utilising existing buildings.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.13**

11891 Support

Summary:

We do not believe a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.13

12212 Support

Summary:

Concerning office space (p. 227), it may be desirable to have more properties available for sale rather than for rent.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.13

15545 Support

Summary:

We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.13

16242 Support

Summary:

We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.13

17997 Support

Summary:

You argue that there is a lack of office space. While this is so, office space is not likely to be lost to other uses. Once satisfied by new office building, old premises might become residential properties? So much the better to bring residents back into the centre. New offices should be established on good public transport routes; they do not need central locations

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.14

11892 Support

Summary:

We do not believe a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.14

15547 Support

Summary:

We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.14

16243 Support

Summary:

We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 130 - Continue to promote cluster development

11893 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 130 - Continue to promote cluster development

13246 Support

Summary:

We support Option 130 and request that a policy supporting cluster development be retained.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 130 - Continue to promote cluster development

15310 Object

Summary:

whilst business does like to cluster these should grow naturally out of genuine business need, e.g. shoe shops and estate agents like to be near each other as they have found form experience that that benefits them all.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 130 - Continue to promote cluster development

15564 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 130 - Continue to promote cluster development

15620 Support

Summary:

No.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 130 - Continue to promote cluster development

16246 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 131 - Do not protect cluster development

11901 Object

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 131 - Do not protect cluster development**15311 Support****Summary:**

We should encourage the growth of real businesses by looking at what someone is actually doing and not relying on beautiful business plans to make support decisions. The awful example of Ionica should be compulsory study for all planners. A putative telecoms company that won every business planning award going but fell at the first fence when it actually opened for business and found it could not supply its first customers because there were trees in the way; we do have quite a few trees even in one of the least wooded counties of England.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 131 - Do not protect cluster development**15573 Object****Summary:**

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 131 - Do not protect cluster development**16259 Object****Summary:**

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15**8325 Object****Summary:**

no policy required as apparently of no previous value

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15**11555 Support****Summary:**

Support

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15**11796 Support****Summary:**

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15**11894 Support****Summary:**

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15

12291 Support

Summary:

The University strongly supports the promotion of cluster development particularly where such development is related to knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries.

The University would object strongly to the discontinuance of this policy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15

12318 Support

Summary:

yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15

15565 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15

15860 Support

Summary:

The promotion of cluster development Option 130 is practical and sensible. We recognise that the new station development with its particular intention of serving the Science Park, will attract additional business to the area and expand the cluster development of the high tech industry towards the new station. This again underlines the need for proper strategic planning of the new station.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15

16248 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15

18372 Support

Summary:

SCDC considers a policy is still required that continues to promote cluster development as in Option 130.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15

18455 Support

Summary:

The County Council supports the need for a policy addressing the promotion of cluster development. Even if it has been rarely used to date, it is important from a perceptions perspective in affirming the City's support for the Cambridge high tech cluster.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

9367 Support

Summary:

Option 130

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

11557 Support

Summary:

Support for cluster development (Option 130) should be encouraged, but not to much detriment of other types of industry which 'don't fit' the preconceived ideas.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

11798 Support

Summary:

Option 130, Continue to promote cluster development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

11895 Support

Summary:

Option 130
We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

12319 Support

Summary:

Option 130 - keep existing policy.

Evidence seems to show that people, esp in hi tech area, appreciate the networking capabilities of clusters.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

14242 Support

Summary:

Option 130 although hard to know how much to credit the policy for the clusters.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

15567 Support

Summary:

Support Option 130 - We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

16203 Support

Summary:

Option 130 - Continue to promote cluster development - is supported. This is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework which at paragraph 21 requires local planning to 'plan positively for the location, promotion and expansion of clusters or networks of knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries'. With the acknowledged shortage of land in Cambridge it is important that such uses are given clear priority. It does however need to be recognised that in order to support a successful cluster, ancillary and supporting uses must be permitted to locate in proximity to these primary uses.

Option 131 is not supported as there is a continued need for a policy promoting cluster development

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

16251 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

17998 Support

Summary:

Option 130. Despite being rarely used, the provision of incubator units is provided for by this policy and could help some entrepreneurs if rents are kept in check

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

18373 Support

Summary:

SCDC considers a policy is still required that continues to promote cluster development as in Option 130. Whilst the City Council may rarely use the policy, it sets out a positive statement of the type of development it wishes to see in Cambridge. It may become more relevant depending on the approach taken in the new Local Plan on other types of employment and the selective management of the economy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

18456 Support

Summary:

The County Council supports option 130 Continue to promote cluster development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.17

11898 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.17

15568 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.17

16254 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.17

17491 Support

Summary:

any development policy regardless of whether it encourages cluster development or not should take into account the finite amount of water available and should be water neutral.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.17

17632 Support

Summary:

the plan barely touches on what the Council proposes to do to foster the creation and growth of SMEs within the City. The University is a source of many of these companies as spin outs from research. There are some propagator units for these companies e.g. at Babraham, but very few sites are available. The units need to be small to facilitate small overheads. there needs to be a pool of small industrial units for short-term rent with a catering service to integrate the units with the community there is an example of this at Sawston. The plan should incorporate this requirement into new developments.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.18

11899 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.18

15570 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.18

16257 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 132 - Promote shared social spaces

7213 Support

Summary:

This cannot be left to market forces: it will interest only developers that take a long-term interest.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 132 - Promote shared social spaces

7699 Support

Summary:

Vital!

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 132 - Promote shared social spaces

11907 Support

Summary:

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. I would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regard to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 132 - Promote shared social spaces

13184 Support

Summary:

Option No. 132

Support/Object: Support

Option 132 seeks opinions on whether to promote shared social spaces within employment areas, effectively allowing for a mix of uses in employment areas. The proposed redevelopment of Homerton Business Centre could deliver a mix of uses; consolidation of existing office uses in conjunction with residential development.

We support Option 132.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 132 - Promote shared social spaces

13186 Support

Summary:

community is important in work places as well as residential.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 132 - Promote shared social spaces

15580 Support

Summary:

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. It would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regards to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 132 - Promote shared social spaces

16262 Support

Summary:

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. It would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regards to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 132 - Promote shared social spaces

17720 Support

Summary:

It makes good sense to have residential accommodation above ground floor commercial premises. This will reduce the risk of areas becoming dead after hours. I therefore support option 132.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 133 - Do not promote shared social spaces

11909 Object

Summary:

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. I would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regard to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 133 - Do not promote shared social spaces

15587 Object

Summary:

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. It would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regards to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 133 - Do not promote shared social spaces

16270 Object

Summary:

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. It would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regards to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 133 - Do not promote shared social spaces

17723 Object

Summary:

It makes good sense to have residential accommodation above ground floor commercial premises. This will reduce the risk of areas becoming dead after hours.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.19

8326 Support

Summary:

policy needed

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.19

11558 Support

Summary:

Support

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.19**

11800 Support**Summary:**

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.19**

11912 Support**Summary:**

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. I would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regard to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.19**

12298 Object**Summary:**

This is not a matter for Local Plan policy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.19**

12321 Object**Summary:**

We do not feel we have any expertise on this but it does not seem necessary or particularly desirable to have a policy, so yes to Option 133.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.19**

14178 Support**Summary:**

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.19**

15312 Object**Summary:**

There should be a presumption in favour of such provision as and when the market is ready for it but I am not sure it is a suitable policy objective. We should encourage sustainable enterprise and look to facilitate support services where they are really needed even if the end result is a bit untidy in planning terms

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.19**

15583 Support**Summary:**

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. It would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regards to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.19**

16264 Support**Summary:**

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. It would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regards to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.19**

18253 Support**Summary:**

The option of adding social use to the employment sites is mentioned. We stress that the plan should adopt this this and stress that not enough emphasis is given to achieving it.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.20**

8328 Support**Summary:**

support option 132

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.20**

9368 Support**Summary:**

Option 132, but only marginally

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.20**

10244 Support**Summary:**

Option 132 - promote shared space. Community is important at work as well as at home.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.20**

11559 Support**Summary:**

Support option 132 (promote social spaces) - since social interaction is key to much of the 'Cambridge Phenomenon', but are poorly provided in centrally-planned developments.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.20**

11801 Support**Summary:**

Opt 132, promote shared social spaces.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.20**

11914 Support

Summary:

Option 132 - We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. I would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regard to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.20

12322 Support

Summary:

Prefer Option 133. We do not feel we have any expertise on this but it does not seem necessary or particularly desirable to have a policy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.20

14179 Support

Summary:

Option 132

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.20

14267 Support

Summary:

Option 132 .. lack of amenities on commercial developments lead to many extra journeys in the day

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.20

15584 Support

Summary:

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. It would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regards to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.20

16265 Support

Summary:

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. It would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regards to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.20

17630 Support

Summary:

We support the concept of upgrading existing office buildings rather than building new ones and we also support the concept of shared social spaces - Option 132

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.20**17999 Support****Summary:**

Option 133

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.21**10245 Support****Summary:**

Gardens which could be utilised for communal lunches might be included as a type of shared social space in an employment area that could be encouraged.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.21**11803 Support****Summary:**

Housing should be located near or as part of employment areas. Mixed development is more sustainable and promotes more integrated communities. Living over the shop!

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.21**11924 Support****Summary:**

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. I would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regard to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.21**15585 Support****Summary:**

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. It would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regards to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.21**16219 Support****Summary:**

Option 132 - Promote shared social spaces. Whilst it is acknowledged that social spaces can add value to employment areas, this can only realistically be viably done on larger sites where there is sufficient critical mass for them to thrive once they have been provided. Whilst the costs of initially providing such facilities are likely to be borne by the developer, it should be recognised that occupiers are likely to have to subsidise such facilities in the longer term if they are not viable which could prove unattractive.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.21

16267 Support

Summary:

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. It would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regards to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.21

18000 Support

Summary:

This type of social engineering is probably unsuccessful, different employers will desire different spaces, The additional costs to developers will increase rents

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.22

11927 Support

Summary:

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. I would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regard to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.22

18133 Support

Summary:

In reference to paragraphs 10.22-10.45:

USS notes that options for retailing in the City are presented throughout this document and that these are generally supportive of and will continue to direct retail investment towards the City Centre.

We very much welcome this approach and hope that this can be carried through to future iterations of the document as this will ensure the future vitality and viability of the City Centre.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.20

12785 Object

Summary:

It is beneficial to demand the planned combination of transport links with other development. However the need for businesses to be near the city railway station and the city centre reinforces the point that development should be integrated with a transport strategy. We do not agree that employment in some areas of the city and in the surrounding historic areas should be densified as the City Station area has been. In the Local Plan the historic area of the Station and surrounding areas should refer primarily to heritage guidelines so that historic buildings and environment should be preserved.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 134 - Densify existing employment areas

7214 Support

Summary:

Adequate weight must be given to possible detrimental impacts (eg traffic, other noise, visual intrusion) on surrounding areas. The need for complementary provision of amenity space should also be considered.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 134 - Densify existing employment areas

7700 Support

Summary:

This approach will reinforce your transportation, density and sustainability goals.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 134 - Densify existing employment areas

11460 Support

Summary:

yes.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 134 - Densify existing employment areas

11943 Support

Summary:

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements in cycleways and public transport should be within policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 134 - Densify existing employment areas

13189 Support

Summary:

Option No. 134

Support/Object: Support

Option 134 seeks opinions on increasing the density at existing employment areas, in order to make the best use of the employment land supply. The proposed redevelopment of Homerton Business Centre, involving the consolidation of existing office uses, would increase the density at the existing site, thus using land more efficiently and enabling the residual land to be used for a mix of other uses.

We support Option 134.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 134 - Densify existing employment areas

13203 Support

Summary:

We would support the densification of existing employment areas as this would make the best use of existing developed land and would reduce pressure on Greenfield sites. One way in which densification could be achieved could be through increasing building heights to provide additional floor space. This could be achieved at Compass House where a densification of the existing site would allow additional office floorspace to be provided within a sustainable location close to the city centre.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 134 - Densify existing employment areas

14777 Support

Summary:

As the report highlights, whilst sites are required for employment in Cambridge, it is counterproductive to force sites to remain in a use which are not viable. However if planning policy showed flexibility and sensitivity to each case then viable uses of existing sites could be achieved at the same time as improving the sites.

To assist in this process I consider that there needs to be an ability to introduce alternative types of employment onto sites and consider mixed use developments which will maximise the use of existing sites and enable schemes to be economically viable.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 134 - Densify existing employment areas

15592 Support

Summary:

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 134 - Densify existing employment areas

16272 Support

Summary:

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 134 - Densify existing employment areas

17705 Support

Summary:

I oppose releasing any of the Green Belt land for industrial use. If there is a shortage of industrial units these can be provided within S. Cambs and not within the City, or by densification and upgrading of existing units. Densification would give the City flexibility in accommodating an upturn in business.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 135 - Do not densify existing employment areas

11940 Object

Summary:

Oppose. We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements in cycleways and public transport should be within policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 135 - Do not densify existing employment areas

12518 Support

Summary:

When a cup is full it is full.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 135 - Do not densify existing employment areas

13204 Object

Summary:

We would not support a policy which would not seek to densify existing employment areas. This would add additional pressure to release Greenfield sites for employment uses which would have the effect of creating employment space in edge of city locations which do not have the same sustainability credentials as city centre and edge of city centre sites such as Compass House.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 135 - Do not densify existing employment areas

15598 Object

Summary:

Oppose. We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 135 - Do not densify existing employment areas

16281 Object

Summary:

Oppose. We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 135 - Do not densify existing employment areas

17708 Object

Summary:

I oppose releasing any of the Green Belt land for industrial use. If there is a shortage of industrial units these can be provided within S. Cambs and not within the City, or by densification and upgrading of existing units. Densification would give the City flexibility in accommodating an upturn in business.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.23

11560 Support

Summary:

Support

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.23

11945 Support

Summary:

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements in cycleways and public transport should be within policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.23

12301 Support

Summary:

The University supports the densification of appropriate existing sites which would make better use of existing developed land (e.g. West Cambridge) and present an opportunity to redevelop other sites (e.g. Old Press/Mill Lane).

Densification of employment sites should be complemented by fast connecting transport routes, particularly at peripheral locations - for example linking the Cambridge Biomedical Campus at Addenbrooke's to West Cambridge and North West Cambridge to the Science Park to the new railway station, by-passing the city centre. Such routes would help to deliver sustainable transport improvements and contribute to local, national and international economic development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.23

12326 Support

Summary:

yes, a policy would be helpful

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.23

12793 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.23

15313 Support

Summary:

Smarter use of land is a must and the opportunity currently presents itself at Chesterton Station to build a high density transport hub with shops offices and railway premises sited above the tracks and road links to Science and Business Parks, Chesterton and Cambridge. The remaining land should be mixed use with appropriate housing, offices and industrial activities complementing existing activities but not being a forced cluster.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.23

15594 Support

Summary:

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.23

16126 Object

Summary:

Densification of some employment sites may be appropriate but the value of open space and social areas should not be underestimated and it is important that employees have easy access to such areas. The merits of densification should be considered on a case by case basis rather than being required by a blanket policy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.23

16274 Support

Summary:

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.23

16574 Support

Summary:

Yes.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.23**

16852 Support**Summary:**

Yes - support

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.23**

16962 Support**Summary:**

We consider there is a need for a policy to address this issue so that the most effective and efficient use of land can be made within the city. With high quality design and landscaping there is no reason why higher density sites cannot be equally as attractive as lower density areas. Higher densities also promote walking and cycling and would release land for alternative uses. However this needs to be considered on a site-by-site basis as it may not be the appropriate solution on all sites, and viability and deliverability considerations are paramount.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.23**

18151 Support**Summary:**

USS notes that a new Study is to be commissioned by Cambridge City Council with a view to looking further into the capacity of the City Centre and competing uses.

This Study will look at how the City Centre currently functions, whether there are distinct zones and how these work together now and in the future. In addition, we note that this Study will outline in more detail the type of retail provision Cambridge should be planning for and where this should be located.

USS requests early engagement with the City Council and its advisors regarding this forthcoming Study-not least because it will guide future retail development across the City and help to define the functionality of the City Centre including the Primary Shopping Area.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.23**

18252 Support**Summary:**

The option of densifying employment sites is mentioned. We would encourage this and stress that not enough emphasis is given to achieving it.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.23**

18457 Support**Summary:**

The County Council supports the need for a policy addressing the densification of existing employment uses although it needs to be applied sensitively and selectively so that it does not result in the image and perception of certain employment areas such as the Science Park being diluted and losing their attractiveness.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.24**

7011 Support**Summary:**

I would favour Option 135, in order to avoid further increases in jobs and population outside the university.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.24**

9369 Support

Summary:

Option 134

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

11562 Support

Summary:

Option 134. Many of the existing sites (eg Science Park) have much wasted space - car parks, unappealing grass. This space could be much better used - for example, underground car parks, grass where you can sit out at lunchtime.

Higher density employment would support better land-use and more sustainable living and transport options.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

11942 Support

Summary:

I would prefer densification on those sites where adequate public transport already exists or could be provided in advance of new employment being advertised.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

11947 Support

Summary:

Option 134

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements in cycleways and public transport should be within policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

12338 Object

Summary:

We support option 134 but with the proviso below.

There are significant opportunities to make better use of existing high tech clusters by both redevelopment and building higher - often existing buildings are 1 or at most 2 storey. This would make better use of existing land rather than use up scarce new land. There are also opportunities to redevelop run down sites (including possible changes of use from derelict retail areas)

However we should not aim to densify in the City Centre but do so on specific sites further out

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

12443 Support

Summary:

I support option 135, where practicable, for example on the West Site. But note that this site is unsuitable for housing and will need upgraded cycle and public transport links as the capacity increases.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

12810 Object

Summary:

No option is preferred. Densification can only be done with discretion according to the environment. The Local Plan should have area specific policies. Heritage guidelines for the historic centre and surrounding areas near the rail station must be robustly stipulated by the Local Plan and comply with national heritage guidelines. Development that encourages transport links with employment and other development could be encouraged in other ways. For example transport networks and infrastructure should be implemented that could link out of town and other regional employment options.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

14183 Support

Summary:

Option 134

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

14284 Support

Summary:

Option 134 on sustainable sites only

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

15595 Support

Summary:

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

16130 Object

Summary:

Densification of some employment sites may be appropriate but the value of open space and social areas should not be underestimated and it is important that employees have easy access to such areas. The merits of densification should be considered on a case by case basis rather than being required by a blanket policy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

16275 Support

Summary:

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

16578 Support

Summary:

Option 134 preferred, if it really would reduce the pressure to develop greenfield sites. Brownfield must always be preferred as a first option.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.24**

16854 Support**Summary:**

We prefer Option 134, which would allow a densification of existing employment areas, to improve the amenity and facilities of these areas and make them look less like the setting for "The Office".

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.24**

16963 Support**Summary:**

We would support option 134 to densify selected existing employment areas. This would allow for the partial redevelopment of existing employment sites, where employment space could be provided at a higher density. This would make a more effective and efficient use of land and present a more sustainable solution.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.24**

18001 Support**Summary:**

Option 134

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.24**

18458 Support**Summary:**

The County Council supports Option 134 but with discretion in its application.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.25**

9370 Support**Summary:**

Encourage expansion upwards in appropriate cases

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.25**

10446 Support**Summary:**

This is neither objection nor support but a comment.

If you densify employment areas you create traffic jam potentials in the morning and evening. Unless this is addressed the whole point of densifying employment areas is counter productive and just creates traffic hot spots like Addenbrookes with it surrounding problems.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.25**

11948 Support**Summary:**

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements in cycleways and public transport should be within policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.25**

15596 Support**Summary:**

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.25**

16132 Object**Summary:**

Densification of some employment sites may be appropriate but the value of open space and social areas should not be underestimated and it is important that employees have easy access to such areas. The merits of densification should be considered on a case by case basis rather than being required by a blanket policy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.25**

16277 Support**Summary:**

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.25**

16964 Object**Summary:**

Rather than identifying selected sites, a criteria-based policy would be more flexible, as land ownership and their intentions may change over the plan period, unforeseen opportunities may arise, there may be changes in surrounding land uses, all of which will affect the appropriate treatment of a site. The criteria could set out the circumstances when densification of an employment site would be appropriate.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.25**

18002 Support**Summary:**

It is important to achieve a variety of employment units in a variety of areas. Some specified areas could be densified. The criteria used are important

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.26**

11950 Support**Summary:**

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements in cycleways and public transport should be within policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.26**

12820 Support

Summary:

A reasonable alternative would be to densify out of town areas but not to densify in the inner city near the historic centre. For other areas such as the Histon road and the Science park densification may be suitable. Densification MUST be linked to adequate transport, local residential accommodation and other amenities and facilities. This emphasises the need for the Local Plan to have area specific policies that take into account the context of any development work within its immediate and surrounding historic and residential environment.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.26

15597 Support

Summary:

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.26

16134 Object

Summary:

Densification of some employment sites may be appropriate but the value of open space and social areas should not be underestimated and it is important that employees have easy access to such areas. The merits of densification should be considered on a case by case basis rather than being required by a blanket policy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.26

16279 Support

Summary:

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

Appendix D – Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended)

Use Classes

- **A1 Shops** - Shops, retail warehouses, hairdressers, undertakers, travel and ticket agencies, post offices (but not sorting offices), pet shops, sandwich bars, showrooms, domestic hire shops, dry cleaners, funeral directors and internet cafes.
- **A2 Financial and professional services** - Financial services such as banks and building societies, professional services (other than health and medical services) including estate and employment agencies and betting offices.
- **A3 Restaurants and cafés** - For the sale of food and drink for consumption on the premises - restaurants, snack bars and cafes.
- **A4 Drinking establishments** - Public houses, wine bars or other drinking establishments (but not night clubs).
- **A5 Hot food takeaways** - For the sale of hot food for consumption off the premises.

- **B1 Business** - this class is formed of 3 parts:
 - B1(a) Offices (other than those that fall within A2).
 - B1(b) Research and development of products and processes.
 - B1(c) Light industry appropriate in a residential area.
- **B2 General industrial** - Use for industrial process other than one falling within class B1 (excluding incineration purposes, chemical treatment or landfill or hazardous waste).
- **B8 Storage or distribution** - This class includes open air storage.

- **C1 Hotels** - Hotels, boarding and guest houses where no significant element of care is provided (excludes hostels).
- **C2 Residential institutions** - Residential care homes, hospitals, nursing homes, boarding schools, residential colleges and training centres.
- **C2A Secure Residential Institution** - Use for a provision of secure residential accommodation, including use as a prison, young offenders institution, detention centre, secure training centre, custody centre, short term holding centre, secure hospital, secure local authority accommodation or use as a military barracks.
- **C3 Dwellinghouses** - this class is formed of 3 parts:
 - C3(a) covers use by a single person or a family (a couple whether married or not, a person related to one another with members of the family of one of the couple to be treated as members of the family of the other), an employer and certain domestic employees (such as an au pair, nanny, nurse,

governess, servant, chauffeur, gardener, secretary and personal assistant), a carer and the person receiving the care and a foster parent and foster child.

- C3(b): up to six people living together as a single household and receiving care e.g. supported housing schemes such as those for people with learning disabilities or mental health problems.
- C3(c) allows for groups of people (up to six) living together as a single household. This allows for those groupings that do not fall within the C4 HMO definition, but which fell within the previous C3 use class, to be provided for i.e. a small religious community may fall into this section as could a homeowner who is living with a lodger.
- **C4 Houses in multiple occupation** - small shared houses occupied by between three and six unrelated individuals, as their only or main residence, who share basic amenities such as a kitchen or bathroom.

- **D1 Non-residential institutions** - Clinics, health centres, crèches, day nurseries, day centres, schools, art galleries (other than for sale or hire), museums, libraries, halls, places of worship, church halls, law court. Non residential education and training centres.
- **D2 Assembly and leisure** - Cinemas, music and concert halls, bingo and dance halls (but not night clubs), swimming baths, skating rinks, gymnasiums or area for indoor or outdoor sports and recreations (except for motor sports, or where firearms are used).

- **Sui Generis** - Certain uses do not fall within any use class and are considered 'sui generis'. Such uses include: theatres, houses in multiple occupation, hostels providing no significant element of care, scrap yards. Petrol filling stations and shops selling and/or displaying motor vehicles. Retail warehouse clubs, nightclubs, launderettes, taxi businesses, amusement centres and casinos.

Changes of use not requiring planning permission

In many cases involving similar types of use, a change of use of a building or land does not need planning permission. Planning permission is not needed when both the present and proposed uses fall within the same 'class', or if the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order says that a change of class is permitted to another specified class (see table below).

For example, a greengrocer's shop could be changed to a shoe shop without permission as these uses fall within the same 'class', and a restaurant could be changed to a shop or a estate agency as the Use Class Order allows this type of change to occur without requiring planning permission.

Most external building work associated with a change of use is likely to require planning permission.

From	To
A2 (professional and financial services) when premises have a display window at ground level	A1 (shop)
A3 (restaurants and cafes)	A1 or A2
A4 (drinking establishments)	A1 or A2 or A3
A5 (hot food takeaways)	A1 or A2 or A3
B1 (business) (permission limited to change of use relating to not more than 235 square metres of floor space)	B8 (storage and distribution)
B2 (general industrial)	B1 (business)
B2 (general industrial) (permission limited to change of use relating to not more than 235 square metres of floor space))	B8 (storage and distribution)
B8 (storage and distribution) (permission limited to change of use relating to not more than 235 square metres of floor space)	B1 (business)
C3 (dwellinghouses)	C4 (houses in multiple occupation)
C4 (houses in multiple occupation)	C3 (dwellinghouses)
Casinos (sui generis)	D2 (assembly and leisure)

Additionally, a planning application is not required for change of use in the following circumstances:

- from A1 or A2 to A1 plus up to two flats above;
- from A2 to A2 plus up to two flats above.

These changes are reversible without an application only if the part that is now a flat was, respectively, in either A1 or A2 use immediately before it became a flat.

Changes of use requiring a planning application

Other than for the permitted changes of use listed above and changes where both uses fall within the same use class, planning permission is generally required for a material change of use.

Most external building work associated with a change of use is likely to require planning permission.

This page is intentionally left blank