



Cambridge City Council
Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee

Date: Wednesday, 29 May 2013

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Council Chamber - Guildhall

Contact: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk, tel:01223 457013

Agenda

- 1 Apologies
To receive any apologies for absence.
- 2 Declarations of Interest
Members are asked to declare at this stage any interests, which they may have in any of the following items on the agenda. If any member is unsure whether or not they should declare an interest on a particular matter, they are requested to seek advice from the Head of Legal Services **before** the meeting.
- 3 Minutes (Pages 5 - 18)
To approve the minutes of the meetings held on 25th March 2013, 27th March 2013 and 16th April 2013.
- 4 Public Questions (See Below)
- 5 Cambridge Local Plan – Towards 2031 – draft Local Plan including the preferred approach to the Spatial Strategy, Vision and Objectives (Pages 19 - 220)
The Cambridge Local Plan – Towards 2031 Appendix documents are too large to attach to the agenda in hard copy format. All documents are published on the Council's website:
 - (i) Main report and Appendices A, D, E, F, G & H (15-16) are attached to the agenda document.
 - (ii) Appendices B, C, H (1-14), I, J, K, L, M & N are accessible via the following hyperlink (please copy all lines as the address is split over several):

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/ldf/localplan2031/may2013dpssc/part1/>

Adjournment

The first part of the meeting starting at 2:00pm will consider the last tranche of local plan policies and the supporting evidence base that goes with them. It is estimated that this first section should be completed by approximately 4:15pm - and there will then be a 45 minute break.

The second part of the meeting will start at 5:00pm. Members will consider the new draft Local Plan and appendices in its entirety.

Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee Members: Reid (Chair), Saunders (Vice-Chair), Blencowe, Price and Marchant-Daisley

Alternates: Herbert

Executive Councillors:

Information for the public

The public may record (e.g. film, audio, tweet, blog) meetings which are open to the public. For details go to:

www.cambridge.gov.uk/have-your-say-at-committee-meetings

For full information about committee meetings, committee reports, councillors and the democratic process:

- Website: <http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk>
- Email: democratic.services@cambridge.gov.uk
- Phone: 01223 457013

This page is intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

25 March 2013
4.30 - 6.15 pm

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

Executive Councillor for Planning and Sustainable Transport: Councillor Ward

Officers Present:

- Head of Planning Services - Patsy Dell
- Planning Policy Manager - Andrew Lainton
- Sustainable Drainage Engineer - Simon Bunn
- Senior Sustainability Officer - Emma Davies
- Principal Scientific Officer – Jo Dicks
- Committee Manager – Toni Birkin

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

13/12/DPSSC Apologies

There were no apologies for absence.

13/13/DPSSC Declarations of Interest

Councillor Saunders, Councillor Tucker and Councillor Reid	13/16/DPSSC	Member of Cambridge Past, Present and Future
Councillor Saunders and Councillor Reid	13/16/DPSSC	Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign

13/14/DPSSC Minutes

The minutes of the meetings of the 29th January 2013 and 19th February 2013, were approved and signed as correct records.

13/15/DPSSC Public Questions (See Below)

There were no public questions.

13/16/DPSSC Cambridge Local Plan -Towards 2031 - Draft Policies and Chapters

Matter for Decision: To consider initial sections of the draft plan for the following sections;

- Section One - About Cambridge
- Section Two (part) The Spatial Strategy - Vision and Objectives
- Outline of content of remainder of Section Two – The Spatial Strategy (standing item for information and discussion, but with no agreement sought at this stage on the full chapter)
- Section Three Responding to Climate Change and Managing Resources.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change:

The Executive Councillor resolved:

- i. To consider feedback from this committee on those draft plan sections to be put forward into the composite full plan. In terms of the Strategy sections 1 and 2 these will return to the 29th May DPSSC for reconsideration in amended form, Section 3 is agreed to go forward into the composite plan subject to amendments to be agreed with Chair and Spokes.;
- ii. To also consider feedback from this committee on the accompanying policy justification documents for each draft policy which will be published alongside the draft plan as an audit trail of how the policy was evidenced, consulted on and assessed;
- iii. To agree that any amendments and editing changes that need to be made prior to the version put to Environment Scrutiny Committee in June and Full Council in June should be agreed by the Executive Councillor in consultation with the Chair and Opposition Spokesperson.

Reason for the Decision:

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected:

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations:

The Committee received a report from the Planning Policy Manager regarding the Cambridge Local Plan. He asked that the committee note that this is scene setting report and therefore was a non-key decision. Full details of the legal and national policy requirements had been included in pages 17 to 19 of the Officer's report.

Councillor Reid asked for inconsistencies in the naming of the report to be amended. In future the title would be the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. The overall report was discussed and the following comments noted.

- i. The use of the term 'smart growth' throughout the report was questioned. Members suggested it implied the delivery of things beyond the capacity of Cambridge City Council.
- ii. Members suggested the documents needed an edit to remove any phrases that could be seen as jargon.
- iii. It was also agreed an edit of the report was needed to ensure consistent use of capital letters for words such as city.
- iv. Members stated that some sections were overly long and clarity could be added by use of a judicious edit.
- v. Members suggested that the structure of the documents was unclear and that the vision statement should come first.

Members of the committee discussed the report section by section and made the following comment.

Section 1 (About Cambridge)

- i. Page 43, item 1.4. Remove the word 'galvanise' and its implications that community was currently passive.
- ii. Page 44, The spatial portrait needed to reflect that Cambridge was a special place where quality and excellence were the norm. The vision should set the tone and aspirations for the future.
- iii. References to Cambridge as a County Town should be removed.
- iv. Page 45. Edit needed to make it clear that the Guided busway does not run through the city centre.
- v. Page 46 (Key facts about Cambridge) Members asked for clarity on how student numbers were calculated as well as the carbon calculations.

- vi. Page 48. This page was agreed to be confusing and added little to demonstrate the international status of Cambridge.
- vii. Page 49. A caption was needed to clarify what the map was demonstrating and to include details on when this would be updated with new census information.
- viii. Pages 50-51. Members stated that these pages were too long needed to be edited into plain English. Figure 4 was considered to be confusing and should be removed.
- ix. Page 52. Joint working to be highlighted.

Section 2 (The Spatial Strategy, Vision and Objectives)

- i. Members were unhappy with the phrase 'Cambridge is England's Smart City'. It was agreed that this statement would be redrafted so that the essence of the 2006 vision statement was preserved. References to Smart City should be removed.
- ii. Members stated that the vision should reflect the need for growth and the aspiration that Cambridge should stay compact.
- iii. The word 'pioneer' on page 54 would be removed and replaced with a reference to learning from the best.
- iv. Members noted the aspiration to promote alternative forms of transport but suggested that the document lacked any reference to cars.
- v. The term 'sufficient housing' was questioned as being too vague. Some acknowledgement of the tension between the constraints of a small city and the need for housing should be included.
- vi. Concerns were raised that student housing would be given preference over affordable housing. The Planning Policy Manager reminded members of a previous decision regarding the growth of the Universities.
- vii. Page 54. Members suggested that grouping the knowledge economy and managing visitors into one section was problematic.
- viii. Page 56. Members suggested that the document be edited to acknowledge that multi centred nature of Cambridge with its historic core with scattered business parks.
- ix. Page 57. Members questioned the inclusion of archaeology and were informed that this had been at the request of English Heritage.
- x. Page 57. The reference to 'including pubs' would be removed as it was no longer needed as it had been covered by policies elsewhere.

It was agreed that a revised Vision and About Cambridge section would be brought back to committee in May.

Section 3

The Senior Sustainability Officer and the Sustainable Drainage Engineer introduced Section 3 of the report. Members made the following comments.

- i. Page 60. The table for new non-residential development contains an error that needs to be edited (reference to BREEAM as opposed to Code for Sustainable Homes).
- ii. Page 62 –63 (Figures 6 and 7). Pictures agreed to be too large, so the scale of these needs to be reduced.
- iii. Page 64 (Paragraph 3.10). This is a duplication of paragraph 3.11
- iv. Page 65. The supporting text for Policy 9 (Carbon reduction etc) needed to be shortened. Clarity was required within paragraph 3.11 with regards to the integration of internal storage capacity into the design of new buildings.
- v. Page 66. Paragraph 3.19. The wording needed to encompass any future district heating schemes that may be developed rather than focussing on the city centre project.
- vi. Page 69. Policy 13 bullet point 7 needed to add some clarification in relation to the reference to rainfall depths (per storm event).
- vii. Members discussed difficulties of insisting on permeable road surfaces when the County Council will not currently adopt such roads.
- viii. Page 69. Paragraph 3.30. Members suggested deleting all wording after the second sentence and adding this to the justification, and adding additional wording to cover future incentives for retrofitting existing homes.
- ix. Page 60 (Policy 13 – Integrated water management and the water cycle) – Add a bullet point regarding the promotion of permeable paving.
- x. Page 71. The source needed to be added to diagrams.
- xi. Pages 72 – 74. Edit needed to add clarity. A reference should be added in this section to fluvial flooding being shown on the Proposals Map. There was also some wording missing from paragraph 3.45.
- xii. Page 75 – Policy 15 (Contaminated Land). Jo Dicks tabled an amendment that needed to be made to the final paragraph of this policy, which was agreed by Members. The wording agreed was “Proposals for sensitive developments on existing or former industrial areas will be permitted where it is demonstrated that the identified contamination is capable of being suitably remediated for the proposed end use.”
- xiii. Page 76 paragraph 3.52. Members suggested that the reference to the lighting of ‘landmark buildings’ was open to interpretation and should be re-phrased.
- xiv. Page 78. Typing errors in the table to be corrected.

Amendment to the Recommendations

The committee agreed that Sections One (About Cambridge) and Section Two (The Spatial Strategy) would be amended and would be returned to this committee in May for reconsideration. Changes to Section Three (Policy justification) to be agreed by the Chair and Opposition Spokesperson.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the amended recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

Not applicable.

The meeting ended at 6.15 pm

CHAIR

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

27 March 2013
4.30 - 5.45 pm

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

Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change – Councillor Ward

Officers Present:

Head of Planning – Patsy Dell
Senior Planning Policy Officer – Joanna Gilbert-Wooldridge
Planning Policy and Economic Development Officer - Stephen Miles
Housing Strategy Manager - Helen Reed
Committee Manager – Martin Whelan

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

13/17/DPSSC Apologies

There were no apologies for absence.

13/18/DPSSC Declarations of Interest

Councillor Saunders, Councillor Tucker and Councillor Reid	13/20/DPSSC	Member of Cambridge Past, Present and Future
Councillor Saunders and Councillor Reid	13/20/DPSSC	Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Councillor Ward and Councillor Price	13/20/DPSSC	Conservator of the River Cam

13/19/DPSSC Public Questions (See Below)

There were no public questions.

13/20/DPSSC Cambridge Local Plan -Towards 2031 - Draft Policies and Chapters**Matter for Decision:**

Additional sections of Draft Plan for recommendation to Executive Councillor to put forward for Key Decision on the Draft Submission Plan for Consultation – Tranche 2 (of 4)

- Section Two (part) The Spatial Strategy - Standing Item, no recommendations
- Section Four - Supporting the Knowledge Economy and Managing Visitors
- Section Five - Maintaining a Balanced Supply of Housing (Draft policies on Specialist Housing, Lifetime Homes and Lifetime Neighbourhoods, Protecting Garden Land and Subdivision of Existing Dwelling Plots, Flat Conversions, Residential Moorings)

Decision of Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change:

The Executive Councillor resolved to:

- To agree that subject to drafting amendments to be agreed with Chair and Spokes, those draft plan sections to be put forward into the composite full draft plan;
- To also consider feedback from this committee on the accompanying policy justification documents for each draft policy which will be published alongside the draft plan as an audit trail of how the policy was evidenced, consulted on and assessed;
- To agree that any amendments and editing changes that need to be made prior to the version put to Environment Scrutiny Committee in June and Full Council in June should be agreed by the Executive Councillor in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson.

Reason for the Decision:

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected:

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations:

The Head of Planning Services introduced the report, and explained that formatting and typographical issues would be picked up in the next stages of the drafting process.

The Executive Councillor requested clarification from the Head of Planning Services regarding the current national picture with the approval of plans. The Head of Planning Services explained that there were reports of increased difficulties at various stages of the plan approval process. The Head of Planning Services agreed to report back to the committee with more information as it became available.

The Planning Policy and Economic Development Officer introduced the first section of the report. Members of the committee made the following comments on the first section of the report.

- i. Concerns were expressed about the potential tension between providing space for new companies to expand in the city, and major companies wishing to move to the city. It was suggested that the proposed removal of the selective management policy, would increase this tension. The Planning Policy and Economic Development Officer noted the concern and explained that the existing policy had been very successful, and that a number of options had been consulted upon. It was agreed that there was limited office space near the city centre, however there is a significant quantity of research and development space that will be developed on the edge of the city in Addenbrooke's, North West Cambridge and West Cambridge. The Chair reminded members of the committee that the removal of the selective management policy had been discussed at a previous meeting and that the supporting evidence for the proposed change was contained in the committee report.
- ii. It was suggested that the titles for proposed policies 22 and 23 should be revised to make their respective purposes clearer. Officers are agreed to review.
- iii. Concern was expressed about the potential implication of proposed policy 22 and whether it would reduce the ability of the Planning Committee to challenge potentially inappropriate developments. It was agreed that the City Centre needed to be defined, this is to be defined in a later Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee.
- iv. Further information was requested on the proposals for the area surrounding the proposed Chesterton station, and whether it was intended to be a high rise area. The Head of Planning Services explained that a "planning for real" event had been organised for 12th

April involving local stakeholders to start looking at options for the area.

- v. Reservations were expressed whether the approached for growth and specifically the expected number of new jobs was too passive, are we seeking to encourage / manage this growth? It was also questioned how the infrastructure of the city would need develop to respond to this increase. The Head of Planning Services acknowledged the difficulty of considering chapters of the plan in isolation to each other, but assured the committee that the plans would become clearer when the chapters were brought together. The use of more neutral wording such as “not normally” will be considered for policies where members had reservations about the degree of assertion that could be implied from them..
- vi. Concerns were expressed about where we were expecting the people who would work in the 20,000 new jobs to live.
- vii. Clarification was requested on why small hi-tech industries were specifically highlighted for support, whereas other sectors hadn't been specifically mentioned. Officers agreed to look into this, but indicated that a similar provision existed in the current local plan. Members of the committee suggested that the plan also needed to consider the needs not just of “start-up” companies but also that some needed “accelerator” support. Officers agreed to contact Cambridge Network for advice.
- viii. It was requested that the references to Cambridge Science Parks were clarified and made consistent throughout the report. The comment was noted.
- ix. The Executive Councillor asked officers what were the industry standards for “ducting” (Policy 24). The Officers agreed to investigate and report back.
- x. Officers clarified the meaning of active frontage in response to a question from the committee, and agreed to ensure this was in the glossary.
- xi. Members of the committee questioned the implication of the proposed policy with regards to Anglia Ruskin University. The Head of Planning Services explained that Anglia Ruskin University would need more space in the future, and that the policy was intended to ensure that

the potential use of the university was considered as part of the development the Eastern Gateway. The Council would continue to work with Anglia Ruskin University on future masterplanning in the area. Officers agreed to look at strengthening the wording of policy 25. The Executive Councillor welcomed proposed policy 25 section a ii, which sought to promote pedestrian and cycle circulation.

- xii. Officers agreed to clarify references to Cambridge Bio-medical campus, so that the definition was clear.
- xiii. The intended meaning of section 4.26 (language schools) was clarified.
- xiv. With regards to policy 27 the meaning of key sites around Parkers Piece was clarified. The Executive Councillor suggested that references to three, four and five star hotels should be consistent between the policy and text. The comment was noted.
- xv. The meaning of “boutique” hotels was clarified, officers agreed to include in the glossary.
- xvi. Officers confirmed that the proposed policy would not automatically preclude the redevelopment of an existing budget hotel and the reference to no new budget hotels referred to net gain of bedrooms.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer introduced proposed policies 36, 40, 41, 42 and 43. The committee made the following comments.

- i. Concern was expressed the sentence (in proposed policy 36) “Where existing specialist housing does not meet modern standards, its refurbishment on development will be considered favourably”. Following discussion it was agreed that the sentence should be removed.
- ii. Concern was expressed that the proposed policy 41 appeared to increase the support for garden development. The Executive Councillor reassured the committee that the change of emphasis was to match the style of the National Planning Policy Framework, but that in practical terms it was expected to be limited change. Officers agreed to look at the emphasis again.

- iii. Further clarification was requested on paragraph 5.31 and specifically the definition of aparthotel. The Head of Planning Services explained that it would be very difficult to define aparthotels, and identify at what point a change of use occurred. The committee were advised that these issues were more appropriately addressed through the planning enforcement process. Officers agreed to look at this paragraph again.
- iv. It was suggested that the requirements related to traffic surveys should be clearer. The comment was noted.
- v. Officers agreed to look at paragraph 5.35 and revise the wording so its purpose was clearer.
- vi. With regards to proposed policy 42 (section iii), it was questioned whether the reference to “unacceptable” appeared to allow negative impact on the amenity. A similar comment was made on section iv.
- vii. It was suggested that cumulative impact of individual schemes should be considered in policy 42 as well as the supporting text.
- viii. Officers agreed to look at paragraph 5.36 with regard the wording around the use of surveys.
- ix. It was questioned whether the issue of the removal of resident parking rights in the event of subdivision could be addressed through this process. The Head of Planning Services expressed reservations about the ability of the local plan process to address these issues. It was noted that car parking would be considered at a future meeting.
- x. With regards to proposed policy 43 policy (section vii) the Executive Councillor suggested that it could be removed to avoid duplication the statutory role of the Cam Conservators, it was however agreed that the criterion should remain.

The Planning Policy and Economic Development Officer highlighted that a paper had been tabled, titled “Annex L1 – Protected Industrial Sites”.

The committee welcomed the proposals with regards to Jedburgh Court. Officers also clarified the current status of the industrial area in the vicinity of Church End.

The Committee resolved by 3 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations, subject to a minor amendment to recommendation i (Changes underlined)

- i. To agree that subject to drafting amendments to be agreed with Chair and Spokes, those draft plan sections to be put forward into the composite full draft plan;

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

Not applicable.

The meeting ended at 5.45 pm

CHAIR

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 committee: Development Plan Scrutiny Sub- 29/05/2013
Committee
Wards affected: All Wards

CAMBRIDGE LOCAL PLAN 2014

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation and the Spatial Approach

Final Sections of Draft Local Plan for Consideration – Tranche 4 (of 4) and associated Local Plan evidence base documents

Key Decision NO

1. Background

- 1.1 The current local plan was adopted in July 2006 and runs to 2016 and beyond. The committee report to 25th March Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee explained the background and next steps for preparation of the new local plan.
- 1.2 This committee report updates the strategic context for the preparation of the new local plan through the agreement amongst the authorities in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to endorse the adoption of a Memorandum of Co-operation on a spatial approach to the delivery of new homes and jobs in Cambridgeshire.
- 1.3 The proposed draft structure and sections of the new local plan are outlined along with the individual new draft local plan policy sections and policy justifications relating to:
 - Section One: About Cambridge
 - Section Two: The Spatial Strategy

- Section Three: City Centre, Areas of Major Change, Opportunity Areas and Site Specific Proposals
- Section Five: Maintaining a balanced supply of housing (draft policies only on Student Accommodation, Housing in Multiple Occupation, Gypsies and Travellers pitch provision, Residential Space Standards)
- Section Six: Protecting and Enhancing the Character of Cambridge (draft policies only on visual pollution, paving over front gardens open space, nature conservation and trees, visual pollution, paving over front gardens)
- Section Nine: Providing the Infrastructure to Support Development (draft policies only on aviation development, telecommunications, infrastructure delivery, planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy).

1.4 This report also refers to evidence base documents associated with the draft policies and the preparation of the draft local plan. These are for noting and approval as part of the evidence base.

2. Recommendations

2.1 This report is being submitted to the Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee for prior consideration and comment. The Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change is recommended:

- a) To agree the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation (and the technical work that has fed into that approach) is used as the basis for identifying the objectively assessed needs for homes and jobs in the Cambridge Local Plan 2014;
- b) To agree the Tranche 4 draft plan sections to be put forward into the composite full draft plan;
- c) To also consider feedback from this committee on the accompanying policy justification documents for each draft policy, which will be published alongside the draft plan as an audit trail of how the policy was evidenced, consulted on and assessed;
- d) To endorse the content of the associated evidence base documents for use as an evidence base for the review of the Local Plan and as a material consideration in planning decisions comprising:

- the Employment Land Review Update 2013,
 - the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment update 2013,
 - the Retail and Leisure Update 2013,
 - City Centre Capacity Study 2013
 - Student Accommodation – Affordable Housing Financial Contributions Viability Study
 - SHLAA and Potential Site Allocations High Level Viability Assessment 2013
 - Technical Background Document – Part 2 Supplement
- e) To agree that any amendments and editing changes that need to be made prior to the draft Local Plan version being put to Environment Scrutiny Committee and Full Council in June should be agreed by the Executive Councillor in consultation with the Chair and Spokesperson.

3. Legal and National Policy Requirement

3.1 There are a number of legal duties that members must consider in submitting any development plan. These are summarised as:

- Whether the plan been prepared in accordance with the **Local Development Scheme** and in compliance with the **Statement of Community Involvement** [The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004¹ (the Act) sections 19(1) and 19(3) respectively];
- Whether the plan has had regard to **policies developed by a local transport authority** in accordance with section 108 of the [Transport Act 2000](#) [Reg 10(a)];
- Whether the plan pursues the objectives of **preventing major accidents and limiting consequences of accidents** by pursuing those objectives through the controls described in Article 12 of [Council Directive 96/82/EC](#) [The Seveso directive] [Reg 10 (b) (c)];
- Whether it has been subject to a **strategic environmental assessment**, and where required an appropriate assessment of impact on any sites falling under the EU Habitat (and Birds) directive [The Act Section 19(5), [EU Directive 2001/42/EC](#),

¹ Note 'The Act' refers to [HThe Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004H.](#) The Regulations refers to the [HTown and Country Planning \(Local Planning\) \(England\) Regulations 2012](#)

[The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004](#), [EU Habitats and Birds Directives Directive 92/43/EEC](#), [The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010](#)];

- Whether the plan is compatible with the requirements of the [EU Water Framework Directive](#) and any River Basin Management Plans prepared under that directive [[Directive 2000/60/EC](#)];
- Whether the plan has regard to the **National Waste Management Plan** [Reg 10(d) and [Waste \(England and Wales\) Regulations 2011](#)];
- Whether the plan is in **general conformity to the Regional Spatial Strategy** [The Act Section 24 – does not apply as the RS the East of England Plan has been revoked – [The Regional Strategy for the East of England Revocation Order 2012](#)];
- Whether the plan has regard to any **Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS)** for its area; [section 19(2)(f), section 4 of the [Local Government Act 2000](#)]²;
- Whether the plan meets the **procedural requirements involving publicity and availability of the development plan document and related documents**; [The Act Section 20(3), prescribed documents Reg 17 and Reg 22, Consultation Reg 18, Submission Reg 22]; and
- Whether the plan meets the **Duty to Cooperate** [The Act Section 33A, Reg 4].

3.2 Plans must also meet the soundness tests as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, that (paragraph 182):

“A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is “sound” – namely that it is:

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

² [The Cambridge SCSH](#) was adopted by the Cambridge Local Strategic Partnership in 2004 and has not been updated. The Local Strategic Partnership no longer sits being replaced by a Public Services Board which does not produce an SCS. [There is also a Cambridgeshire LPS SCS adopted in 2006H](#).

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

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation

- 3.3 A key role of Local Plans required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is to objectively identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area in a flexible way, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. This must involve using an evidence base to ensure that the Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area as far as is consistent with the policies set out on the NPPF, including identifying key sites that are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period.
- 3.4 This includes preparation of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to assess full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries. The SHMA must identify the scale of housing likely to be needed over the plan period that meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change and addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing, and caters for housing demand.
- 3.5 The SHMA ‘all homes’ chapter has now been completed and identifies the objectively assessed housing need for all districts. Technical forecasting work on homes and jobs needs has also been published and concludes that 22,100 jobs and 14,000 homes are needed in Cambridge City Council’s administrative area.
- 3.6 The Localism Act 2011 establishes a Duty to Cooperate for local planning authorities in the preparation of their local plans. The Cambridgeshire Authorities and Peterborough (through the

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Transport and Spatial Planning Member Steering Group) have agreed a Memorandum of Cooperation (underpinned by the evidence base of technical work and the SHMA update 2013) that demonstrates at Appendix 1 of that document that the full objectively assessed needs of the Cambridge Sub Region housing market area will be addressed. This approach needs to be formally endorsed by each constituent council as the basis for local plan making.

- 3.7 The Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group which provides governance oversight of the preparation of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire's local plans, as part of the Duty to Co-operate approach set up between the councils. The group is due to meet on 22 May and will consider the joint strategy approach being suggested by the draft local plans. Members will be updated on the outcome of that meeting on 29 May.

Proposed local plan structure and progress update

- 3.8 The table below sets out the proposed draft structure of the new local plan, with the proposed policy sections and policy numbers. This has been subject to a number of amendments since the draft structure was presented at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee on 16 April 2013. These changes are mainly in naming, numbering and positioning of policies in particular sections of the document.

DRAFT POLICY NO.	WORKING DRAFT SECTION AND POLICY TITLES	DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING
Section One – About Cambridge		
-	Cambridge and its context	29 May
Section Two – The Spatial Strategy		
-	Vision and Strategic Objectives	29 May
1	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	29 May
2	Spatial Strategy for the Location of Employment Development	29 May
3	Spatial Strategy for the Location of Residential Development	29 May
4	The Cambridge Green Belt	29 May
5	Strategic Transport Infrastructure	29 May
6	Hierarchy of centres and retail capacity	29 May

DRAFT POLICY NO.	WORKING DRAFT SECTION AND POLICY TITLES	DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING
7	The River Cam	29 May
8	The Setting of the City	29 May
Section Three – City Centre, Areas of Major Change, Opportunity Areas and Site Specific Proposals		
9	The City Centre	29 May
10	Development in the City Centre Primary Shopping Area	29 May
11	Fitzroy/Burleigh/Grafton Area of Major Change	29 May
12	Cambridge East	29 May
13	Areas of Major Change and Opportunity Areas – General Principles	29 May
14	Northern Fringe East and land surrounding the planned Cambridge Science Park Station Area of Major Change	29 May
15	South of Coldham's Lane Area of Major Change	29 May
16	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) Area of Major Change	29 May
17	Southern Fringe Areas of Major Change	29 May
18	West Cambridge Area of Major Change	29 May
19	NIAB 1 Area of Major Change	29 May
20	Station Areas East and West Area of Major Change	29 May
21	Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area	29 May
22	Eastern Gate Opportunity Area	29 May
23	Mill Road Opportunity Area	29 May
24	Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre Opportunity Area	29 May
25	Old Press/Mill Lane Opportunity Area	29 May
26	Site Specific Development Opportunities	29 May
Section Four - Responding to Climate Change and Managing Resources		
27	Carbon Reduction, Community Energy	25 March

DRAFT POLICY NO.	WORKING DRAFT SECTION AND POLICY TITLES	DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING
	Networks, Sustainable Design and Construction and Water Use	
28	Allowable Solutions for Zero Carbon Development	25 March
29	Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation	25 March
30	Energy Efficiency Improvements in Existing Dwellings	25 March
31	Integrated Water Management and the Water Cycle	25 March
32	Flood Risk	25 March
33	Contaminated Land	25 March
34	Light Pollution Control	25 March
35	Protection of Human Health from Noise and Vibration	25 March
36	Air Quality, Odour and Dust	25 March
37	Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone and Air Safeguarding Zones	16 April
38	Hazardous Installations	16 April
39	Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lord's Bridge	16 April
Section Five – Supporting the Cambridge Economy		
40	Development and Expansion of Business Space	27 March
41	Protection of Business Space	27 March
42	Connecting new developments to digital infrastructure	27 March
43	University Faculty Development	27 March
44	Specialist Colleges and Language Schools	27 March
Section Six – Maintaining a balanced supply of Housing		
45	Affordable Housing and Dwelling Mix	16 April
46	Development of Student Housing	29 May
47	Specialist Housing	27 March
48	Housing in Multiple Occupation	29 May
49	Provision for Gypsies and Travellers	29 May
50	Residential Space Standards	29 May
51	Lifetime Homes and Lifetime Neighbourhoods	27 March
52	Protecting Garden Land and the Subdivision of Existing Dwelling Plots	27 March

DRAFT POLICY NO.	WORKING DRAFT SECTION AND POLICY TITLES	DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING
53	Flat Conversions	27 March
54	Residential Moorings	27 March
Section Seven – Protecting and enhancing the character of Cambridge		
55	Responding to Context	16 April
56	Creating Successful Places	16 April
57	Designing New Buildings	16 April
58	Altering and Extending Existing Buildings	16 April
59	Designing Landscape and the Public Realm	16 April
60	Tall Buildings and the Skyline in Cambridge	16 April
61	Conservation and Enhancement of Cambridge's Historic Environment	16 April
62	Local Heritage Assets	16 April
63	Works to a Heritage Asset to Address Climate Change	16 April
64	Shopfronts, Signage and Shop Security Measures	16 April
65	Visual Pollution	29 May
66	Paving over Front Gardens	29 May
67	Protection of Open Space	29 May
68	Open Space and Recreation Provision through New Development	29 May
69	Protection of Sites of Local Nature Conservation Importance	29 May
70	Protection of Priority Species and Habitats	29 May
71	Trees	29 May
Section Eight – Services and local facilities		
72	Development and Change of Use in District, Local and Neighbourhood Centres	16 April
73	Community and Leisure Facilities	16 April
74	Education Facilities	16 April
75	Healthcare Facilities	16 April
76	Protection of Public Houses	16 April
77	Development and Expansion of Hotels	27 March
78	Redevelopment or Loss of Hotels	27 March

DRAFT POLICY NO.	WORKING DRAFT SECTION AND POLICY TITLES	DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING
79	Visitor Attractions	27 March
Section Nine – Providing the Infrastructure to Support Development		
80	Supporting Sustainable Access to Development	16 April
81	Mitigating the Transport Impact of Development	16 April
82	Parking Management	16 April
83	Aviation Development	29 May
84	Telecommunications	29 May
85	Infrastructure Delivery, Planning Obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy	29 May

4. Draft Policy Sections to be considered

4.1 Section One

Appendix A sets out the draft Section One - About Cambridge which introduces the draft plan.

4.2 Section Two – Spatial Strategy

Appendix B sets out the vision, spatial objectives, the objectively assessed needs the draft plan should meet in accordance with national planning policy and the chosen spatial strategy to meet those needs, including briefly why this was chosen. The draft spatial strategy includes:

- Policy 1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy 2 – Spatial Strategy for the Location of Employment Development
- Policy 3 – Spatial Strategy for the Location of Residential Development
- Policy 4 – The Cambridge Green Belt
- Policy 5 – Strategic Transport Infrastructure
- Policy 6 – Hierarchy of centres and retail capacity
- Policy 7 – The River Cam
- Policy 8 – The Setting of the City

4.3 Section Three - City Centre, Areas of Major Change, Opportunity Areas and Site Specific Proposals

Section Three of the draft plan sets out broad framework for specific areas such as the City Centre, CB1 and the area around the station and other specific areas within the urban area where redevelopment and change is contemplated during the life of the plan as well as the main urban extension areas. It would contain policies for key sites and a schedule of other sites. Appendix C sets out the draft policies that are proposed for the following:

- Policy 9 – The City Centre
- Policy 10 - Development in the City Centre Primary Shopping Area
- Policy 11 – Fitzroy/Burleigh/Grafton Area of Major Change
- Policy 12 – Cambridge East
- Policy 13 – Areas of Major Change and Opportunity Areas – General Principles
- Policy 14 - Northern Fringe East and land surrounding the proposed Cambridge Science Park Station Area of Major Change
- Policy 15 – South of Coldham’s Lane Area of Major Change
- Policy 16 – Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke’s Hospital) Area of Major Change
- Policy 17 – Southern Fringe Areas of Major Change
- Policy 18 – West Cambridge Area of Major Change
- Policy 19 – NIAB 1 Area of Major Change
- Policy 20 – Station Areas East and West Area of Major Change
- Policy 21 – Mitcham’s Corner Opportunity Area
- Policy 22 – Eastern Gate Opportunity Area
- Policy 23 – Mill Road Opportunity Area
- Policy 24 – Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre Opportunity Area
- Policy 25 – Old Press/Mill Lane Opportunity Area
- Policy 26 - Site Specific Development Opportunities

4.4 Section Six - Maintaining a balanced supply of housing

A number of the draft policies from Section Six have previously been presented at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee in March and April 2013. Appendix D sets out the remaining draft policies that are proposed to relate to the following areas:

- Policy 46 – Development of Student Housing

- Policy 48 - Housing in Multiple Occupation
- Policy 49 – Provision for Gypsies and Travellers
- Policy 50 – Residential Space Standards

4.5 **Section Seven - Protecting and enhancing the character of Cambridge**

Draft policies on urban design and the historic environment were presented at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee. The remaining draft policies in Section Seven are listed below. The policy justifications for these draft policies is set out in Appendix E:

- Policy 65 – Visual Pollution
- Policy 66 – Paving over Front Gardens
- Policy 67 – Protection of Open Space
- Policy 68 – Open Space and Recreation Provision through New Development
- Policy 69 – Protection of Sites of Local Nature Conservation Importance
- Policy 70 – Protection of Priority Species and Habitats
- Policy 71 – Trees

4.6 **Section Nine – Providing the Infrastructure to Support Development**

Draft policies on transport infrastructure were discussed at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee in April 2013. The remaining draft policies are listed below and these are set out at Appendix F along with their policy justification:

- Policy 83 – Aviation Development
- Policy 84 – Telecommunications
- Policy 85 – Infrastructure Delivery, Planning Obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy

5. Evidence base documents

5.1 A number of evidence base documents have been produced or updated to support the development of the plan. The following paragraphs discuss the main findings of the following studies:

- Employment Land Review Update (2013) (Appendix G);
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Update (2013) (Appendix H);
- Retail and Leisure Study 2013 (Appendix I)
- City Centre Capacity Study 2013 (Appendix J)

- Student Accommodation – Affordable Housing Financial Contributions Viability Study (Appendix K)
- SHLAA and Potential Site Allocations High Level Viability Assessment 2013 (Appendix L)
- Technical Background Document – Part 2 Supplement (Appendix M)

Employment Land Review Update (2013)

- 5.2 Following the production of the County Council's Technical Report and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, the Cambridgeshire local planning authorities have agreed the projections of objectively assessed need arising from these documents. These documents use the East of England Forecasting Model to translate population growth into homes and jobs growth. For Cambridge, a job growth of 22,000 new jobs has been indicated between 2011 and 2031. This caused a slight issue as the Employment Land Review Update 2012 used a different model that output 14,740 and 19,600 jobs, in two different scenarios. Given that the difference in jobs from the forecasts that we are using and those that have previously been assessed is significant (over 2,000), further assessment work was commissioned to translate the 22,000 jobs forecast from the East of England Forecasting Model into B-use land requirements.
- 5.3 It should be noted that the projections output from the model are based on assumptions around the sectors applied to the outputs from the East of England Forecasting Model, which itself has a number of assumptions built in to it. The employment land requirements are, therefore, a guide and the figures outputting from it are directions of travel rather than hard targets. It should also be noted that it is not just the total number of jobs that are different, the East of England Forecasting Model uses different assumptions from the previous model used and hence shows growth in different sectors, this growth in different sectors translates into considerably different land requirements.
- 5.4 The East of England Forecasting Model projections of 22,100 jobs contain a growth of 8,800 jobs (net) in B-use classes. Work undertaken to translate these into land requirements indicates that this works out to 7.4 hectares; this includes a loss of jobs in industrial and warehousing. The detail is set out in the table overleaf, and the write up of the work is included at Appendix G:

Use	Jobs	Net floorspace (m ²)	Net land (hectares)
B1a (Offices)	7,000	83,000	12.2
B1b (Research and Development)	2,700	32,700	4.8
B1c/B2 (Industrial)	-300	-11,800	-2.8
B8 (Warehousing)	-600	-33,700	-6.7
All B-use classes	8,800	70,200	7.4

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Update (2013) (Appendix H)

5.5 The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is an important part of the evidence base to the local plan and has been updated to accompany the draft plan, providing the most up-to-date picture of the housing supply position. The SHLAA has been updated as a result of:

- work on objectively assessed needs within the SHMA;
- progress on the supply side since the 2012 AMR with housing starts and completions and a reassessment of phasing;
- assessing new sites submitted to the council following the Issues and Options consultation, and the Issue and Options 2 consultation;
- reviewing the suitability of sites following a suggested change in threshold for all SHLAA sites;
- reconsidering the role of small sites and windfalls within the supply;
- considering new information from some landowners on the availability of a few sites;
- reviewing the achievability of sites following the separate consultancy work undertaken on development viability addressed in Appendix L of this report;
- reviewing the suitability of edge of City sites following more detailed work the Council has undertaken with South Cambridgeshire District Council on the Local Plan Review, the Sustainable Development Strategy of the Local Plan and the 2012 Green Belt Appraisal.

- 5.6 The draft Local Plan contain a proposals schedule identifying all the development sites and the anticipated housing capacity from each. Since May 2012 a series of updates have been undertaken have been applied to the SHLAA. The conclusions drawn as a result of these updates should be noted and the new site threshold of 0.5ha and above for SHLAA sites and the approach to windfalls should be agreed by Members.

Retail and Leisure Study 2013 (Appendix I)

- 5.7 The council commissioned consultants GVA to produce the Cambridge Retail and Leisure Study Update (2013). Its purpose was to establish the extent to which the current retail and leisure provision in the city satisfies the level and nature of consumer demand within its catchment, and to identify the scale and nature of additional provision that may be appropriate in the period to 2031. It forms part of the evidence base for the review of the Cambridge Local Plan.
- 5.8 The study looks at existing retail and leisure provision in Cambridge, in the City Centre, District and Local Centres and the out of centre retail warehousing parks and superstores, and makes a qualitative assessment of these different locations.
- 5.9 Overall, the City Centre is performing well with a strong comparison shopping offer and low vacancy rate compared with the national average. The District and Local Centres are also performing well, and the study makes recommendations in relation to the hierarchy of centres in Cambridge which have been taken into account in the development of Policy 6 (Hierarchy of Centres and Retail Capacity) in the draft Local Plan. This includes the designation of new centres in major planned developments once they have been developed, including the station area, NIAB site and University of Cambridge site and Clay Farm site.
- 5.10 The study shows that whilst Cambridge City Centre is clearly the most dominant comparison shopping destination in the survey area, attracting an overall market share of 57%, this represents a marginal decline in market share (5%) since 2008 when the previous study was produced. At the same time the retail warehousing off Newmarket Road has increased its market share from 15% in 2008 to 24% in 2012. This reinforces the need for the council to support the City Centre and maintain the complementary role of the out-of-centre retail warehousing and

resist development here which would have the effect of creating direct competition with the City Centre.

Retail Capacity

- 5.11 The study also looks at the capacity for further convenience and comparison goods retail floorspace above consented and pipeline proposals during the plan period to 2031. Convenience goods are food and drink and non-durable household goods and comparison goods include clothing, home and electrical goods etc. On the basis of current market shares and forecast growth in population and expenditure no capacity has been identified to support additional convenience floorspace in the city to 2031. This is largely as a result of existing commitments including the extension to the Sainsbury's store on Coldham's Lane, and the new convenience stores coming forward in North West Cambridge and the Southern Fringe. The study therefore recommends that there is not any need to plan for or allocate sites to accommodate further additional convenience goods provision in the city beyond the convenience developments already planned.
- 5.12 With regards to comparison floorspace, the study states that on the basis of current market shares of the city centre and out-of-centre retail provision (an 80% retention rate of expenditure in the study area) and allowing for an inflow of 36% (based upon a in-centre survey carried out in 2008) and known commitments there is capacity to support approximately 3,820m² net additional comparison floorspace at 2017, increasing to 14,141m² net by 2022, to 31,226m² net by 2027 and to 39,976m² net by 2031.
- 5.13 The study looks at other factors which could affect the level of capacity forecast for comparison floorspace. These include the potential effect of other major planned developments in the area including retail developments at Peterborough and Huntingdon and the planned new town centre at Northstowe, which could potentially claw back a proportion of spend currently directed towards Cambridge. The consequence of wider developments could be to meet all available capacity in the city in the short to medium term. However, over the longer term there is still forecast capacity to support c.13,637m² net additional comparison goods floorspace by 2027, increasing to c.21,563m² net by 2031.
- 5.14 The forecasts have taken into account growth in Special Forms of Trading (SFT) (particularly internet spending) based upon

levels set out by Experian (a firm specialising in retail forecasting rates). However, the study points out that there is no certainty over this and in physically constrained places like Cambridge, retailers are more likely to maximise the use of the internet or generate new innovations in order to suppress demand for additional floorspace. As a result, the study has also looked at a forecasting scenario where the proportion of spend on SFT is raised from 16% to 20% over the period 2022-2031. The results of both of these scenarios together reduces the capacity for comparison retail even further to 4,579m² net by 2027 and 12,444m² net by 2031. However, the study is clear that given the inherent uncertainties in forecasting over such a long period of time, longer term forecasts should be treated with caution and updated at regular intervals during the plan period.

- 5.15 The study recommends that for comparison goods, there is an element of uncertainty particularly given new developments coming forward in the wider area which will inevitably effect the capacity forecast for the city. As a result it is not considered feasible for the council to plan to fully meet the capacity up to 2031, and it is recommended that the council's strategy should, in the first instance, be to focus on planning to meet the capacity identified up to 2022 (ie 14,141m² net³). As this capacity is sensitive to developments in the wider area, there will also need to be a degree of cooperation between local authorities and on-going monitoring to establish the extent to which some of the capacity identified may be met elsewhere.
- 5.16 At the top of the retail hierarchy, the City Centre should be the primary focus to meet the identified capacity for additional comparison retail development up to 2022. The historic core is constrained in this respect and is unlikely to be capable of accommodating a substantial amount of additional comparison floorspace. However, the study recommends that there may be scope to accommodate some of the identified capacity in the Fitzroy/Burleigh Street area of the City Centre, and that this should be regarded as the first priority in sequential terms, and that the council should adopt a pro-active approach in trying to bring this forward. This has been taken forward in the draft Local Plan in Policy 11 which identifies the Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area of Major Change for mixed use development, including retail and leisure uses with residential and student accommodation on upper floors. The exact quantum of net new

³ For comparison the Grand Arcade is c.41,000m² gross, which at a net:gross ratio of 70%, gives c.28,700 sqm net, the Grafton is c.38,460m² gross, which at a net:gross ratio of 70%, gives c.26,922m² net.

retail and leisure floorspace will be subject to testing and demonstration through the development of a masterplan for the area, which the council will coordinate.

Leisure

- 5.17 The study also looks at leisure provision in Cambridge and notes the market decline in snooker and bingo and rise in eating out, health and fitness and children's indoor play. It also identifies that many new D2 (leisure) uses such as modern bingo halls, multiplex cinemas, ten-pin bowling, larger health and fitness clubs, larger children's play centres and concert halls were unlikely to be able to find space large enough for their formats within Cambridge City Centre or other existing district and local centres in the area.
- 5.18 The report identifies demand for an additional 20,141m² of all leisure floorspace in the city centre by 2031 of which 12,592m² relates to restaurant (A3), public house/drinking establishments (A4), fast food/takeaways (A5) and sui generis nightclub uses floorspace by 2031.
- 5.19 The report recommends that leisure policies would benefit from some updating to encourage the retention of existing, and encourage new, leisure space. Any policy or text which protects D1 (community facilities) floorspace should also allow for their conversion to, or dual use as, performance and other cultural D2 space where appropriate.

City Centre Capacity Study 2013 (Appendix J)

- 5.20 The council commissioned consultants Arup to produce the Cambridge City Centre Capacity Study (2013). Its purpose was to examine the capacity of the City Centre to accommodate the needs of the growing City and the wider sub-region in the period to 2031, whilst respecting the important environment of the City Centre. It forms part of the evidence base for the review of the Cambridge Local Plan.
- 5.21 The study looks at the current uses and functionality of the City Centre, the growth of the city during the plan period and how this might affect the City Centre. Also, how the capacity of the City Centre could be increased, through the identification of development sites and alternative management of uses to free up capacity.

- 5.22 It shows the large number of competing uses in the City Centre and the constraints to growth from open spaces, university and college land ownership and historic buildings. There are few opportunities from council owned property and redevelopment of car parks and a limited number of vacant properties. However, there is a need for retail, leisure, offices, student accommodation, hotels and housing.
- 5.23 The study looks at the sites identified in evidence based studies produced for the council and the sites identified by the council at Issues and Options 2 consultation. It also makes an assessment of development opportunities on a street by street basis in the City Centre. The study identifies six areas of potential change, in or at the edge of the City Centre. It sets out existing conditions, known plans for the area and opportunities for future development for each. These areas include:
- Mill Road;
 - Old Press/Mill Lane;
 - Regent Street/Hills Road/Station Road;
 - Castle Street/Magdalene Street;
 - East Road/Grafton/Fitzroy Street/Burleigh Street;
 - Market Square/Guildhall/New Museums.
- 5.24 The potential for development in these areas is recognised in the draft Local Plan through the Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area of Major Change (Policy 11) and Opportunity Area policies for Mill Road (Policy 23), Old Press / Mill Lane (Policy 25), Eastern Gate (Policy 22), Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre (Policy 24). The potential improvements to the Market Square is recognised in the policy on the City Centre (Policy 9). The potential for enhancing the visitor experience as part of a tourism loop running between King's Parade, Silver Street, and along the Backs to the Folk Museum and Kettles Yard and then back over Magdalene Bridge, Bridge Street and through the City Centre is recognised in Policy 79 - Visitor Attractions.
- 5.25 The study looks at potential transport and public realm improvements that will help to increase capacity in the City Centre. The study recognises that sustainable modes of transport are key in the City Centre. It does not recommend that pedestrians are segregated from cyclists because shared space is often safer, as cyclists will tend to travel more slowly. It also

recognises the need for further cycle parking facilities in the City Centre. With regards to bus services the study agrees that City Centre bus services should continue to be routed through the City Centre, to provide easy accessibility. However, it recognises the capacity problems of Drummer Street bus station and suggests that opportunities for other hub facilities could be considered such as at a redeveloped Grafton Centre, and if feasible the railway station.

- 5.26 The study states that a public realm strategy will ensure a clear vision for the City Centre, with a strategic goal of creating a high quality, safe and accessible urban environment. It will be key in promoting sustainable modes of transport and ensuring that there is a consistent and coherent approach to street furniture, lighting, tree planting and material palettes. This approach has been taken forward into the policy on the City Centre (Policy 9) which supports the production of a Public Realm Strategy Supplementary Planning Document.
- 5.27 The study makes recommendations on the extent of the City Centre boundary, the Primary Shopping Area, and the Primary and Secondary Shopping Frontages which have been taken into account in the drawing of these boundaries on the policies map. The study recommends that no change needs to be made to the City Centre boundary which is shown on the current Cambridge Proposals Map (October 2009). This is because it follows a logical boundary along roads and the river, and although there are hubs of activity developing outside the City Centre, such as around the station and at the retail parks on Newmarket Road, they lack a physical coherence with the main centre. The council agrees with this assessment and no change is proposed to the City Centre boundary in the draft Local Plan.

Student Accommodation – Affordable Housing Financial Contributions Viability Study (Appendix K)

- 5.28 The aim of this report was to consider the potential for affordable housing contributions to be sought from student accommodation through testing the financial viability of a number of potential student accommodation development sites across the city. On the basis of the results generated, the consultants were of the opinion that they could not confidently recommend that the council include a policy for the collection of financial contributions from student accommodation at this stage.

SHLAA and Potential Site Allocations High Level Viability Assessment 2013 (Appendix L)

- 5.29 Dixon Searle Partnership (DSP) were commissioned by the council to carry out a high level viability assessment of a range of sites within the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and of a number of potential allocation sites. This assessment is related to wider viability assessment work for the council undertaken to inform and support the development of the Local Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) proposals.
- 5.30 This work has been used to inform SHLAA site assessments and Local Plan Site allocations site-specific assessments. The report found that on the whole, good to strong levels of sales values are available to support development viability in Cambridge, so that schemes can proceed and frequently still bear planning obligations at significant levels as promoted by existing and proposed policies. This appears to be borne out through the relatively high level of continued development interest and activity in the city, particularly compared with that seen in many other areas recently.

Technical Background Document – Part 2 Supplement (Appendix M)

- 5.31 This document is a May 2013 supplement to the Issues and Options 2 Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge Technical Background Document. It is part of the audit trail setting out the origination and evaluation of sites brought forward for allocation in the Draft Submission Plan. The full audit trail to date includes:
- the identification of sites through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, May 2012;
 - site and issues raised through the Issues and Option 1 stage of the Plan preparation, July 2012;
 - the detailed assessment of sites in *Issues and Options 2, Part 2 Site Options Within Cambridge – January 2013: Technical Background Document - Part 2*;
 - the Issues and Options 2 consultation and responses on specific sites.
- 5.32 This supplement provides a full technical assessment of any additional sites or sites on where there has been significant

changes since Issues and Options 2. This document evaluates all the site options against criteria covering:

- impact on education provision;
- site viability;
- landowner comments and willingness to bring sites forward; and
- key issues emerging from the representations on Issues and Options 2.

5.33 Each site has been given a red, amber and green rating of its acceptability for development against each of the criteria. The process of evaluation identified:

- which sites should be carried forward;
- sites where the capacity and/or mix of uses should be amended; and
- sites that should not be carried forward.

5.34 The *Issues and Options 2, Part 2 Site Options Within Cambridge – January 2013 – Technical Background Document Part 2* sets out in detail the methodology for the assessment of the sites to be allocated in the Cambridge Local Plan. This document is available at <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/background-documents>

6. Implications

(a) Financial Implications

6.1 There are direct financial implications arising from this report, but the cost of preparing a local plan has been budgeted for and included in the draft budget for 2013-2014 and the medium term financial planning for 2015-2016. The agreed approach of preparing one single local plan rather than three separate development plan documents will mean that considerable cost and time savings can be achieved.

(b) Staffing Implications

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

(c) Equal Opportunities Implications

6.3 There are no direct equal opportunities arising from this report. An Equalities Impact Assessment (as an integral part of the sustainability appraisal) has been undertaken as part of preparing the new local plan.

(d) Environmental Implications

6.4 There are no direct environmental implications arising from this report. The new local plan for Cambridge will assist in the delivery of high quality and sustainable new developments 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. Overall there should be a positive climate change impact.

(e) Consultation

6.5 The draft submission plan will be consulted on following the Full Council decision in June and more details on the arrangements for consultation will follow in the second report on this agenda. 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.

(f) Community Safety

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

7. Background papers

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

- Localism Act 2011, which can be accessed at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/contents/enacted>
- National Planning Policy Framework 2012, which can be accessed at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

- Cambridge Local Plan 2006, which can be accessed at: <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/local-plan-2006>
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- <http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/environment/planning/policies/structure-plan.htm>
- Cambridge Local Plan Towards 2031 – Issues and Options and Issues and Options 2 consultations, which can both be accessed at: <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/local-plan-review>

8. Appendices

- Appendix A: Section One – About Cambridge
- Appendix B: Section Two – The Spatial Strategy
- Appendix C: Section Three – City Centre, Areas of Major Change, Opportunity Areas and Site Specific Proposals
- Appendix D: Section Six - Maintaining a balanced supply of housing (Part)
- Appendix E: Section Seven – Protecting and Enhancing the Character of Cambridge (Part)
- Appendix F: Section Nine – Providing the Infrastructure to Support Development (Part)
- Appendix G: Employment Land Review Update (2013)
- Appendix H: Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Update (2013)
- Appendix I: Retail and Leisure Study Update (2013)
- Appendix J: Cambridge City Centre Capacity Study (2013)
- Appendix K: Student Accommodation – Affordable Housing Financial Contributions Viability Study
- Appendix L: SHLAA and Potential Site Allocations High Level Viability Assessment 2013
- Appendix M: Technical Background Document – Part 2 Supplement
- Appendix N: Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation: The Spatial Approach

9. Inspection of papers

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

Author's Name: Patsy Dell

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

This page is intentionally left blank

SECTION ONE: ABOUT CAMBRIDGE

The Cambridge Local Plan

- 1.1 This is the new plan for Cambridge. This plan replaces the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and sets out policies and proposals for future development and spatial planning requirements to 2031.
- 1.2 Built around the banks of the River Cam, Cambridge is a successful city with a world-class reputation for education, research and knowledge-based industries and its historic environment. It is a place that people want to visit, live, work and study in. This plan aims to maintain and enhance that success.
- 1.3 Cambridge already demonstrates the success that can be achieved with well-planned growth. The council adopts a positive and proactive approach; but this success also brings challenges. The challenges facing the city are complex and often have no easy resolution, requiring partnership working and consensus amongst many stakeholders to achieve positive solutions. Delivery of infrastructure to support growth, reducing carbon consumption and managing change to heritage assets of international importance all within a compact tightly bounded city are particular challenges.
- 1.4 Working closely with South Cambridgeshire District Council, whose area wraps around the city, this plan is based on finding solutions to these challenges, with a high level vision that meets the aspirations of residents, civic, academic and business communities. The plan follows these through with specific crosscutting themes and objectives to tackle these challenges, and then sets out a spatial strategy to deliver the strategic priorities of the plan (some of these reflect national priorities but also includes priorities for Cambridge and Cambridgeshire). There are area specific spatial frameworks for the areas of major change and opportunity areas within and on the edge of the city as well as the City Centre. These include allocations of land for development and more detailed delivery policies to achieve the strategic priorities through day-to-day decision taking on planning applications.
- 1.5 This plan is essentially a pragmatic continuation of the 2006 growth strategy, with adjustment to reflect the experience of delivery of that strategy and the current context for planning. It focusses on delivery and meeting Cambridge's needs. The plan reflects how the current growth is changing the city and the new challenges this creates. In light of experience, the plan has an increased emphasis on mitigating transport impacts, securing further progress on sustainable development, area improvement and place making.
- 1.6 This plan sets out what is important for Cambridge to achieve. The plan should be read as a whole with cross-references kept to a minimum. A more detailed explanation of how each policy area has developed and the reason for the choice of chosen options is published alongside this plan.

- 1.7 The plan is written in the form that is intended for submission and adoption. This round of consultation will be the opportunity to comment on the plan itself in its whole form. These comments need to formally support or object to the plan in terms of its legal compliance and compliance with national policy (soundness) tests. These will go forward to an independent inspector who will invite interested individuals and groups to public hearings to test the plan.

Cambridge and its context

- 1.8 Although Cambridge is a small city in size, its stature on an international scale and the extent of facilities it offers is much greater than one would expect. The population of Cambridge was 123,900 in 2011.¹ It is predicted that by 2031, the population will reach 150,000. Cambridge also has to consider the needs of its academic population. The city hosts a large student population from the University of Cambridge and Anglia Ruskin University. In 2012, the student population was estimated at 29,087.²
- 1.9 It is estimated that over four and a half million people visit Cambridge each year. The city boasts 743.59 hectares of Protected Open Space, including large parks and gardens such as the Cambridge University Botanic Gardens, Parker's Piece and the other pieces, greens and commons. Overall, this equates to approximately 6.2 hectares of Protected Open Space per 1,000 people, of which 2.9 hectares per 1,000 people is publicly accessible. Cambridge has an internationally renowned legacy of designated and undesignated heritage assets and seeks to enhance this legacy by encouraging innovative new buildings of the highest quality. An essential part of the character of the city stems from the spaces and grounds around buildings and the important role of trees and other landscape features.
- 1.10 Cambridge is a demonstrably successful place where economic success and high quality of life, sustainable living and quality of place are inextricably linked. Cambridge's modern day accomplishments include a thriving hi-tech and biotech industry, which has developed since the 1960s and is known as the Cambridge Phenomenon. Although the hi-tech and biotech clusters in Cambridge remain successful, the city has seen some negative impacts of success. Management and mitigation of the impacts of growth is therefore a key challenge. Average wages in the city have not risen in line with the city's average house prices. This has made it increasingly difficult for people to purchase property in the city, and this has associated impacts on the level of people commuting into the city from the surrounding villages and market towns.

¹ Census 2011

² Cambridge City Council Annual Monitoring Report 2012

- 1.11 Cambridge is a busy city and has a wide influence on its surrounding area. In terms of strategic road connections, the M11 and A14 are the main trunk roads that connect Cambridge to the strategic road network. The M11 bounds Cambridge to the south and west, and provides a direct link to London. The A14 bounds the north of the city, and creates a link from the east coast and the port of Felixstowe through to the M1 and M6 Motorways. The city is situated on the London to King's Lynn railway line, with London accessed within 45 minutes. In addition to being a hub of both road and rail connections, it is the centre of a wider travel to work and housing market area (the area in which people live to get to work at a settlement that offers major employment). The city's area of influence, both as a sub-regional centre and a major focus for employment, includes the majority of Cambridgeshire, parts of West Suffolk, Bedfordshire, Essex and North Hertfordshire.
- 1.12 More people in Cambridge are likely to use sustainable modes of transport to travel to work than anywhere else in the United Kingdom. According to the 2011 Census, 33% of our residents commute to work by bike, compared with 34% by car. Given the level of in-commuting, the growth of the city and ongoing demand for the city's services and facilities, transport infrastructure in the city is under pressure. As a result of these trends, more needs to be done to support the use of sustainable modes of transport. Without integrated approaches to the planning of development and transport, the significant achievements in shifting towards sustainable transport, walking, public transport and cycling in recent years will be undermined. On the positive side, major new public transport improvements have been delivered recently in the form of the Cambridgeshire Busway that connects to Peterborough, St Ives and Huntingdon through and beyond the city. Nevertheless, infrastructure funding issues remain a challenge.
- 1.13 The need for new housing in Cambridge is high. Current new large-scale housing developments are underway at sites at Trumpington Meadows, Clay Farm, Glebe Farm, NIAB, and the University of Cambridge's North West Cambridge site and these are estimated to provide over 7,000 new homes. These sites, however, will not meet all future housing need to 2031, which is forecast to be around 14,000 new homes between 2011 and 2031. This plan addresses that shortfall.

What Comprises the Development Plan for Cambridge?

- 1.14 In the past, strategic planning for Cambridge was undertaken at a 'higher plan-making level', through the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 and the Regional Spatial Strategy (the East of England Plan 2008) and their predecessor documents. Both these documents have now been revoked and strategic planning is now undertaken at a local level, co-ordinated by a statutory "duty to co-operate." The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Strategic Planning Unit has been set up to help

coordinate the development of strategy with South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and other local planning authorities and stakeholders in the area. However, the outputs of this strategic work are not statutory and therefore do not form part of the official development plan for Cambridge.

1.15 On adoption of this plan, the official statutory development plan for Cambridge comprises:

- Cambridge Local Plan 2014;
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework;
- Cambridge East Area Action Plan (excluding policies CE/3 and CE/35 which are replaced by Policy 12: Cambridge East); and
- North West Cambridge Area Action Plan.

The Cambridge Local Plan 2006 is deleted in its entirety and no longer forms part of the development plan.

1.16 Supporting the development plan for Cambridge, there are a number of additional policy documents and guides. These are set out in more detail in Appendix A.

Appendix D: Section Six – Policies 46, 48, 49 and 50

Policy 46: Development of Student Housing

Proposals for new student accommodation will be permitted if they meet identified needs of an existing educational institution within the city of Cambridge in providing housing for students attending full-time courses of an academic year or more. Applications will be permitted subject to:

- a. there being a proven need for student accommodation to serve the institution;
- b. the development does not result in the loss of existing market housing and Affordable Housing;
- c. it is in an appropriate location for the institution served;
- d. the location is well served by sustainable transport modes;
- e. appropriate management arrangements are in place to ensure students do not keep cars in Cambridge;
- f. rooms and facilities are of an appropriate size for living and studying; and
- g. if appropriate, they are warden controlled to minimise any potential for anti-social behaviour.

The loss of existing student accommodation will be resisted unless adequate replacement accommodation is provided or it is demonstrated that the facility no longer caters for current or future needs.

Language schools will be expected to provide residential accommodation for their students within their own sites; make effective use of existing student accommodation within the city outside term time or use home stay accommodation.

Supporting text:

- 6.10 The presence of two large universities has a significant impact on Cambridge's demography and on its housing market, with one in four of its residents studying at one of the universities. The student communities, including both undergraduates and postgraduates, contribute significantly to the local economy, and to the vibrancy and diversity of the city. Out of term time and throughout the year, the city is also a temporary home to conference delegates and other students attending pre-university courses at specialist schools and colleges or studying English as a foreign language at one the city's language schools.
- 6.11 Although student communities contribute greatly to Cambridge's diversity, the number of students who share privately rented accommodation affects the availability of larger houses available in the general market. Development of new student accommodation may free up accommodation suitable for wider general housing needs. The restriction on occupation by

full-time students enrolled on courses of at least one academic year does not apply outside term-time. This ensures opportunity for use of the accommodation for conference delegates or summer language school students, whilst providing more long-term student accommodation when needed.

- 6.12 Accessibility by public transport is important, as students in purpose-built accommodation do not usually have access to a car. The policy should ensure students are able to live in a convenient location, and in a well-managed development subject to restrictions on car usage to help maintain the character of residential areas.
- 6.13 Evidence must be provided as a part of the application to show a linkage with one or more higher or further education institution. It is accepted that, due to the relatively short lifespan of tenancies and the lifestyle of student occupants, different amenity standards should apply from those for permanent accommodation. However, student accommodation should still be well designed, providing appropriate space standards and facilities. The provision of amenity space will need to reflect the location and scale of the proposal. The ability to accommodate disabled students should be fully integrated into any student housing development in keeping with the requirements of Policy 51.

How the policy came about:

1. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development', for both plan-making and decision-making. For plan making this means that local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area. Local plans should meet needs, which are based upon evidence, and they should be flexible and be able to adapt to rapid change, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly outweigh the benefits, or development is within protected areas.
2. The National Planning Policy Framework requires local authorities to support the knowledge industries and the development of a strong and competitive economy. Supporting further education organisations is compatible with national policy aims and the proposed economic vision for the city as a centre of excellence and world leader in higher education. In supporting to ongoing success of higher and further education in Cambridge, consideration needs to be given to the provision of sufficient student accommodation to meet the ongoing needs of a range of institutions, whilst addressing the potential for distortions in the local housing market as a result of the attractiveness to developers of providing student housing.
3. In view of the known student housing shortages in the city, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 contained a number of policies addressing the need to

deliver student accommodation. Policy 7/7 deals with staff and student housing for the University of Cambridge and sets out criteria for assessing proposals against. Policy 7/9 addresses the student accommodation needs for Anglia Ruskin University, through sites allocated for this purpose in the proposals schedule. Policy 7/10 supports the provision of speculative student hostels on sites that have not been allocated in the Local Plan, but have become available during the plan period. Policy 7/10 restricts such speculative development by way of a Section 106 to housing full-time students attending Anglia Ruskin University or the University of Cambridge. Concerns have been raised that this is unfair to other legitimate and established education providers in Cambridge such as specialist schools.

4. The Cambridge Local Plan 2006 also has a policy, which only deals with language schools. Existing Policy 7/11 does not allow for new permanent language schools to be set up in the city and regulates existing schools by virtue of a 10% tolerance control on new teaching floorspace provided. This policy has been in place for a considerable number of years and stems from concerns about possible impacts on the local housing market and previous Structure Plan policy towards selective management. However, language schools are only one type of specialist school, so future policies would need to extend to include all of the other types of independent specialist schools and possibly independent academies. The numbers of these have increased from around three in the 1990s to approximately 11-14 currently. Examples include CATS in Round Church Street, Abbey College in Station Road, and Glisson Road, and Bellerby's College in Bateman Street and Manor Community College. Others such as Cambridge Centre For Sixth Form Studies are educational charities and non profit organisations more akin to a state registered schools catering for local students and boarders.
5. In the Issues and Options report (2012), student accommodation issues were raised in Options 95, 96, 144, 145, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151 and 152. These options dealt with both universities, tutorial colleges and other specialist education provision, such as language schools. The following paragraphs discuss the intention to move forward with the options 96, 144, 148, 150, 151 and 152 to form a policy on the development of student housing.

Growth of educational institutions

6. Future growth rates are predicted to continue the past trends of increases in undergraduates of around 0.5% per annum and postgraduates at 2.0% annually. This suggests 1,188 additional undergraduates and an additional 2,876 postgraduates at the University of Cambridge by 2031 and a further 1,000 students at Anglia Ruskin University.
7. The University of Cambridge continues to be a world leader in education and a vital driver of the local and national economy. In 2012, around 18,300 students studied full time at the University of Cambridge. The University of

Cambridge continues to maintain a steady growth rate and is not facing the decline in student numbers being experienced by other United Kingdom higher education institutions. The majority of University of Cambridge students live in university or college owned accommodation, concentrated predominantly in the City Centre and to the west of the City Centre. The University of Cambridge's colleges aim to house 100% of undergraduates and 90% of their postgraduates. The University of Cambridge's targets for increasing student numbers over the coming years have to be achieved by the 31 colleges who are autonomous from the University of Cambridge, but house almost all students during their time of study in Cambridge.

8. Given land shortages within the city, the resulting requirements to house student numbers in college can at times create land use planning issues for the colleges. The Colleges currently have around 15,000 rooms available to house their students. A survey by the Colleges Bursars' Committee in April 2012 has revealed that over the past five years, the Colleges have added 158 new rooms per year through new build, conversion and adaptation of existing College building stock. The Colleges anticipate that they will be able to provide 140 new student rooms per year to 2016 (700 rooms in total). 40% of these new rooms will be delivered through rationalisation and adaptation of existing college buildings. After 2016, the rate is likely to drop to around 112 new student rooms per annum as opportunities for windfall sites reduce. By 2031, the Colleges would need 21,390 rooms based on the above growth rates. They would therefore face a shortfall of around 6,390. If 2,800 can be provided within existing College sites this would leave the shortfall at 3590. Taking off 2,000 student bedrooms approved as part of North West Cambridge development would leave a need to find land for around 1,596 student rooms on allocated sites around the city. Based on recent developments and evidence put to the 2006 Local Plan Inquiry by the University of Cambridge, this could imply a net land requirement of 10.1 hectares for undergraduates and postgraduates.
9. Anglia Ruskin University also continues to grow, with postgraduate study as the key growth area. Anglia Ruskin University currently has 8,900 students studying in Cambridge, comprising 7,600 undergraduates and 1,300 postgraduates. Anglia Ruskin University has a much smaller stock of its own purpose built student accommodation and relies more heavily on head lease properties, hostels built by third parties, and housing its students in open market housing including Housing in Multiple Occupation.
10. Despite a continuing reliance on open market housing in the city, Anglia Ruskin University has made considerable progress in acquiring new purpose built student accommodation since the allocation of a number of sites for student accommodation in the Cambridge Local Plan in 2006. The policy approach taken in the 2006 Local Plan allowed for student accommodation to be delivered in lieu of Affordable Housing on a number of sites in the city, whilst significant levels of development around Cambridge railway station

(CB1) allowed for the inclusion of student accommodation in the City Centre. 251 units have been delivered at the Brunswick site adjacent to Midsummer Common during 2012 and are predominantly occupied by Anglia Ruskin University students. 511 units have been delivered at CB1 which are proving to be popular with 1st year students. A further 739 student bedrooms may be delivered at CB1 within the later phases of the development, although they are not being specifically delivered for Anglia Ruskin University. In addition, other new accommodation has come forward on a range of sites around the city, including at Addenbrooke's, Perne Road and Malta Road, and has increased the overall stock of purpose-built student accommodation to 2,043 bedspaces. This figure includes the loss of 121 bedspaces at Bridget's and Nightingale hostels in Tennis Court Road. The number of managed head lease properties has continued to fall to around 180 bedspaces in 32 properties. The numbers of properties contracted with the private sector was at about 700 in 2011/12. With the growth in student numbers, however, the overall proportion of Anglia Ruskin University students housed in purpose built accommodation has fallen from 34% prior to the 2006 Local Plan to around 27% in 2011/12.

11. There are a growing number of specialist schools in Cambridge, including secretarial and tutorial colleges, pre-university foundation courses, crammer schools and tutorial colleges. These schools concentrate on GCSE and A level qualifications along with pre university entrance tuition. They attract a large number of students and contribute significantly to the local economy. The Cambridge Local Plan 2006 has a policy which only deals with language schools. However, these are only one type of specialist school and future policies would need to address all of the other types of independent specialist schools and possibly independent academies. Many of these specialist organisations attract school age children who live with families in the city and surrounding area or commute into Cambridge from other locations in the sub-region. As such, they do not necessarily place further pressure on the local housing market. In some cases, though, these types of organisation attract students from further afield and provide associated accommodation for boarders, e.g. Cambridge Centre for Sixth Form Studies. The 2006 Local Plan policy made an exception for secretarial and tutorial colleges allowing them to grow by 10% of their overall gross floorspace provided that they serve a mainly local catchment and provide residential accommodation, social and amenity facilities for all non local students.
12. Cambridge continues to be an important centre for study of English as a foreign language. Overseas students have been coming to Cambridge to study English for over 50 years. The city has over 20 permanent foreign language schools and a fluctuating number of around 30 temporary schools, which set up in church halls and other temporary premises over the summer months. Currently, the annual student load at these centres is thought to be around 31,000, though the average length of stay is only 5 weeks. Many schools house their teenage students with host families during the summer

months, which also provides another source of income for local families and does not unduly cause pressures on the local housing market. Other schools are starting to take on more mature and business students, along with pre-university entrance students wishing to improve their English. Most make use of independently provided student accommodation to house their more mature students. This can involve use of existing University of Cambridge and Anglia Ruskin University accommodation outside term-time.

Affordable Housing Provision from Student Accommodation

13. Cambridge has a high level of private renting at 26.2% of total housing stock in the city¹, 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.
14. It is important to note that student housing is not currently counted as a form of Affordable Housing provision. This is on the basis that it is not permanent housing, being provided only because an individual has chosen to study at a specific educational institution. It is recognised that further student housing provision might reduce pressure on the remainder of the city's housing stock dependent on the overall growth in student numbers at a range of institutions, but it is also noted that there can be a tension between the provision of student accommodation and other types of housing, with the two uses competing for the same sites. There is therefore a need to strike an appropriate balance to ensure that housing delivery, particularly Affordable Housing delivery, is not compromised. In the case of student accommodation, it benefits from not being required to contribute towards Affordable Housing provision, which may result in greater land values being achieved and little incentive to deliver non-student housing. Through the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, sites have been identified which could contribute to meeting local housing need. If these sites come forward without Affordable Housing, the Council would not be able to address Affordable Housing need.
15. Requiring Affordable Housing under option 95 (Affordable Housing contribution for new student accommodation) of the Issues and Options report (2012) would respond to the existing demand and need for increased provision, but it may have an adverse effect on viability of proposals for student accommodation and in turn lead to fewer proposals for student accommodation. This could exacerbate the existing pressure on the city's housing stock. In investigating this issue, the council appointed Dixon Searle to undertake viability assessment on the provision of Affordable Housing through the delivery of student accommodation. On the basis of the results generated from analysis, Dixon Searle advised the council that the average

¹ Census 2011.

surplus is too low to confidently recommend that the council include a policy for the collection of financial contributions from student accommodation at this stage. A notional very low charge could potentially be levied but this could mean that any financial contribution towards Affordable Housing could potentially reduce or even remove any buffering inherent within the Community Infrastructure Levy rate suggested for student accommodation.

16. As such, Option 96 (No Affordable Housing contribution from new Student Accommodation) will be pursued.

Affordable Housing exemption

17. Policy 7/9 in the Local Plan 2006 was very supportive of the development of student hostels for Anglia Ruskin University. This included a provision that if residential developments provided a significant proportion of student hostel accommodation for Anglia Ruskin University, they would not have to provide affordable housing as set out in Policy 5/5. This has been successful in encouraging the provision of further student hostels at locations like the former Cambridge Regional College Brunswick site and the Station Area (CB1). In relation to options 147 and 148 in the Issues and Options report, these options set out the opportunity to retain (147) or remove the exemption from Affordable Housing provision(148). Whilst Anglia Ruskin University does not have access to considerable levels of purpose-built student residential accommodation and remains highly dependent on houses acquired on short leases and on students living in HMOs, its circumstances have improved with the delivery of the Brunswick and Station Area student accommodation. Given the limited land availability in Cambridge and the need to provide more Affordable Housing to meet a range of needs, it is important that the council takes all reasonable opportunities to provide new market housing and Affordable Housing. The Council is committed to supporting the University of Cambridge, the colleges, Anglia Ruskin University and other institutions, which contribute to the knowledge economy, and acknowledges the important role that they play locally, nationally and internationally. However, the importance of and need for student accommodation must be balanced with the need to deliver Affordable Housing. As such, it is proposed that the exemption is removed and that option 148 is pursued through the new Local Plan.

Delivery of staff and student housing for the University of Cambridge only

18. Within the Issues and Options report (2012), Option 144 allowed for the development of sites for staff and student housing for the University of Cambridge. Whilst sites for student housing would be assessed against Policy 46, the allocation of sites is a separate process being undertaken as a part of the Local Plan Review. Staff housing may be provided in line with the requirements set out for employment related housing in policy 45 of the plan. Option 145 related to the delivery of student accommodation at North

West Cambridge. This is being delivered as part of the planning permissions for the site. Whilst it may be the case that existing colleges gain access to some of the accommodation provided at North West Cambridge, the North West Cambridge site is subject to the planning policies set out in the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan. As such, neither of these options are to be taken forward into the plan.

Speculative Student Accommodation

19. Options 149 and 150 of the Issues and Options report (2012) set out two approaches to dealing with speculative student accommodation. Option 149 addressed the current approach, which restricts the provision of speculative student accommodation to use by Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge. Option 150 meanwhile suggested widening the approach to allow other established educational institutions to access speculatively provided student accommodation.
20. In relation to options 149 and 150 and the existing policy approach in Cambridge, a similar policy to existing Cambridge Local Plan 2006 Policy 7/10 in Oxford (Policy CS25) was overruled by the Inspector at the Examination in Public into the Council's Core Strategy on 21st December 2010.

“...Student accommodation will be restricted in occupation to students in full-time education at either Oxford Brookes University or the University of Oxford. Appropriate management controls will be secured, including an undertaking that students do not bring cars to Oxford.”
21. The Inspector removed the embargo restricting occupation of such hostels to students attending the two universities in Oxford on the basis that it was inequitable and was discriminating against non-university colleges.
22. The Inspector's report at Paragraphs 4.81 and 4.82 are particularly relevant; they state:

“The policy restricts the provision of student accommodation to that related to the Universities, effectively placing an embargo on student accommodation to serve the needs of the many non-university colleges in Oxford. The Council points to the greater emphasis of these other colleges on part-time courses and that a lot of their students take up lodging accommodation, so not adding to the pressures on the city's housing stock and limited development sites. Nevertheless, some of the students at these other colleges will be full-time and are just as likely to require housing out in the community and put pressure on the housing market. Where full-time students are on courses of upwards of an academic year, it seems to me that they are as likely as University students to be seeking their own housing as opposed to lodgings.

23. Whilst removing the policy embargo would increase the competition for any available sites, provided any new accommodation was directed to full-time students, and then the impact on the overall housing market would be very limited. These colleges also make their contribution to the local economy. I find little reason, in terms of housing pressures, to discriminate against non-University colleges. It is not justified in equity terms and I propose some wording changes to reflect this. Detailed consideration of the needs of the non-University Colleges can be looked at as part of subsequent DPDs.”
24. The principle of targeting the policy towards full time students engaging in a full time course of a year or more at an existing educational establishment providing full time education within the city should serve to broaden the accommodation delivered to a wider range of establishments. As such, option 149 will not be pursued, whilst option 150 will form part of policy 46.

Specialist Colleges and Language Schools

25. Options 151 and 152 address specialist colleges and language schools respectively. Both options mainly address the provision of new and expansion of existing specialist colleges and language schools. It is recognised though, that these forms of educational institution can impact on the local housing market. As such, policy 46 covers the needs of specialist colleges where students often participate in courses of over one year. Language schools have a different student base, with many students visiting for very short periods of time. Accordingly, it is recommended that the residential accommodation needs of language schools are addressed through provision of accommodation within language school sites, temporary provision within existing student accommodation outside term-time, and use of home-stay accommodation.
26. Policy 46 sets out a criteria-based approach to provision of student accommodation, requiring proposals for new student accommodation to meet identified needs of an existing educational institution within the city of Cambridge in providing housing for students attending full-time courses of an academic year or more. This addresses the issue discussed above regarding equity of approach to a range of institutions within the city. Additional criteria cover loss of existing housing, for which there is a need within the city; locational issues such as proximity to the institution and to sustainable transport modes; proctorial control of car usage in Cambridge and amenity for future residents.

Policy 48: Housing in Multiple Occupation

Proposals for large houses in multiple occupation as defined by the Government's Circular 08/2010 will be supported, where the proposal:

- a. does not create an over-concentration of such a use in the local area or cause harm to residential amenity or the surrounding area;
- b. the building or site (including any outbuildings) is suitable for use as housing in multiple occupation, with provision made, for example, for appropriate refuse and recycling storage, cycle and car parking and drying areas;
- c. will be accessible to sustainable modes of transport, shops and other local services.

Appropriate management arrangements should be put in place in order to monitor and minimise anti-social behaviour and adverse impact on local residents. A condition to this effect may be applied to any planning consent.

Supporting text:

6.19 Housing in multiple occupation (HMO) are flats or houses permanently occupied by more than one household, where each household does not have exclusive access to all cooking, washing and toilet facilities behind a locked front door. In planning terms, HMOs are split into two different use classes, based on the number of occupants:

- A small HMO - this is a shared dwellinghouse 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).² Permitted development rights enable a flat or house in Use Class C3 (i.e. in simple terms, a normal 'family' house) to change use to Use Class C4 without submission of a planning application;
- A larger HMO – this is when there are more than six unrelated individuals sharing basic amenities such as a kitchen or bathroom. This falls outside the Town and Country Planning Uses Classes Order (2010) and is categorised as sui generis.

Proposals for smaller HMOs (Use Class C4) will be considered in the same way as a proposal for C3 residential development.

6.20 Cambridge's HMOs have an important role to play within the local housing market. They provide a range of shared accommodation, predominantly

² The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Order 2010

occupied by students and young professionals. However, it is acknowledged that HMOs can reduce the number of family homes available; impact negatively on the character of an area; and contribute to local parking problems.

- 6.21 It is also important to ensure that HMOs provide a standard of accommodation equivalent to that enjoyed by other residents and that the amount of activity generated by the proposed level of occupation does not detract from the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. The criteria for Lifetime Homes will therefore be applied to proposals for change of use to HMOs and minimum space standards for development should also be aspired to in the provision of new HMOs. The application of the space standards will help to determine the number of occupiers that a property can reasonably accommodate as a HMO. This not only ensures reasonable living conditions for occupiers, but will also ensure that the intensification of such activity associated with any HMO is proportionate to the size of the property.

How the policy came about:

27. The Government's Circular 08/2010³ sets out the Government's formal guidance on dealing with Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) through the planning system. It recognises in paragraph 2 of this circular 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).
28. In planning terms, HMOs are currently split into two types, 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 outside the Town and Country Planning Uses Classes Order (2010) and is categorised as sui generis.

³ Department for Communities and Local Government Circular 08/2010 Changes to Planning Regulations for Dwellinghouses and Houses in Multiple Occupation.

29. The change in approach to HMOs stems from amendments made to the Use Classes Order and the General Permitted Development Order⁴ 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 Order⁵, which allows for permitted change of use from C3 residential use to a C4 HMO without the need for planning permission. It should be noted that the definition of an HMO for planning purposes differs to the definition in the Housing Act 2004.
30. HMOs form an important part of the housing market in Cambridge. According to the Council's Private Sector House Condition Survey 2009⁶, there were then approximately 5,000 HMOs in the city (using the Housing Act definition), making up some 12.6% of the housing stock compared with the national average of just over 2%. Just over 1,000 of these were thought to be occupied by students. 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 city⁷, 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, 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.
31. 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. The high cost of housing in Cambridge makes HMOs a more affordable option for many than self-contained accommodation, and rooms in HMOs are in high demand. Tables 2 and 3 below show that both the

⁴ The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2010

⁵ The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No.2) (England) Order 2010

⁶ Cambridge City Council House Condition Survey 2009:
<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/ccm/content/housing/housing-strategy-and-research/housing-research.en>

⁷ Census 2011

average and lower quartile monthly rent on a room (although not necessarily in a HMO as legally defined) has increased faster than the rent on a one bedroom property over the past year.

Table 2: Average rent per calendar month in Cambridge

	Dec 2011	June 2012	Dec 2012	Change	% Change
Room	£405	£432	£488	£83	20%
Studio	£604	£641	£675	£71	12%
1 bedroom	£757	£769	£802	£45	6%

Source: VOA data and Cambridgeshire Atlas

Table 3: Lower quartile rent per calendar month in Cambridge

	Dec 2011	June 2012	Dec 2012	Change	% Change
Room	£359	£360	£420	£61	17%
Studio	£525	£580	£613	£88	17%
1 bedroom	£665	£680	£725	£60	9%

Source: VOA data and Cambridgeshire Atlas

32. HMO accommodation may be subject to further pressures as reforms to the welfare system take effect, particularly amongst under 35s who are no longer entitled to claim Housing Benefit (Local Housing Allowance) (at the single-room rate. The shared accommodation rate at April 2013 is £76.65 per week – equating to around £316 per month, which is insufficient to cover even the lower quartile rent on a room in the city. At April 2013 there were 469 one-room Local Housing Allowance claimants in the city (a number that at the moment currently remains fairly stable).

33. Unfortunately, HMOs are also associated with issues that affect the neighbourhood, which can result from 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 low quality amenities and overcrowding, which can often have an adverse impact on the health, safety and welfare of occupiers and neighbours.
34. Given the potential issues associated with HMOs, it was considered reasonable to include Option 116 'Criteria based policy for HMOs' in the Issues and Options report (2012). This outlined the factors to be taken into consideration 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 was considered important to set out specific criteria in the 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.
 35. Conversely, setting out a policy with a presumption against further HMO development was not considered to represent a sustainable approach as it would 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 bring to Cambridge, on balance it was considered that the case for introducing a cap has not been made.
 36. It was agreed at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee in February 2013 to pursue Option 116, which set out a criteria based approach, recognising the contribution that HMOs make to the overall supply of housing in Cambridge.
 37. Members have previously raised concerns about the impact of HMOs on particular areas of the city and the quality of accommodation experienced by HMO residents. These concerns resulted in a project to look in more detail at HMO issues and recommend how they can best be tackled.
 38. As part of this project the council commissioning consultants MRUK to carry out a qualitative and quantitative study of HMO tenants living in smaller

HMOs⁸ in order to establish their living conditions, their reasons for living in HMOs and their overall perceptions of HMO accommodation within the city. The study, which took place in Winter 2012/13 involved a door-step survey of a sample of HMO tenants, and some further focus groups. It produced useful data for the council in terms of its role in providing housing advice to both landlords and tenants, and maintaining and improving the environmental health of the city. From a planning perspective, the study addressed issues such as car ownership, waste management, the quality of provision and the relationship of HMOs with their wider environment.

39. Quantitative outputs of the survey should be treated with caution for a variety of reasons, e.g. difficulties in identifying which properties in the city are HMOs. However, it does give a flavour of some of the issues experienced by tenants.
40. Residents of HMOs surveyed were mostly living in areas with a mix of accommodation types, including both HMOs and family houses. Overall, they did not identify any specific benefits of living in areas where there was only shared accommodation, nor did they express a desire to live in such an area. Furthermore, the diversity of properties was generally seen as an advantage. Students valued the fact that it made them feel as though they were living in a real-world environment; somewhat detached from student life. However, while residents liked living in areas with different accommodation types, they felt that this did lead to some problems. They identified conflicts between residents in shared accommodation and other residents; some of which were due to incidents that had occurred and others due to general perceptions of those living in shared accommodation. The most common incidents were around noise levels, with many residents having experienced complaints from neighbours about these. It was accepted that noise levels were sometimes higher in shared accommodation therefore respondents were not overly critical of neighbours who complained.
41. In terms of quality of accommodation, tenants felt that choice was reduced because the physical condition of properties varies considerably, meaning that many properties were not seen as suitable. Tenants also identified a split between student and non-student properties, which further reduced availability. Accommodation was generally thought to be harder to find close to the start of academic terms, due to a high demand amongst students.
42. In relation to car ownership, the study highlighted that just over half of the respondents reported that a vehicle was owned by someone in the HMO (57%). However, the incidence of car ownership was higher in non-student HMOs and the majority of HMOs only had one or two vehicles associated with the property. Surprisingly, tenants with five or more other occupants in

⁸ Smaller HMOs were considered in the study as the Council has traditionally had less access to data on smaller HMOs as they are not subject to the same licensing regime as larger HMOs.

the property were most likely to have no vehicles associated with the property (49%). Two in five properties with two or three occupants had one vehicle compared to one in five properties with five or more occupants. There were generally few issues with parking, but those problems that did occur related to parking permits. Most residents were not given allocated parking spaces by their landlords and, as such, they tended to park in areas where permits were not required. While this was inconvenient, residents generally felt they were able to get a space without too much difficulty. However, those who lived in areas not requiring permits were concerned about a permit system being implemented in future, and the impact this would have on residents.

43. Waste management was also raised as a specific issue within the study. There was a sense that waste storage and collection could be improved. Some residents felt that their properties tended to generate more waste and that the number of bins allocated to each house could be increased. Those respondents from properties housing 5 or more occupants were more likely to have said there were not sufficient bins for recycling. Residents felt that, because recycling facilities were often stored in communal spaces, these areas could become messy because nobody took responsibility for their maintenance. Residents also often tended to use or see others using bins belonging to other households if they ran out of space, which could lead to bins overflowing.
44. A survey of a sample of landlords and letting agents – as part of the same project – has also highlighted concerns around waste management and the need for tenants to have more information on their rights and responsibilities.
45. 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, the criteria based approach for HMOs was followed in tandem with policies supporting the delivery of appropriately located purpose-built student accommodation; addressing the conversion of large properties (Option 118); Lifetime Homes (Option 111); residential space standards (Options 106 – 110 and Options I.1 – I.3). It should be noted that occupiers of new HMOs would 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.
46. The criteria based approach discussed at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee in February 2013 suggested 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.
47. This policy would only apply where an application for planning permission is required for a large HMO (sui generis) or where a change of use from a use other than C3 residential to a C4 HMO occurs.

Policy 49: Provision for Gypsies and Travellers

The council, working with neighbouring authorities, will maintain a local assessment of need for pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and plots for Travelling Showpeople. The outcome of these assessments will assist the council in determining planning applications. The latest published evidence (December 2011) indicates there is a need for just one pitch between 2011 and 2031. This Local Plan therefore makes no provision for new sites in Cambridge. Proposals for permanent, transit and emergency stopping provision for Gypsies and Travellers will only be permitted where:

- a. the applicant or updated council evidence has adequately demonstrated a clear need for the site in the city, and the number, type and tenure of pitches proposed, which cannot be met by a lawful existing or available allocated site;
- b. the site is accessible to local shops, services and community facilities by public transport, on foot or by cycle;
- c. the site has safe and convenient vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access for the type of vehicles that could reasonably be expected to use or access the site;
- d. the site is capable of being provided with essential utilities, including mains water, electricity, sewerage and drainage and waste disposal;
- e. the site will provide an acceptable living environment and the health and safety of the site's residents should not be put at risk. Factors to be taken into account include flood risk, site contamination, air quality and noise;
- f. the site will not have 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;
- g. the site will allow the needs of the residents of the site to be met without putting undue pressure on local services; and
- h. the site provides adequate space for vehicle parking, turning and servicing of large vehicles, storage, play and residential amenity.

Should up to date needs assessment indicate there is a need, then opportunities to deliver sites for Gypsies and Travellers will be sought as part of significant major development sites. The location of site provision will be identified through the masterplanning and design process. Sites in the Green Belt would not be appropriate, unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated at the masterplanning and planning application stage. Sites will not be located in identified areas of green separation. Sites provided will meet the following criterion in addition to the above criteria (a to h):

- i. sites will be well related to the major development, enabling good access to the services and facilities, and providing safe access on foot, cycle and public transport. Access should not rely on minor residential roads.

Supporting text:

6.22 The Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites requires local planning authorities to:

- set out targets for the provision of pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and plots for Travelling Showpeople;
- to maintain a five year land supply of sites;
- to identify and update annually deliverable sites to meet the accommodation needs of Travellers within their area within the first five years;
- identify a supply of sites or broad locations for growth in later years of the plan period;
- work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities to provide flexibility in identifying sites.

6.23 These requirements necessitate collaborative working with neighbouring authorities on both assessment of need and ongoing provision. In informing debate on need, a number of Cambridgeshire, Norfolk and Suffolk authorities commissioned the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTANA)(2011) to cover the period 2011–2031. This assessment concluded that Cambridge's need was for one permanent pitch for Gypsies and Travellers between 2021 and 2026. There was no identified need for plots⁹ for Travelling Showpeople within Cambridge's administrative area. Reference is made in the GTANA to a need for transit/emergency stopping place provision, but it was not possible to determine precise demand for such temporary accommodation in any one local authority area. The GTANA notes that beyond the immediate need, assessments of growth are based on modelling, and the best information available. There will be a need to monitor and review the plan, as necessary, to take account of up to date evidence.

6.24 The Government's Planning Policy for Travellers Sites requires plans to identify specific sites or broad locations, where need will be met within the plan period. The council considers that significant major developments provide an opportunity to deliver provision to meet longer term needs. This would allow the delivery of pitches as an integral part of the development, in sustainable locations close to services and facilities. As stated in 'The Road Ahead: Final Report of the Independent Task Group on Site Provision and Enforcement for Gypsies and Travellers' published by the Department of Communities and Local Government in December 2007, the approach of

⁹ Where there is sufficient space for living accommodation and the storage of equipment.

integrating the provision of accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers as part of new development helps to erode misconceptions and distrust.

- 6.25 The Local Plan has not identified specific sites for pitch provision for Gypsies and Travellers at significant existing major development sites in the city's urban extensions as many of the sites have already established outline consents and masterplans. The criteria-based policy on pitch provision for Gypsies and Travellers will be used to determine any applications coming forward and to guide the identification of a site through the masterplanning of developments. This would allow design issues and the relationship between land uses to be considered fully at the design stage. The policy provides flexibility with regard to the location of provision, in order that the best location can be identified through the masterplanning and design process. Phasing plans would also need to consider the availability of services and facilities when sites were to be occupied.

How the policy came about:

48. 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, the assessment identified the need for transit or emerging stopping place provision for Gypsies and Travellers in the Cambridge area.
49. 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.

50. In accordance with national guidance, one option (119) was put forward for consideration in the Issues and Options report (2012). 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 Government's national guidance on planning for Gypsy and Traveller sites. This option allowed 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. It was agreed at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee in February 2013 that the suggested option be taken forward into the draft Plan with further reference to be made to transit site provision. The approach will address the following issues to guide the quality of provision of permanent, transit and emergency stopping provision for Gypsy and Traveller sites in Cambridge:

- 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.

51. 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.

52. 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.

53. 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.
54. Due to the interrelationship with land in South Cambridgeshire, the 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.
55. A number of sites were identified within the urban area and in the Cambridge Green Belt during the Issues and Options consultation in 2012. 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.
56. 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).

57. There is a need to consider whether any further development sites in the Cambridge Green Belt should deliver Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision. Given the interrelationship of the two authorities, it is important to take into account the approach adopted by South Cambridgeshire District Council. 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. South Cambridgeshire District Council has recently reported through its report to the Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Localism on 11 April 2013 that the results of consultation on this issue were mixed, but it was concluded that their policy approach should include seeking opportunities to deliver new sites as part of large scale new communities and significant major development sites. The 500 unit figure has not been used as it is arbitrary and does not reflect national or local planning or evidence base documents. Given the interdependence of the two authorities and the need to deliver pitch provision, it is considered that both South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge should seek opportunities to deliver new sites as part of large scale new communities and significant major development sites, in order to demonstrate how future needs will be met.

Policy 50: Residential Space Standards

Internal Residential Space Standards

New residential units will be permitted where their gross internal floor areas meet or exceed the residential space standards set out in the table below:

Designed occupancy	Dwelling Type	Unit size in m ²
Flats		
1 bedspace	Studio	37
2 bedspaces	1 bed flat	50
3 bedspaces	2 bed flat	61
4 bedspaces	2 bed flat	70
4 bedspaces	3 bed flat	74
5 bedspaces	3 bed flat	86
5 bedspaces	4 bed flat	90
6 bedspaces	4 bed flat	99
2 storey houses		
4 bedspaces	2 bed	83
4 bedspaces	3 bed	87
5 bedspaces	3 bed	96
5 bedspaces	4 bed	100
6 bedspaces	4 bed	107
3 storey houses		
5 bedspaces	3 bed	102
5 bedspaces	4 bed	106
6 bedspaces	4 bed	113
7 bedspaces	4 bed	123

In order to ensure reasonable living conditions, residential development should have reasonable room sizes and convenient and efficient room layouts to meet the changing needs of residents over their lifetimes. Such development will:

- a. have minimum bedroom sizes for single and double bedrooms of 7.5m² and 11.5m² respectively;
- b. any room designated on plan as a study will need to be of at least the size of a single bedroom; and
- c. rooms will have a minimum headroom of 2.1m in order to allow for reasonable levels of storage and a sense of space. Any floorspace where the ceiling height is less than 2.1m will not count towards the gross internal floor area.

Applicants should state the number of bedspaces/occupiers a home is designed to accommodate rather than simply the number of bedrooms.

When designing homes for more than six persons/bedspaces, developers should allow approximately 10m² per additional bedspace/person.

External Residential Space Standards

All new residential units will be expected to have direct access to an area of private amenity space. The form of amenity space will be dependent on the form of housing and could include a private garden, roof garden, balcony, glazed winter garden or ground level patio with defensible space from any shared amenity areas. In providing appropriate amenity space, development should:

- d. consider the location and context of the development, including the character of the surrounding area;
- e. take into account the orientation of the amenity space in relation to the sun at different times of year;
- f. address issues of overlooking and enclosure, which may otherwise impact detrimentally on the proposed dwelling and any neighbouring dwellings; and
- g. design the amenity space to be of a shape, size and location to allow effective and practical use of and level access to the space by residents.

Supporting text:

6.26 The provision of sufficient space within new homes is an important element of good residential design and new dwellings should provide sufficient space for basic daily activities and needs. It is recognised that many new developments are perceived to provide inadequate amounts of both internal and external amenity space. These standards are applicable for both private and Affordable Housing in Cambridge as they cover a full range of dwelling types and consider the amount of space needed by residents within their dwellings. New homes created through residential conversions and homes created by changes of use from non-residential land uses should seek to meet or exceed the standards as far as it is practicable to do so.

6.27 The standards are intended to encourage provision of enough space in dwellings to ensure that homes can be used flexibly by a range of residents. The standards also aim to ensure that sufficient storage can be integrated into units. It is also important to consider that these standards are expressed as minimum space standards. Housing which exceeds minimum dwelling sizes will always be encouraged, and in order to achieve certain design configurations, work within site constraints or deliver units to a particular segment of the housing market, designers and developers may need to make early allowance to exceed the minimum gross internal area for that dwelling type. Application of residential spaces standards, both internally and externally should be shown on all submitted layouts and floorplans and be clearly demonstrated in the design and access statement, which will be used to assess the acceptability of any proposal.

6.28 Private amenity space can make an important contribution in improving the quality of life of the city's residents and supporting and enhancing local biodiversity. The National Planning Policy Framework¹⁰ sets out the need to seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

6.29 External amenity space should be sufficient to accommodate:

- a table and chairs suitable for the size of dwelling;
- where relevant, provision of a garden shed for general storage (including bicycles where no garage provision or cycle storage to the frontage of the dwelling is possible);
- space for refuse and recycling bins;
- an area to dry washing;
- circulation space; and
- an area for children to play in.

In calculating how much space might be required, this will be based on bedspaces. External amenity space would not include car parking or turning areas. Suitable arrangements for access to refuse and recycling bins should be made, in order to prevent bins/bags being transported through dwellings.

6.30 One bedroom dwellings would not be expected to provide space for children to play, due to the lower likelihood of children occupying these units. Dwellings with more than one bedroom would need to take space for children to play into account. In addition to private amenity space, developments with flats will need to provide high quality shared amenity areas on site to meet the needs of residents, including playspace for children.

How the policy came about:

Internal Space Standards

58. The provision of sufficient space within new homes is an important element of good residential design and new dwellings should provide sufficient space for basic daily activities and needs. It is recognised that many new developments are perceived to provide inadequate amounts of both internal and external amenity space. This issue could be addressed by drafting policies on minimum residential unit sizes and external amenity space.

59. The current Local Plan does not include a policy setting out specific internal and external space requirements. However, the council's current Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document specifies that Affordable Housing "should meet Housing Corporation Design and Quality Standards or any

¹⁰ Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework

future replacement.”¹¹ Historically, there has been very limited national guidance on the issues connected with space standards within and around the home, which addresses both market and Affordable Housing. Whilst Planning Policy Statements provided support for the development of residential space and layout standards, paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that Local Planning Authorities should plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community, such as families with children, the elderly and people with disabilities.

60. A number of options were put forward in the Issues and Options report consulted on during June and July 2012 for policy development on the basis that they outlined the most appropriate way to address this issue. These options were based on national guidance and research undertaken looking at policies set by other Local Planning Authorities. Option 106 proposed developing a policy, which sets out requirements for minimum standards based on bedspaces to be used for all new residential developments and conversions of existing dwellings to residential use. Option 107 suggested developing a new policy outlining the minimum internal floor space and storage space (in terms of gross floor area) for a range of dwelling types. Option 110 meanwhile proposed that the status quo be maintained, by taking the approach of not specifying either internal or external space standards and continuing to use the Homes and Communities Agency standards for all Affordable Housing delivered within the city. Analysis, responses and the preferred approaches to residential space standards are included in Appendix I of this document.

61. The preferred approach agreed at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee in 2012 was to follow Option 106 on internal space standards. However, within Option 106, following further research of existing standards across the country and consideration of developing a Cambridge-specific approach, it was considered that two main approaches on overall unit sizes require further consultation as a part of Issues and Options 2 (January – February 2013). Briefly, they comprised Option I.1 which originates from the London Housing Design Guide which informed the standards in the adopted London Plan (2011) (hereafter referred to as London Plan standards) and Option I.2, which stems from the Homes and Communities Agency Housing Quality Indicators (2008). As residential space standards are based on the amount of space needed for key items of furniture and circulation space within dwellings, a number of other Local Authorities have already set out their own space standards. Both the London Plan standards and the Homes and Communities Agency approach have been tested by Examination in Public and repeated use through the planning application process. Although the standards were originally developed for housing in London or for Affordable Housing, they are equally applicable for both private and Affordable Housing

¹¹Cambridge City Council Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document, January 2008, Paragraph 26, Pages 10-11.

in Cambridge as they cover a full range of dwelling types and consider the amount of space needed by residents within their dwellings.

62. The unit sizes within the Housing Quality Indicators are given as a range in order to allow some flexibility. The unit sizes provided through the Housing Quality Indicators system vary from those provided in the London Plan, with the largest differences exhibited in the largest dwelling types (11 square metres difference between the top end of the Housing Quality Indicators range and the London Plan standard). This could have an impact on the delivery of Affordable Housing where housing is being funded by grant funding for floorspace up to the level of the Housing Quality Indicator standards only. Additionally, as Housing Quality Indicators provide a range of unit sizes, the use of these unit sizes on a cross-tenure basis across Cambridge could mean that developers might choose to develop private housing at the lowest end of the range of unit sizes.
63. The standards would be applied on a cross-tenure basis, which would allow for the same unit sizes to be applied across Cambridge on both private and Affordable Housing dwellings. The standards are intended to encourage provision of enough space in dwellings to ensure that homes can be used flexibly by a range of residents with varied needs. The standards also aim to ensure that sufficient storage can be integrated into units. It is also important to consider that these standards are expressed as minimum space standards. Housing which exceeds minimum dwelling sizes will always be encouraged, and in order to achieve certain design configurations, work within site constraints or deliver units to a particular segment of the housing market, designers and developers may need to make early allowance to exceed the minimum gross internal area for that dwelling type.
64. The Issues and Options 2 consultation resulted in the following key issues being raised:

Table 4: Key Issues for Options I.1 and I.2 on Internal Space Standards

Option I.1			Option I.2		
Supp	Object: 3	Comment: 3	Support: 2	Object: 3	Comment: 3
Paragraph/ Option/Que stion	Key Issues				
Paragraphs I.1 – I.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Necessary to have policies on internal and external spaces; • Size of the garden should be at least as much as the footprint of the house; • A Cambridge specific standard for all housing should be researched and adopted, but in the interim Option I.1 should be used. 				

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More 3 and 4 bedrooms houses are needed; • Support for housing which exceed minimum unit sizes; • Support for private and Affordable Housing using the same standards.
Option I.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standards are too high and have little appreciation of market requirements; • Support for a minimum standard; • Space standards proposed in Option I.1 are larger than Option I.2; • Consideration should be given to inclusion of figures for houses of three and four storeys; • Increasing space standards will decrease the viability of homes; • Homes will fall outside the affordability range of buyers; • Better not to have a range of standards (as in Option I.2); • Design layout is more important than space standards; • Increasing demand for storage; • Neither standard is sufficiently big; • Developers will only seek the bare minimum;
Option I.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homes will fall outside the affordability range of buyers; • The range proposed in Option I.2 is more realistic and less restrictive, but still lacks appreciation of site context and the balance of accommodation within a schemes; • Provides more leeway than Option I.1; • Need for appreciation of market requirements; • Presents a definitive standard for developers; • Option I.2's unit sizes are too small; • Design layout is more important than space standards; • Neither standard is sufficiently big; • Developers will only seek the bare minimum; • The lowest point of Option I.2 should be set as the minimum.
Question I.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Size of the kitchen needs to be set in order to encourage cooking; • Bicycle shed or garage needs to take the same number of bicycles as bedspaces; • All new homes should be built to Lifetime Homes Standards; • Need for flexibility for changing needs, including mobility and need to work from home; • Need for homes to be wheelchair accessible; • Does the space standards policy apply to student accommodation?

65. Overall, Option I.1 was supported much more strongly than Option I.2. Some respondents objected to the inclusion of any policy in the Local Plan setting

out space standards. These objections were based on concerns about the impact of such standards on the affordability and viability of housing. It should be noted that some research was undertaken on the unit sizes of specific approved developments within Cambridge, in order to ascertain whether the proposed standards in Options I.1 and I.2 were significantly above the norm for Cambridge. A number of assessed schemes coming forward in the city were considered to meet or exceed the proposed standards. Additionally, the viability work on the delivery of Affordable Housing and for the Community Infrastructure Levy included minimum internal space standards for a range of dwelling units based on the London Plan standard in order to help test that building to this standard is viable.

66. A number of respondents also raised concerns about access to developments and people's changing needs, including reference to the use of the Lifetime Homes Standard. These issues are addressed by the policy on Lifetime Homes and Lifetime Neighbourhoods.

External Space Standards

67. Private amenity space can make an important contribution in improving the quality of life of the city's residents and supporting and enhancing local biodiversity. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the need to seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings as one of the core planning principles in paragraph 17.
68. Within the Issues and Options report, Option 108 proposed developing a policy setting out minimum space standards for private outdoor amenity space only. This would be based on the number of bedspaces within the dwelling and would exclude parking areas and turning spaces. Alternatively, Option 109 suggested the introduction of a policy outlining that all new residential development (both private and affordable) should seek to provide an area of outdoor private amenity space in the form of gardens, balconies, patios and roof terraces. Option 110 meanwhile proposed that the status quo be maintained, by taking the approach of not specifying either internal or external space standards and continuing to use the Homes and Communities Agency standards for all Affordable Housing delivered within the city.
69. The recommendation to Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee in 2012 was to pursue a combination of Options 108 and 109, setting out a flexible, criteria based approach to determine adequate provision of external amenity space for houses and flats. The criteria would include those issues considered to be most influential in the development management process.
70. The rationale for pursuing a mixture of Options 108 and 109 is based on the varied nature of the city and the need to consider context flexibly. Cambridge has a number of areas of varying townscape character, with

different densities, dwelling types and sizes, garden sizes and distances between dwellings. A universal approach to external amenity space would not necessarily be contextually suitable. As such, it is considered that a criteria-based approach based on key issues such as location and context, orientation, shape and size of amenity space and its usability, is the most appropriate way forward. Additionally, the number of bedspaces provided by the dwelling will need to be considered in reaching an appropriate solution, providing space for seating, play space, drying and storage space. This approach provides flexibility in design solutions, allowing the local context to be considered.

71. Whilst it is relatively straightforward to ascertain minimum standards for internal residential layout based on the size of standard items of furniture and the need for circulation space within dwellings, outdoor amenity area can also be configured in a similar manner. It is recognised that outdoor amenity space for dwelling units should provide sufficient space to accommodate a table and chairs suitable for the size of dwelling; and where relevant, a garden shed for general storage (including bicycles where no garage provision or cycle storage to the frontage of the dwelling is possible) and space for refuse and recycling bins; an area to dry washing; circulation space and an area for children to play in. However, dependent on the context of the dwelling and the character of the surrounding area, this external amenity space could range significantly in size. As such, beyond setting out the types of structures and activities expected to be accommodated within a garden or other form of external amenity space, it is not considered appropriate to be prescriptive about minimum garden/balcony depths. It is considered that prescribing a given minimum depth for gardens/balconies would give rise to difficulties in delivering housing on constrained sites. Where a site is constrained, it may still be possible to bring housing forward with more innovative and usable solutions to the delivery of external amenity space. Although a garden length of less than 10 metres might not necessarily constitute a reason to refuse planning consent, it is considerably more likely that an application might be refused where gardens lack privacy and/or usable and accessible space; is dominated by car parking; or is subject to an unreasonable level of overlooking or enclosure.

72. The council undertook further consultation in January and February 2013 on Issues and Options 2. This included Option I.3 on External Amenity Space, which took forward the agreed approach of combining Option 108 and 109 of the Issues and Options Report (2012). The table below sets out the key issues and number of responses to the option I.3 and associated question I.3.

Table 5: Key Issues for Option I.3 on External Amenity Space

Option I.3

Support: 8	Object: 1	Comment: 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important have external amenity space and space to store bicycles; • Good for quality of life; • Suitable play space for children is very important; • Outdoor space should include space for gardening for wellbeing and productivity; • Space at pavement level should be provided for refuse and recycling bins to allow people to pass on collection day; • Spaces need to be designed and located to help create lifetime neighbourhoods; • Agree with the concept of flexible criteria; • One bedroom properties must also allow space for children to play as many families live in one bedroom flats, due to the overheated housing market in Cambridge. 		

73. The response to the setting of criteria to assess the quality and quantity of provision of external amenity space was very positive. The only point of concern was the need for provision of playspace for one-bedroom flats. Whilst it is acknowledged that the Cambridge housing market is overheated and some families may be living in less than optimum conditions, it is not considered appropriate to aspire to families living in unsuitably sized dwellings.

CHAPTER: 9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.17

11335 Support

Summary: Yes, student housing should make a financial contribution to affordable housing.

16833 Support

Summary: Yes - support.

CHAPTER: 9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.18

11126 Object

Summary: This option does not recognise that for a proportion of students it is their permanent home whilst at Cambridge. For example there are courses which extend beyond the usual academic terms. Postgraduates and students with families often live in Cambridge year round. In addition Class C4 of the Use Classes Order recognises students do not occupy a property all year but still defines this as their main residence.

12540 Object

Summary: Would there really be less pressure on housing stock - my experience has been that there are very few students living in private housing compared to other cities?

13094 Object

Summary: This option does not recognise that for a proportion of students, postgraduates and those with families it is their permanent home whilst at Cambridge outside the usual academic terms. Nor does it recognise that Class C4 of the Use Classes Order acknowledges that students do not occupy a property all year but still defines this as their main residence.

13465 Object

Summary: This option fails to understand that for many students the City is their permanent home. Postgraduates and students with families often live in Cambridge year round. Some courses extend beyond the academic year. Some students take jobs in Cambridge in the Summer. In addition, Class C4 of the Use Classes Order recognises students do not occupy a property all year but still defines this as their main residence.

6931 Object

Summary: If it slows development it would make the situation worse, not better: it would force students into competition with city workers for cheap houses.

7605 Object

Summary: I am writing as Bursar of Selwyn College.

This option would effectively be a tax on the colleges, which are charitable institutions. This would discourage colleges from building accommodation for our students and thus put more pressure on the wider housing market in Cambridge, bringing yet further upward pressure on price. If the City Council is seeking a contribution from commercial developers of student housing, it might wish to consider an exemption for charitable and/or educational institutions.

7607 Object

Summary: Cambridge Colleges should be encouraged to house their own students in their own College accommodation as far as possible. A 'tax' on building new student accommodation, often on sites already owned by a College, would act as a disincentive to such building/development, with College students having to live outside of their College, thus putting greater pressure on the external housing market in Cambridge.

7644 Object

Summary: Unlike in most other University cities, Cambridge Colleges house the vast majority of their students.

This results in less pressure on "market" housing stock than would otherwise be the case.

A policy requiring affordable housing contributions for student developments would discourage Colleges from building to meet rising demand.

This would result in increasing demand on limited Cambridge housing stock.

8071 Object

Summary: Cambridge Colleges house a far greater percentage of their students than other Universities, resulting in less pressure on housing stock than experienced in other University towns and cities. Adding a further 'tax' on College accommodation developments would be a disincentive to the construction necessary to keep pace with growing numbers. It results in an increased demand on Cambridge's limited housing stock, particularly beyond the City centre. It could also fail the legal tests for section 106 planning obligations. This option may be aimed at speculative developers, rather than Colleges. If so, this should be made clear.

10369 Object

Summary: In general it is the Colleges in Cambridge which provide housing for students and, unusually compared with other universities, try to accommodate most of their students as part of the collegial experience. These students do not have to seek private accommodation which is in short supply in the city. If the requirement for affordable housing contributions for student accommodation developments were to be introduced then this would act as a real disincentive for colleges to continue to build. Indeed, not all colleges are well endowed and additional costs of this nature might prohibit poorer colleges from developing at all.

11059 Object

Summary: Such an approach would be likely to discourage the development of student accommodation, which in turn would have significant implications for the level of student demand for private housing stock. This in turn is likely to affect the local rental market, forcing prices up and have a negative impact on affordability or, alternatively, will mean some students simply can not afford to attend university in Cambridge.

Question whether such an approach complies with CIL Regulation 122.

11127 Object

Summary: As recognised by the Council this would affect viability. Student accommodation is not as valuable as private residential housing and this option would inevitably lead to less student accommodation being built. This restricts colleges ability to increase student numbers, provide better accommodation for existing students and house all its students within its own properties.

12542 Object

Summary: I guess one thing that I am struggling with slightly and this may reflect my lack of understanding of economics, is, are the Universities really in an 'expand or die' state? Therefore, is there really a significant need for large amounts of new student accommodation, without which the Unis will die?

13468 Object

Summary: As recognised by the Council this would affect viability. Student accommodation is not as valuable as private residential housing and this option would inevitably lead to less student accommodation being built. This restricts Colleges ability to increase student numbers, provide better accommodation for existing students and house all its students within its own properties.

13485 Object

Summary: The colleges and University already provide much more housing for their populations than is the case in other University cities. This reduces the pressure on the general housing stock available across Cambridge. Applying what is effectively a 'tax' on new college-provided student housing will reduce the incentive to provide that well-controlled stock of quality units and thus increase pressure on students and academics to seek to rent or buy housing from the generally available stock. It is not clear that this Option meets S106 requirements either. If the Option targets only speculative development, this should be stated.

14353 Object

Summary: Danger of displacement of residents from city centre housing altogether. Disincentive to Colleges to invest in more accommodation for their students.

15183 Object

Summary: Cambridge Colleges house a far greater percentage of their students than other Universities, resulting in less pressure on housing stock than experienced in other University towns and cities. Adding a further 'tax' on College accommodation developments would be a dis-incentive to the construction necessary to keep pace with growing numbers. It result in an increased demand on Cambridge's limited housing stock, particularly beyond the City centre. It could also fail the legal tests for section 106 planning obligations. This option may be aimed at speculative developers, rather than Colleges. If so, this should be made clear.

15317 Object

Summary: In providing College owned and managed accommodation, we are taking pressure away from the local housing market more generally. Option 95 would have the effect of increasing the cost of new accommodation developed by colleges and therefore reducing the likelihood that sufficient accommodation will be provided in this way with the consequence that pressure on housing elsewhere in the City will be intensified. This would be an entirely perverse consequence of a policy option which purports to enhance Affordable Housing.

15490 Object

Summary: We object to the policy proposal in Option 95, as we do not consider that it would be lawful, and we believe that it would have the undesired consequence of reducing student accommodation delivery across the City.

16389 Object

Summary: Student developments should not be expected to contribute to Class C3 affordable housing.

9946 Support

Summary: Would contribute to the overall need in the city.

12467 Support

Summary: Student accommodation means space taken up which then cannot house permanent residents. So yes, let developers contribute to what ought to have priority.

12630 Support

Summary: The universities require an average of one new staff member per eight new students. Therefore, for each new university-led housing development, there should be a requirement to provide at least one 'affordable' property per eight students (regardless of how many properties are used to house each the eight students) though this would not have to be on the same site (might even be better if it's not on site). This would mean university housing developments would not have a negative effect on housing in Cambridge.

14101 Support

Summary: support

15262 Support

Summary: Yes and this may be the only situation in which off-site contributions might be acceptable. Actual living space should be the default requirement for all developments.

15263 Object

Summary: No. Students impose their own pressures and demands on the city and their accommodation should make an appropriate contribution to affordable housing, leisure, library and recreational provision of which they are heavy users.

6932 Support

Summary: Makes sense.

7606 Support

Summary: Cambridge Colleges should be encouraged to house their own students in their own College accommodation as far as possible. A 'tax' on building new student accommodation, often on sites already owned by a College, would act as a disincentive to such building/development, with College students having to live outside of their College, thus putting greater pressure on the external housing market in Cambridge.

7643 Support

Summary: Unlike most other University cities, Cambridge Colleges house the vast majority of their students. This results in less pressure on "market" housing stock than would otherwise be the case.

A policy requiring affordable housing contributions for student developments would discourage Colleges from building to meet rising demand.

This would result in increasing demand on limited Cambridge housing stock.

7690 Support

Summary: Vital!

8072 Support

Summary: Maintaining the current policy would enable Colleges to add accommodation necessary to maintain the high percentage of students who live on College sites and ease the demand on other housing stock in a city where housing availability is such an important issue.

10380 Support

Summary: The ongoing health of the collegiate University of Cambridge is critical to the future of the city. Supporting appropriate growth and development in colleges will make a positive contribution to the economic, social and environmental well-being of the city, relieving pressure on the housing market by avoiding more take up of 'private' homes by students and potentially releasing back some properties to the market. Encouraging colleges to build appropriate and sustainable accommodation for the future will support the continued world class reputation of both the University and the city.

11062 Support

Summary: Seeking an affordable housing contribution from student accommodation is likely to discourage the development of student accommodation, which in turn would have significant implications for the level of student demand for private housing stock. This in turn is likely to affect the local rental market, forcing prices up and have a negative impact on affordability or, alternatively, will mean some students simply can not afford to attend university in Cambridge.

11128 Support

Summary: This option recognises that provision of new student accommodation frees up housing stock at the lower end of the market especially in the rented sector.

13444 Support

Summary: If colleges can add needed accommodation units without disincentives to those investments, demand and thus pressure on the housing stock for general use across the City must fall.

13476 Support

Summary: This option recognises that provision of new student accommodation frees up housing stock at the lower end of the market especially in the rented sector.

14384 Support

Summary: Introducing an affordable housing levy on housing built by Colleges for their own students would be contrary to Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations and would increase pressure on city housing perversely.

15184 Support

Summary: We strongly support the current policy. Maintaining the current policy would enable Colleges to add accommodation necessary to maintain the high percentage of students who live on College sites and ease the demand on other housing stock in a city where housing availability is such an important issue.

15319 Support

Summary: Option 96 would maintain the status quo and would not introduce a new Affordable Housing contribution in respect of student accommodation. The College supports this option. It is an approach which recognises both the importance of the collegiate university to the prosperity and vitality of Cambridge as a city and the case for encouraging and assisting colleges to commit their own resources to provide appropriate accommodation for their Junior Members. That the collegiate University should continue to develop and that colleges should be encouraged to provide facilities to accommodate their members are two principles which should be central within the Local Plan.

15791 Support

Summary: Provision of student accommodation should relieve pressure on private rented sector.

16383 Support

Summary: Student developments should not be expected to contribute to Class C3 affordable housing.

12010 Object

Summary: Recent announcements from the government indicate this whole area is likely to be radically changed in the near future with a move away from requiring specified amounts of affordable housing. Our plan will need to reflect any changes in government policy.

12926 Object

Summary: Oxford already operate a 50% affordable housing requirement, and they do this on dwellings of 0.25 hectares/10 dwellings and above.

12968 Object

Summary: Housing co-operatives make a valuable contribution towards affordable housing. They ease pressures on Council waiting lists and offer rent that is genuinely affordable, as well as self-manage (meaning no Council resources need to be used in running them). They also offer residents a genuine say in how their housing is run and, in our experience, this results in active residents who participate in their co-op as well as participate in the wider community. We would like the Council to proactively explore opportunities for facilitating co-operative housing development in Cambridge and would like this to be included in the Local Plan.

12984 Object

Summary: Housing co-operatives can help the Council meet its affordable housing targets, and they also meet all the objectives set out in the Housing Strategy. I would like to see the Council look at how and where we can provide a housing co-operative(s) here in Cambridge and look at potential sites for development. Housing co-operatives range in size (of the two we have in Cambridge, one houses 12 people and the other around 90 people), though the ideal size is really no more than about 150 residents.

14470 Object

Summary: We need more affordable housing for the people of Cambridge. This includes single people, couples and families, who are struggling to get on the housing ladder, yet are not deemed in enough need to be on the Council waiting list. For example, people earning good and above median salaries can still not afford property to buy (or indeed rent) due to the high cost of housing. We must tackle this, otherwise the housing list is likely to increase in the coming years.

15043 Object

Summary: The report fails to mention the several hundred people living on the river aboard moored boats. This group needs to be a 'recognised housing group' so that planning policies and fiscal measures (e.g. Council Tax) can extend to these people as well. Many boat dwellers claim that they are forced to live on the water because boats are a form of affordable housing. In some cases, owners sub-let their boats to third parties. These boats are often squalid and attract antisocial behaviours in the vicinity of respectable land-based communities. A marina with some static houseboats would provide a different type of affordable housing provision as an entry into the Cambridge residential sector by students and young professionals.

15488 Object

Summary: There ought to be an element of the Council's affordable housing policy that enables residential schemes to be compared against other uses from a viability point of view, and accordingly to determine how much affordable housing can be delivered as part of such developments. This is likely to increase the supply of housing in the City.

16760 Object

Summary: We have a problem (especially in Romsey) with absentee landlords and properties that sit empty. Property owners should be made to pay full Council tax on properties they own, even if they are empty (e.g. make them pay full tax after property is empty for six months). This would encourage them to make sure properties have people living in them, and would reduce pressures on those who simply cannot find adequate housing, as well as reduce pressure on housing waiting lists.

17455 Object

Summary: Until the need for affordable homes is satisfied I am not in favour of speculative house building. Local Authorities, Housing Associations or co-operative scheme should first, before speculative house builders, be given the chance to build affordable homes.

17834 Object

Summary: Any affordable housing policy at whatever % level needs to recognise viability issues in bringing forward affordable housing on top of all the other costs associated with large developments, such as infrastructure requirements. Para 173 of the NPPF should be carefully considered. The current Local Plan Policy on affordable housing (5/5) does recognise viability issues and this is all the more important at the current time; differing market conditions should be allowed for, therefore flexibility is essential. The final policy wording and supporting text should include detailed reference to this matter.

7760 Support

Summary: The type of housing is important. Cambridge has a lot of 1 and 2 bed flats and 4/5 bed homes - need more 2 ,3 & 4 bed homes.

14092 Support

Summary: Rather than myopically focus on the issue of 'affordable housing', perhaps we should consider more adaptable housing instead. Look at our Victorian terraces. They look very similar from the outside, and are rightly treasured. However, inside they contain a multitude of uses. They are doctor's surgeries, small offices, family homes and shared properties. Why can we not commission homes that can be sub-divided or enlarged as necessary? The problem with apartment blocks is you can't build an extension to them or divide them up! Better quality design thinking is needed.

17644 Support

Summary: Commuting represents a drain on the city's resources, transport, water, housing etc. However they represent a source of income to the city by virtue of council tax, they pay and the money they spend within the city and must therefore be considered as part of the economy of the city. However, many of the commuters have highly paid jobs in the city. High quality housing at premium price could be built to capitalise on this. A suggested policy to allow Council flexibility to require that a development in a suitable area be low density, high quality housing so as to maintain the high quality of housing in a neighbourhood and that 40% affordable housing requirement would not be applied.

17932 Support

Summary: No

CHAPTER: 9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.6

7000 Object

Summary: First, I do not believe that the city needs either more students than it already has, or more student accommodation.

If existing student accommodation is to be *replaced*, then it should be replaced with accommodation suitable for students, not residential properties. There should therefore be no "affordable housing" included in it.

12128 Object

Summary: The University does not support policy for affordable housing contribution for new student accommodation (Option 95).

14094 Object

Summary: No

16884 Object

Summary: Option 95 is objected to. Option 96 is supported. Cambridge is very different to other university cities, in terms of its commitment to house students. There is therefore a distinct danger that the imposition of a policy to require affordable housing contributions from student accommodation would discourage such developments. The implications of this would be to increase pressure upon the wider Cambridge housing market.

18228 Object

Summary: There is no need for a new policy addressing the issue of Affordable housing contribution for new student accommodation. The existing policy is of benefit to Cambridge in that designated sites are already encouraged to provide student housing for either Anglia Ruskin or Cambridge University.

7389 Support

Summary: It is important that Colleges (which are non-profit making charitable organisation) are not treated in the same way as developers.

8105 Support

Summary: Policy needed.

8479 Support

Summary: Yes

9467 Support

Summary: Yes

10609 Support

Summary: Yes

12014 Support

Summary: Yes, we need to decide one way or the other and be clear on this matter.

14190 Support

Summary: New student accommodation should contribute to affordable housing.

16527 Support

Summary: Yes.

16830 Support

Summary: Yes - support

17439 Support

Summary: Subject to viability, the provision of privately funded major new student accommodation should include the requirement to provide additional affordable housing where viable, including as this expansion will generate the need for additional lower paid workers who need affordable local rental accommodation

17933 Support

Summary: Yes

10391 Object

Summary: One option would be to restrict any policy requiring affordable housing contributions to speculative developers.

12631 Object

Summary: The universities require an average of one new staff member per eight new students. Therefore, for each new university-led housing development, there should be a requirement to provide at least one 'affordable' property per eight students (regardless of how many properties are used to house each the eight students). This would mean university housing developments would not have a negative effect on housing in Cambridge.

18229 Object

Summary: However, on sites where this policy applies, it needs to be made more transparent during the planning process.

11235 Support

Summary: Option 96 continues the current approach within the 2006 plan which does not require new student accommodation to contribute to affordable housing provision. Such a policy stance enables important student accommodation to come forward without the threat of any financial obligation or any other obligation as it relates to affordable housing. Consequently the College supports Option 96 contained within the Issues and Options report.

12375 Support

Summary: Student housing should be put in locations unsuitable for family housing. Student housing does not come with a requirement for leisure space, sport space, play areas (assumed no children and university supply of facilities). So, put student dwellings where such space would be impossible. However, students in standard housing can often prove less than optimum neighbours, so moving them into "specialist" accommodation is a desirable aim.

17440 Support

Summary: Subject to viability, the provision of privately funded major new student accommodation should include the requirement to provide additional affordable housing where viable, including as this expansion will generate the need for additional lower paid workers who need affordable local rental accommodation.

17934 Support

Summary: No

11064 Object

Summary: We prefer Option 96.

Requiring a contribution is likely to discourage the development of student accommodation, which in turn would have significant implications for the level of student demand for private housing stock. This in turn is likely to affect the local rental market, forcing prices up and have a negative impact on affordability or, alternatively, will mean some students simply can not afford to attend university in Cambridge.

12015 Object

Summary: Option 96 seems to be the one better suited to our overall needs.

14097 Object

Summary: Option 96 - but again, I oppose to the principle of having segregated student housing. Again, this is ghettoising. We were all students once. Shuffling them out to the railway station only exacerbates the problem.

16729 Object

Summary: We would like to comment strongly on the choice between option 95 & 96. We oppose 95 and support 96 for the following reasons:

- Cambridge colleges house the vast majority of their students
 - This results in less pressure on "market" housing stock
 - A policy on this would discourage colleges from building to meet rising demand
 - Land is a finite resource, particularly in Cambridge. The college's commitment to house students, in or nearby colleges means that a "displacement" effect would be particularly acute in terms of impacts on family sized accommodation and non-student housing beyond the City Centre.
- If this policy is aimed at speculative developers instead of colleges it should be made clear.

7390 Support

Summary: Option 96 is strongly supported. Colleges building accommodation for their own students should not be required to contribute to Affordable Housing Provision. Colleges are not building the accommodation to make a profit, but to accommodate their own students, and so should be treated differently to developers building student accommodation speculatively and/or to make a profit. Colleges are charitable institutions and do not make profits from their accommodation stock. College built property will ease the pressure on other properties in the city (e.g. HMO). Having to make contributions to AHP would be a disincentive to build.

8107 Support

Summary: Option 96 as provision of student housing contributes to an increase in overall housing provision in the city.

9198 Support

Summary: Bearing in mind that student accommodation may not attract Council Tax revenue in view of charitable status of University/colleges/ARU, it would be useful to be able to negotiate some form of contribution. Most colleges are not poor (though few are rich) and can tap their alumni for funds for new buildings, including student accommodation.

9469 Support

Summary: Option 96

10392 Support

Summary: Definitely support Option 96

10611 Support

Summary: Option 95. Certainly re speculative development on non college owned land.

10725 Support

Summary: Option 96

12368 Support

Summary: Option 95 is suitable if the supply of student housing rises faster than student numbers. The planned growth in university student numbers must be more than met by supply of purpose built accommodation.
Option 96 is appropriate if student numbers grow faster than accommodation supply.
Option 96 also for pre-university student housing. There are far too many language school student etc - their number should be required to fall and they are certainly not suited to living in groups with little supervision.

15727 Support

Summary: We support option 95 which would require new student accommodation to contribute towards affordable housing.

16528 Support

Summary: Option 96.

16831 Support

Summary: Our preference is for option 95, so that student housing is treated in the same way as other housing development, and required to provide affordable housing.

17935 Support

Summary: Option 96

18313 Support

Summary: Option 96 - no affordable contribution

CHAPTER: 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.

CHAPTER: 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.

17442 Support

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

CHAPTER: 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.

CHAPTER: 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.

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.

13988 Object

Summary: We request a new policy, similar to Option 143 and 146, for Abbey College that supports further development within existing college sites or at additional sites if required. We suggest that appropriate criteria could include the following: sensitive to its surroundings, no adverse impacts on the environment or amenity, is an efficient use of land, and is accessible to non-car modes of transport.

18016 Object

Summary: Policy should continue to be assessed in close collaboration with the University
Movement of students between sites can produce traffic problems; bicycles as much a problem as cars

12530 Support

Summary: The scale of buildings in any Mill Lane development ought to be restricted in any policy on this issue.

12840 Support

Summary: They should be developed to the highest design and conservation and climate change standards. Any development of the historic centre should be subject to national heritage guidelines. The Local Plan should be robust in ensuring that city centre developments will primarily enhance the historic, aesthetic and cultural environment.

13136 Support

Summary: We request that a similar policy approach used for development at the University of Cambridge faculty buildings be adopted for Westminster College. This could be in the form of a separate policy for Westminster College, or an amendment to Option 143 to make it clear that other Colleges not part of the University are also subject to similar policies and the application of appropriate criteria in determining development proposals for further teaching and learning facilities as well as related accommodation.

14202 Support

Summary: As long as the University continue to have a presence in the town centre, I am supportive.

16232 Support

Summary: Option 143 is supported, particularly as it seeks to identify as an opportunity the development of medical teaching facilities and related University research institutes at the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. However there needs to be recognition that the increasing trend is for research and development uses (both higher education, institutional and commercial R&D) to be embedded alongside clinical uses, and they do not need to be separately 'zoned'. Any policy in this area should allow sufficient flexibility for these uses to operate alongside each other, potentially within the same building envelope. NB: Reference should be to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, not the Addenbrooke's Biomedical Campus.

11139 Object

Summary: Growth in student numbers will undoubtedly increase demand for hostel accommodation. It cannot be regarded as only a possibility.

13526 Object

Summary: Growth in student numbers will undoubtedly increase demand for hostel accommodation. It cannot be regarded as only a possibility.

11140 Object

Summary: If the student accommodation is to be part of two new colleges then this makes no impact on existing shortfall or future demand for accommodation.

13531 Object

Summary: If the student accommodation is to be part of two new Colleges then this makes no impact on existing shortfall or future demand for accommodation.

11141 Support

Summary: The provision of adequate housing for the University and colleges is fundamental to its continuing success. Failure to provide appropriate housing can have a direct impact on attracting not only the students but crucially academic and support staff. Policy should be worded positively to encourage provision by the University and particularly colleges to deliver the necessary housing. Policy should recognise how acute the problem is and that adequate provision would be of such significant public benefit that may outweigh other Local Plan objectives.

Policy encouraging the continuing expansion of the University needs complimentary policy for adequate housing provision.

13533 Support

Summary: Provision of adequate housing for the University and Colleges is fundamental to its continuing success. Failure to provide appropriate housing can have a direct impact on attracting not only the students but crucially academic and support staff. Policy should be worded positively to support the University and particularly Colleges to deliver the necessary housing. Policy should recognise how acute the problem is and that adequate provision would be of such significant public benefit that may outweigh other Local Plan objectives.

Policy encouraging the continuing expansion of the University needs complimentary policy for adequate housing provision.

11142 Object

Summary: This option does not go far enough in helping to address accommodation issues. A policy should recognise that colleges are increasingly providing residential accommodation for students and staff.

13537 Object

Summary: This option does not go far enough in helping to address accommodation issues. A policy should recognise that Colleges are increasingly providing residential accommodation for students and staff.

15330 Object

Summary: Recognise there are limits to growth and downsize

8677 Support

Summary: We strongly support this option. However, whilst it is drafted as an alternative to option 145, it must be understood that only by maintaining this policy and allowing for the development of student accommodation on the NW Cambridge site can the future accommodation needs of the University be met through the collegiate system. Failure to allow for sufficient growth will increase pressure on other housing stock within the City.

10453 Support

Summary: This is a better idea than option 145 where one tries to keep Colleges of a size that fosters a collegiate atmosphere.

13317 Support

Summary: Strongly supported. Though apparently drafted as an alternative to Option 145, it is only by implementing development in both areas(Central and NW Cambridge) that the future accommodation demands on the Colleges and University could be met, thereby reducing pressure on general City housing stock.

15181 Support

Summary: We strongly support this option. Whilst it is drafted as an alternative to option 145, it must be understood that only by maintaining this policy and allowing for the development of student accommodation on the NW Cambridge site can the future accommodation needs of the University be met through the collegiate system. Failure to allow for sufficient growth will increase pressure on other housing stock within the City.

17668 Support

Summary: The major growth of jobs will take place in Addenbrookes and at the two Universities. The present proposals for the Southern edge of the City and in the North West will accommodate the majority of the added workforce without the need to build further on Green Belt. I agree with proposals in the Plan to relax regulations for building speculative student accommodation for all such institutions and that at least some of this accommodation should be incorporated within developments on site. Such provision at West Cambridge would help create a sustainable community for students on site, reducing the need to commute across the City.

8683 Object

Summary: As drafted, this option is self-contradictory and confusing. The headline advocates expanding existing Colleges rather than planning for new ones at North West Cambridge, whilst the text argues for the opposite. In reality, both the NW Cambridge option and the expansion of existing Colleges will be necessary to provide the accommodation needed to enable the University to maintain its pre-eminence, particularly in relation to the growing numbers of graduate students.

10452 Object

Summary: Just expanding a college can too easily remove the collegiate atmosphere and make it too impersonal. New colleges (option 144) is a better policy than expanding present colleges on their present sites.

11147 Object

Summary: The policy has to be a combination of options 144 and 145 to use every opportunity to make provision for student accommodation. Accommodation for existing colleges in North West Cambridge is not ideal especially as the objective is to have all students onto the main campus. The proximity of academic and support services and communal facilities is particularly important in attracting students and in effectively caring for and managing students whilst at University.

13373 Object

Summary: This Option is illogically drafted and presented. It appears to advocate expansion of college accommodation stock where and as possible, which is supported. However, the text proposes exactly the opposite, focussing mistakenly on whether NW Cambridge will be for 'colleges' or 'dormitory suburb'. The world-leading position of the University and its Colleges can only be maintained by the use of both options. The false question of 'colleges' or 'hostels' does not then arise, except correctly that pastoral, social and welfare support of perhaps thousands of academically associated people at NW Cambridge must be more difficult without a localised college structure.

14883 Object

Summary: Object

15182 Object

Summary: In reality, both the NW Cambridge option and the expansion of existing Colleges will be necessary to provide the accommodation necessary to enable the University to maintain its pre-eminence, particularly in relation to the growing numbers of graduate students.

15333 Support

Summary: Existing colleges should be improved as a first priority and bear their share of the pain of being squeezed into a pint pot and not enjoy pre-emption rights to the Green Belt even though they appear to won most of it.

12320 Object

Summary: The University supports the future provision of student accommodation at existing Colleges, sites close to Colleges, and at North West Cambridge.

Student accommodation at North West Cambridge is secured through the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan. Option 145, related to the nature of student accommodation at North West Cambridge, is not a matter for planning policy as it would determine the way in which the University provided its student accommodation.

13538 Object

Summary: A positively worded policy is essential to support the Colleges in providing accommodation within or close to their main sites. It should be recognised that student accommodation which is remote from the main College is not ideal. It simply does not operate as part of the College and the students are isolated. The College seeks to have all their students living as close as possible to the main site. Inevitably because of the ongoing shortage of suitable accommodation this situation will continue.

18375 Object

Summary: Taking a specific policy approach for student accommodation would remove this flexibility. The Council wishes to explore this issue with the City Council before a decision is made on the approach in its new Local Plan which will have implications for the joint AAP.

7013 Support

Summary: I believe there are already a sufficient number of colleges in Cambridge. I would favour Option 145, with preference being given to those colleges who currently have fewest students.

7770 Support

Summary: I would favour option 144: if the University is to grow in student numbers then new colleges should be created rather than creating more hostel locations. Part of the benefit of the University and to the wider community is the number of opportunities for participation and leadership created by a large number of smaller communities.

Creating colleges could also mitigate the lack of social provision in the existing West Cambridge development.

8405 Support

Summary: need policy we prefer option 144

8495 Support

Summary: yes favour option 144

11251 Support

Summary: St John's College support Option 144 which continues the current policy 7/7. We would also take this opportunity to confirm that we continue to support site 7.07 within the 2006 local plan as an allocated site for a student hostel or affordable/key worker housing for the Colleges

12373 Support

Summary: yes

12556 Support

Summary: The university should be encouraged to increase its accommodation stock for staff and students by requiring contributions to affordable housing if it does not so do. Are there any other ways the Council could incentivise the University to help the city meet its accommodation needs?

12842 Support

Summary: Yes, but we dispute that it will be hard for the university to provide pastoral care. Very few students are not mobile on bicycles.

14204 Support

Summary: Yes

14309 Support

Summary: I support retention of the existing policy with a slight bias towards enabling colleges to build on their main sites wherever possible in order to meet the collegiate and pastoral objectives.

16898 Support

Summary: The ability for Colleges to provide sufficient levels of accommodation is essential. It is also extremely important for the Colleges to provide a scholarly learning environment for students and central to this is the provision of living accommodation within the respective College communities. As such, the provision of living accommodation within, or in close proximity to Colleges is very important. As such a policy to help achieve this is very important.

17493 Support

Summary: There is a need to address the issue of accommodation for Cambridge University Students

17496 Support

Summary: There is a need for a policy facilitating the continued growth of the University, given the acknowledged importance of the University to the reputation and economic profile of the city.

17598 Support

Summary: We support Options 143 and 144 provided that this latter is carefully monitored to ensure that the open character of many existing colleges is not detrimentally affected.
with regard to option 145, we support the use of the West Cambridge Site to include additional student accommodation, especially as many technical faculties will be located in this area and the provision of significant amounts of student accommodation here will reduce the commute of students across the City. However this must be tied to infrastructure improvements including public transport to City Centre & shops including the supermarket at NIAB1 and small convenience shops to create an independent community for students.

18018 Support

Summary: Yes, though it should be able to reach an understanding with the University and Colleges Committee rather have a formal policy

11143 Object

Summary: With regard to the loss of family accommodation this option does not acknowledge that a property can be occupied by up to 6 unrelated people i.e. a small HMO. Many colleges own such properties. A college will retain such properties for the long term with no prospect of selling or re-using for a single family given the serious shortage of college accommodation available. A permissive policy which allowed for redevelopment of such sites for college accommodation would make more efficient use of the land and clearly ease pressure on the private housing market.

12376 Object

Summary: we support option 144

12843 Object

Summary: What are College windfall locations? Use Class C3 (Dwelling houses) is so broad that it gives no protection for family residences not to be bought by colleges and used for undergraduate or graduate accommodation. The premises then often look uncared for, and the gardens grabbed for higher density student accommodation.

12851 Object

Summary: What are College windfall locations? Use Class C3 (Dwelling houses) is so broad that it gives no protection for family residences not to be bought by colleges and used for student accommodation. The premises then often look uncared for, and the gardens grabbed for higher density student accommodation.

Conservation Area declaration is insufficient to stop this, as is happening in Newtown. It needs to be halted now before the Conservation Area has been further degraded. Area specific policies in the Local Plan are required. A change of the Class C3/C4 definition is needed to overcome this.

13098 Object

Summary: This does not acknowledge that a property regarded as family accommodation can be occupied by up to 6 unrelated people i.e. a small HMO. Student accommodation in the private rented sector is commonly occupied in such a manner.
A permissive policy which allows for development of student accommodation on campus as well as speculative student accommodation even where it means the loss of a unit which could potentially be occupied as family accommodation would have an overall benefit in making more efficient use of the land and easing pressure on the private housing market.

13541 Object

Summary: With regard to the loss of family accommodation this option does not acknowledge that a property can be occupied by up to 6 unrelated people i.e. a small HMO. Many Colleges own such properties. A college will retain such properties for the long term with no prospect of selling or re-using for a single family given the serious shortage of college accommodation available. A permissive policy which allowed for redevelopment of such sites for college accommodation would make more efficient use of the land and clearly ease pressure on the private housing market.

16899 Object

Summary: Whilst supporting text is supported, Option 144 appears to suggest that the approach of the existing Local Plan is available on the one hand, and on the other under Option 145, is an approach to refocus the provision at North West Cambridge from new colleges to provision for existing Colleges. Our view is that an alternative approach is required. This would involve a policy to allow for development to be brought forward within existing College sites and on new sites, as well as at North West Cambridge.

17497 Object

Summary: There is a need for a policy facilitating the continued growth of the University, given the acknowledged importance of the University to the reputation and economic profile of the city. It is also apparent that there is a pressing need for additional student accommodation to meet an identified shortfall. Greatest possible use should be made of land already allocated for University uses at North-West Cambridge for student accommodation, and therefore Option 145 is supported. The need for student and general housing must be pursued separately so that the acute needs of both sectors are planned for effectively.

18019 Object

Summary: To house members of the old colleges in North West Cambridge would make it difficult to provide the College functions (educational, social, pastoral etc); also it would increase student traffic between the centre and West Cambridge. Encourage the University to absorb increasing numbers through founding new Colleges in NW Cambridge rather than expanding existing

18376 Object

Summary: Option 145 introduces the idea that the potential for a new college(s) at North West Cambridge could be replaced by a specific focus on additional student accommodation. Whilst the AAP was not specific that a new college would be developed given uncertainty over deliverability, the potential to create a new college and the opportunity it would provide to help create a heart to the new University quarter was discussed when the AAP was being prepared.

9376 Support

Summary: Creation of new colleges has disadvantages in terms of scale and makes fundraising more difficult. In addition, any new colleges might tend to become more specialist as regards subjects, which is against the Cambridge ethos. Expanding existing colleges, albeit on split sites, would be preferable but this should ultimately be the University's decision, though the Council should discuss and advise.

14066 Support

Summary: Planning policy should reflect the fact a certain action of graduate students want and have a need for, cars.

17494 Support

Summary: Yet again there seems little perception of the need to provide water in this case for the large planned increase in the student population. Perhaps the availability of water should be considered first before taking the decision that student numbers should continue to rise.

17602 Support

Summary: We support Option 146 for the development of Anglia Ruskin and Option 147 for expansion of student accommodation. However, we feel that it is appropriate to consider the provision of hostel accomosation for the Education sector as a whole and therefore we tie our support for Options 145 and 147 to the fact that Option 150 is an over-riding consideration. Again, this support is tied to improving the local infrastructure to support the additional loads such as student accommodation will impose.

CHAPTER: 10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy Question 10.51

16332 Object

Summary: The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European educations centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

14206 Support

Summary: I would like to see the redevelopment of the Grafton Centre to provide a mixture of shops and accommodation.

CHAPTER: 10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy Question 10.52

9377 Support

Summary: Is there scope for the colleges to make greater use of shared accommodation? Rooms shared by two students (often freshmen) was common in my day and should still be workable today.

16335 Support

Summary: The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European educations centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

**CHAPTER: 10 - Building a Strong and
Competitive Economy**

Question 10.55

9379 Object

Summary: Not in Cambridge

10957 Object

Summary: The University has land holdings at Huntingdon Road (in South Cambridgeshire), where its outdoor sports facilities are located. The site is currently under utilised owing to its designation as Green Belt. Additional facilities could be delivered at this site.

12389 Object

Summary: Could the Mill Road cemetery be considered.

This may be difficult and contentious, but this area is also sometimes a 'no go' with many using it for drugs etc and its loss might change the 'ambience' of that part of Mill Road

12121 Support

Summary: We believe a policy is required in this respect and should a) discourage use of inner City space for warehousing and b) only locate such warehouses in locations where the transportation links are such as to render the impact of the warehousing minimal, both in terms of traffic congestion, noise, pollution, access and road safety. Access to these warehouse spaces should also not be enabled at the expense of the quality of life, safety and congestion of surrounding villages outside or inside the City. Additionally, we do not believe space should be made available for warehousing at the expense of office or housing.

**CHAPTER: 10 - Building a Strong and
Competitive Economy**

Question 10.56

10961 Object

Summary: The alternative of enabling the agreed masterplan to evolve and change needs to be considered.

12125 Support

Summary: We believe a policy is required in this respect and should a) discourage use of inner City space for warehousing and b) only locate such warehouses in locations where the transportation links are such as to render the impact of the warehousing minimal, both in terms of traffic congestion, noise, pollution, access and road safety. Access to these warehouse spaces should also not be enabled at the expense of the quality of life, safety and congestion of surrounding villages outside or inside the City. Additionally, we do not believe space should be made available for warehousing at the expense of office or housing.

**CHAPTER: 10 - Building a Strong and
Competitive Economy**

**Option 147 - Anglia Ruskin University - support for student hostel
development with affordable housing exemption**

10965 Support

Summary: Policy 7/9 has been successful in delivering more student accommodation and hence easing pressure on existing stock. Removing the exemption is likely to place greater pressure on the housing stock as students seek to find accommodation in shared housing.

14418 Support

Summary: We support the policy of identifying specific sites where student accommodation for Anglia Ruskin will be permitted in lieu of affordable housing. The sites should be well-located to Anglia Ruskin. This is an important policy to help support Anglia Ruskin.

17671 Support

Summary: The major growth of jobs will take place in Addenbrookes and at the two Universities. The present proposals for the Southern edge of the City and in the North West will accommodate the majority of the added workforce without the need to build further on Green Belt. I agree with proposals in the Plan to relax regulations for building speculative student accommodation for all such institutions and that at least some of this accommodation should be incorporated within developments on site. Such provision at West Cambridge would help create a sustainable community for students on site, reducing the need to commute across the City.

**CHAPTER: 10 - Building a Strong and
Competitive Economy**

**Option 148 - Anglia Ruskin University - Support for student hostel
accommodation but removal of affordable housing exemption**

10977 Object

Summary: Policy 7/9 has been successful in delivering more student accommodation and hence easing pressure on existing stock. Removing the exemption is likely to place greater pressure on the housing stock as students seek to find accommodation in shared housing.

10670 Support

Summary: Support. Present policy allows developers to exempt themselves from affordable housing element, often in areas which badly need such housing.

8407 Support

Summary: need policy

10970 Support

Summary: Policy 7/9 has been successful in delivering more student accommodation and hence easing pressure on existing stock. Removing the exemption is likely to place greater pressure on the housing stock as students seek to find accommodation in shared housing.

12390 Support

Summary: yes we need a clear policy

12564 Support

Summary: A clear need to address the issue. Exemption should be made provided the supply of accommodation is sufficient to reduce significantly the difference between student accommodation and the number of students.

15338 Support

Summary: There is a need for a policy that applies to all student housing and it should be around Option 148. Student housing should be the responsibility of the student and the institution they attend. the policy should not restrict itself to CU and ARU, there are other institutions with residential students although those two are the biggest by far. Student accommodation should make the same contributions to section 106 as any other housing, the exemption currently adds 15% to the value of any site that can get consent for student housing.

10987 Object

Summary: We support option 147 as Policy 7/9 has been successful in delivering more student accommodation and hence easing pressure on existing stock. Removing the exemption is likely to place greater pressure on the housing stock as students seek to find accommodation in shared housing.

12394 Object

Summary: we strongly support Option 148. We acknowledge the need for much more student accommodation but ARU have done well out of CB1. The need for affordable housing is equally as great if not greater and Affordable housing has not fared so well of late given the exemptions granted and the slow pace of house building. Time to reverse the policy and push for more affordable housing

Provision of student rooms is generally facilitated by developers who are looking for a reasonable return, this is market led.

12862 Object

Summary: Option 148: but better to cap numbers of students in Cambridge and for ARU to use their campuses elsewhere

8408 Support

Summary: some of us favoured 147 and some 148

9380 Support

Summary: A compromise between the two.

14211 Support

Summary: Option 148

17601 Support

Summary: We support Option 146 for the development of Anglia Ruskin and Option 147 for expansion of student accommodation. However, we feel that it is appropriate to consider the provision of hostel accommodation for the Education sector as a whole and therefore we tie our support for Options 145 and 147 to the fact that Option 150 is an over-riding consideration. Again, this support is tied to improving the local infrastructure to support the additional loads such as student accommodation will impose.

18596 Support

Summary: Option 148

10993 Object

Summary: The approach should be extended and apply not only to specific identified sites in the plan but to other sites which come forward for development.

12844 Object

Summary: Anglia Ruskin University does not need any more hostels than have already been agreed by the Council. We want students to feel part of the community, but I fear that putting them in separate secular student blocks will not achieve this - in fact other Cambridge residents are likely to be more accepting of students if they are integrated with the community and can feel part of it.

17603 Object

Summary: Many students will be of graduate status and have families. this needs to be accommodated in the mix of housing provided for the students and will lead to a more balanced student population in any one housing/hostel group. The proportion and size of such family units will need to be established from typical demographic surveys. Also it is important that any such housing group provides safe play/recreation areas for children. The units opposite the Institute of Manufacturing on the West Cambridge site are an example of what not to provide, since they have very limited and ramped play areas which are open to the road and hence not safe.

9381 Support

Summary: Develop a formula allowing a reduced affordable housing percentage on sites with student hostels, but not on a one-for-one basis.

18024 Support

Summary: Affordable housing is vital to all of Cambridge and should take priority over Anglia Ruskin University

10997 Object

Summary: Any sites suitable for residential development would be equally suitable for the provision of student accommodation. Cambridge is compact city and Anglia Ruskin is easily accessible by a range of modes of travel from locations across the city.

12397 Object

Summary: Any new accommodation should be as close as possible to the ARU main campus to avoid migration of large numbers of students through existing areas.

Tram Depot and car park at the rear could be 'over built'; but retain the parking. This may include some of the shops fronting East Rd

14457 Support

Summary: The site of the former Atrium Health and Fitness club (64-68 Newmarket Road) which runs along Severn Place between East Road and Newmarket Road should be listed as a site where student accommodation for Anglia Ruskin should be provided in lieu of affordable housing. The site is listed for residential development in the Council's SHLAA. The proposals for the site include student housing at the East Road end of Severn Place which is within easy walking and cycling distance of Anglia Ruskin's East Road campus. Anglia Ruskin have expressed an interest in the proposed student accommodation here.

16375 Support

Summary: Agree that it is unfair/discriminatory on other legitimate and established providers of higher education to restrict speculative student accommodation and students to the two main universities.

11004 Object

Summary: The suggested criteria are unnecessary. Most are simply general development management criteria which will apply in any event. Others are unnecessary, for example,

* there is already a proven need for more student accommodation

* the university will only enter agreements where the accommodation is adequate and hence the planning authority does not need to involve itself in such matters of detail

* such accommodation is occupied by adults and there is no need to mandate the need for warden controlled premises.

11149 Object

Summary: As set out in paragraph 10.70 this option is inequitable and discriminating against non-university colleges. It should not be taken further.

12132 Object

Summary: Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

13099 Object

Summary: As set out in paragraph 10.70 this option is inequitable and discriminating against non-university colleges as confirmed by a Planning Inspector a year ago at the EIP to the Oxford Core Strategy. As such it is not an option that should be given any further consideration.

13546 Object

Summary: As set out in paragraph 10.70 this option is inequitable and discriminating against non-university Colleges. It should not be taken further.

13846 Object

Summary: Speculative student hostel accommodation should not be limited to Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge because there is a growing demand for student accommodation in connection with other educational establishments in the city. As set out in paragraph 10.70 this option is inequitable and discriminating against non-university colleges as confirmed by a Planning Inspector a year ago at the EIP to the Oxford Core Strategy. As such it is not an option that should be given any further consideration.

14077 Object

Summary: Planning policy should reflect the fact a certain fraction of graduate students want and have a need for, and are permitted by the universities to have cars. Planning policy should not discriminate against these individuals, who are often effectively doing a job as trainee teachers, doctors, scientists, etc. and ought instead actively seek to ensure their needs are provided for.

14706 Object

Summary: It needs to be clear that car parking is only for disabled students and those with mobility problems. The wording here could potentially allow more car parking than the city can sustain. Cycle parking must of a high standard and quantity.

15636 Object

Summary: Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

16325 Object

Summary: Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

16353 Object

Summary: Object to Option 149

12534 Support

Summary: Essential to have wardens to control noise and nuisance.

11151 Object

Summary: The policy should include the need for staff as well as student accommodation. Such a policy would recognise the economic benefits of all educational establishments. However, this should also not prevent the use of the accommodation in academic holidays. This can be of considerable benefit to the economy in providing short term accommodation for students on short term courses, conferences and visitors to the City. The shortfall in such accommodation is acknowledged in 10.77 onwards.

13104 Object

Summary: Such a policy is supported but provision also needs to be made for staff accommodation. The difficulties of providing staff and student housing applies equally to specialist schools such as language schools as to the Universities and Colleges.

13549 Object

Summary: The policy should include the need for staff as well as student accommodation. Such a policy would recognise the economic benefits of all educational establishments. However, this should also not prevent the use of the accommodation in academic holidays. This can be of considerable benefit to the economy in providing short term accommodation for students on short term courses, conferences and visitors to the City. The shortfall in such accommodation is acknowledged in 10.77 onwards.

14079 Object

Summary: Planning policy should reflect the fact a certain fraction of graduate students want and have a need for, and are permitted by the universities to have cars. Planning policy should not discriminate against these individuals, who are often effectively doing a job as trainee teachers, doctors, scientists, etc. and ought instead actively seek to ensure their needs are provided for.

14707 Object

Summary: Currently, some schools and colleges (i.e. those under County Council control) are not subject to the cycle parking standards in the Local Plan. This situation must change. Except for disabled spaces, car parking should not be provided.

11080 Support

Summary: A need for accommodation for students should be demonstrated before planning permission is given and the conditions outlined seem sensible.

12134 Support

Summary: Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

13849 Support

Summary: There is a growing demand for student accommodation in connection with other educational establishments in the city. There is a recognised economic benefit arising from other educational facilities in the city.

14010 Support

Summary: We support Option 150, so that additional student accommodation could be provided for Abbey College students.

15638 Support

Summary: Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

16329 Support

Summary: Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

16364 Support

Summary: Any policy on the development of speculative student accommodation should not include an occupancy restriction to students of the two main universities, but expanded to allow occupation of students of educational establishments on full time academic courses.

17672 Support

Summary: The major growth of jobs will take place in Addenbrookes and at the two Universities. The present proposals for the Southern edge of the City and in the North West will accommodate the majority of the added workforce without the need to build further on Green Belt. I agree with proposals in the Plan to relax regulations for building speculative student accommodation for all such institutions and that at least some of this accommodation should be incorporated within developments on site. Such provision at West Cambridge would help create a sustainable community for students on site, reducing the need to commute across the City.

18394 Support

Summary: We are in full support of Option 150 and the associated set of criteria that is listed, with the exception of the ninth bullet point relating to the provision of sufficient external amenity space for the occupiers. Concern is raised on the inclusion of this clause since often the normal constraints associated with developing on urban brownfield land will mitigate against the prospects of providing such space, as it did in the appeal cases discussed in our full submission. This option would allow the accommodation needs of such specialist schools to be properly catered for and would therefore reduce the pressure on the local housing market.

11007 Object

Summary: The suggested criteria are unnecessary. Most are simply general development management criteria which will apply in any event. Others are unnecessary, for example,

* there is already a proven need for more student accommodation

* the university will only enter agreements where the accommodation is adequate and hence the planning authority does not need to involve itself in such matters of detail

* such accommodation is occupied by adults and there is no need to mandate the need for warden controlled premises.

15637 Object

Summary: Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

16327 Object

Summary: Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

10241 Support

Summary: The continuing use of policy 7/10 within any new planned period is inequitable and discriminates against non-university colleges. An amended policy stance which does not restrict occupiers in this manner should be supported. CCSS as an established education provider in Cambridge should constitute such a provider.

11255 Support

Summary: We consider that suggested wording together with the criteria against which new development proposals would be assessed are supportable and consider it is Option 150 that should be considered as an appropriate policy approach in any local plan review.

12136 Support

Summary: Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

12401 Support

Summary: yes

12865 Support

Summary: Yes

15339 Support

Summary: Support a policy that does not encourage speculative student accommodation. If student housing were brought wholly within the same rules that apply to other housing this would probably deal with some of the speculative pressure.

17511 Support

Summary: There is a need to address the issue of speculative building of student accommodation.

18025 Support

Summary: Yes

12403 Object

Summary: there seems little point in pursuing Option 149 given the Inspector's decision in Oxford.

So Option 150 should be adopted but with strict guidelines and controls in the policy. Care should be taken to review each 'site' on its own merits.

12883 Object

Summary: Option 150 would offer more protection for historic areas close to the city such as North Newtown where we are in danger of having the area swamped by students who have no long term loyalty to the area. If mixed residential communities in the local areas are to be sustainable a balance needs to be struck between permanent and temporary residents, and a limit to the density of occupation, particularly in Conservation Areas. The Local Plan needs to determine area specific policies especially for areas such as Conservation Areas.

17512 Object

Summary: I prefer neither of the options. Speculative building of student hostels accommodation should not be allowed.

9382 Support

Summary: Option 149 though I query whether speculative development should be allowed at all.

10248 Support

Summary: We support Option 150 which widens the current policy stance of the Council to include established educational institutions engaged in academic courses providing full time education in Cambridge

10671 Support

Summary: Option 149

12140 Support

Summary: Option 149 Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

13853 Support

Summary: Support option 150 which increases the flexibility of student accommodation to meet the needs of the education sector in the local economy. Over the past 20 years there has been a growth in the number of student weeks. General trend of increase means that there is a demand for student accommodation to meet speculative provision.

City centre sites, particularly over ground floor retail use, are good locations for additional student accommodation because

- High existing student population in and low residential population;
- Close to educational establishments;
- Highly accessible by public transport;
- Low or nil requirement for car parking;
- Close to amenity open space.

14212 Support

Summary: Option 149

15639 Support

Summary: Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

16330 Support

Summary: Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

18026 Support

Summary: Option 150

13108 Object

Summary: This should recognise the economic benefits of all educational establishments. However, this should also not prevent the use of the accommodation in academic holidays. This can be of considerable benefit to the economy in providing short term accommodation for students on short term courses, conferences and visitors to the City and would make the most efficient use of that available accommodation. The shortfall in such accommodation is acknowledged in 10.77 onwards.

18027 Object

Summary: It is only fair that providers for students on long courses are treated comparably to those at the Universities

12538 Support

Summary: Avoid large numbers of students being accommodated in 'non-student' locations. They can be very disruptive to quiet and established suburbs.

CHAPTER: 10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy **10.71**

17018 Object

Summary: There is another specialist school type not mentioned in your policy; Cambridge Performing Arts.

The report does not make the connection between relatively few jobs created and a relatively high need to provide student housing. Given the low unemployment in Cambridge and high local housing need this ratio needs to be examined.

This policy needs to examine if hostel accommodation is at the expense of the local housing market.

The statement in the planning document refers to students from the sub region, but the schools targets international market.

Want policy to reference suitability of premises and recognise impact on surrounding residential property.

CHAPTER: 10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy **10.72**

13113 Support

Summary: Evidence that language schools contribute strongly to the local economy should inform policies which enable existing schools to continue to grow providing improved teaching facilities and accommodation. Language schools are significant employers in the city. In addition, language schools make a strong social and cultural contribution by attracting a diversity of international students to Cambridge. Policy should recognise their contribution to the economy and the accommodation issues they face in the same way as it does for Colleges and ARU.

16245 Support

Summary: Option 153 is supported which suggests additional hotel provision based on a high growth scenario of around 2000 new bedrooms. The requirement for visitor accommodation in Cambridge is very high and provision should match this. In fact perhaps the policy justification should refer to 'at least 2000 new bedrooms'.

CHAPTER: 10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy **10.74**

11083 Support

Summary: All specialist schools should be treated in the same way.

CHAPTER: 10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy **10.76**

18395 Support

Summary: Language schools and other specialist schools make an important contribution to the education sector in Cambridge and provide a significant boost to the local economy, possibly by as much as £78m per annum. This was recognised in the 'Cluster at 50' study which suggested a review of the current policy restriction. We wish to endorse that such a review now takes place.

CHAPTER: 10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy **Option 151 - Specialist colleges such as secretarial and tutorial colleges**

12151 Object

Summary: The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European educational centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for the students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

12541 Object

Summary: Too many of these already. The local economy doesn't need an infinite number. This city is crowded enough as it is.

15644 Object

Summary: The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European educational centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

9670 Support

Summary: a vital part of our economy and education on the international scene with many long-term advantages.

15340 Support

Summary: Agree

17691 Support

Summary: The jobs expansion at the Universities and schools will largely be driven by those organisations rather than anything the Council does. However, I agree with proposals in the Plan to relax regulations for building speculative student accommodation for all such institutions and that at least some of this accommodation should be incorporated within developments on sites.

12550 Object

Summary: Look at the streets in the summer! More is worse. Where are these hostels to be built? Who wants to live near one? And why should hostels for yet more students be built, at the expense of housing for residents, and particularly for students who could learn English just as well in Wigan or Newcastle.

13114 Object

Summary: It is unreasonable and inappropriate to refer to behaviour issues when considering whether a policy to support expansion is appropriate. Actions of groups of young people are too often attributed to language schools when they are actually tourists. Moreover the effective management of the students is down to individual schools.

7046 Support

Summary: I think language schools with a good track record for 20,30 or 40+ years should have the opportunity to develop their businesses sensibly. If they can fulfil the criteria proposed, I would support these measures

10826 Support

Summary: Broadly in favour

12153 Support

Summary: The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European educational centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for the students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

15341 Support

Summary: Agree

15646 Support

Summary: The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European educational centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

17693 Support

Summary: The jobs expansion at the Universities and schools will largely be driven by those organisations rather than anything the Council does. However, I agree with proposals in the Plan to relax regulations for building speculative student accommodation for all such institutions and that at least some of this accommodation should be incorporated within developments on site.

10269 Object

Summary: It is important the City Council understands the role and operations of CCSS and accordingly new text is recommended to be inserted into any new plan which confirms the nature of CCSS's organisation and the role and services it offers to Cambridge.

13118 Object

Summary: The Local Plan objectives include promotion of employment growth and supporting higher education institutions as they continue to grow. The report recognises the contribution of specialist schools to the local economy which is in line with Local Plan objectives.
The language schools have the same issues in terms of provision of adequate and appropriate teaching space and associated facilities as the Colleges and Universities. Further they have the same difficulties in finding suitable accommodation for both staff and students. As such they should be treated in an equitable manner.

17514 Object

Summary: I prefer neither option. A continuing increase in number of specialist schools should be discouraged.

8409 Support

Summary: need policy

10827 Support

Summary: Yes

12158 Support

Summary: The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European educational centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for the students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

12405 Support

Summary: yes

12573 Support

Summary: Policy 152. There should be a policy on language students. The students should not have purpose-built accommodation (for reasons given in document). Policies should be enacted to reduce the number of weeks to 80000 pa once again.
Facilities for local students (secretarial colleges are welcome) and Cambridge can cope with crammers. University students are also welcomed but the expansion is controlled. The situation with language students has got completely out of hand.

12885 Support

Summary: Yes

17513 Support

Summary: There is a need to address the issue of an increasing number of specialist schools as more schools will further increase the demand for water.

18029 Support

Summary: Yes

18463 Support

Summary: The County Council supports the need for a policy addressing specialist schools.

8410 Object

Summary: we prefer neither option. We believe the current policy of restriction is appropriate

12406 Object

Summary: option 152 is preferred

Care must be exercised not to allow large residential homes from being lost to these users. Understood there are some controls in place to prevent too many specialist schools opening.

12889 Object

Summary: These do not appear to be alternatives as one deals with specialist colleges and the other with language schools. However, for both types of school it would be advisable for adequate hostel accommodation to be provided to relieve pressure on residential accommodation. Colleges at present buy properties to house students and then expand and fill them as much as possible, as has happened in North Newtown. Houses in multiple occupancy should be limited so as to preserve sustainable mixed communities. The Local Plan should have area specific policies especially for Conservation and other historic areas.

13120 Object

Summary: A supportive policy which allows for additional teaching space would enable the language schools to expand to be able to offer more year round rather than short term. The restriction on expanding teaching space or providing the associated facilities e.g. shared communal spaces, offices etc in the current Local Plan effectively means this cannot happen.

9383 Support

Summary: Retain option 152 but widen its scope to include other schools. Restrict, as far as legally possible, the opening of new schools.

12160 Support

Summary: Option 152
The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European educational centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for the students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

15647 Support

Summary: Supporter option 152 - The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European educational centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

16337 Support

Summary: The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European educational centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

17604 Support

Summary: We support Options 151 & 152 but tied to an enforceable requirement that the schools provide on site accommodation for students. We feel that it is overly optimistic and unenforceable to require education establishments to supervise gathering of students in the City Centre's streets and open spaces. One only has to look at the gathering of young people at the corner of Downing and Regent Streets in the evening to see how difficult this would be.

18030 Support

Summary: Option 151

18464 Support

Summary: The County Council supports Option 152 Language schools.

12891 Object

Summary: There has to be some limit set on the number of such colleges and schools regardless of the hostel accommodation. Cambridge should remain a university town and not become a crammer town which would result in a very different atmosphere.

17021 Object

Summary: There is another specialist school type not mentioned in your policy; Cambridge Performing Arts.

The report does not make the connection between relatively few jobs created and a relatively high need to provide student housing. Given the low unemployment in Cambridge and high local housing need this ratio needs to be examined.

This policy needs to examine if hostel accommodation is at the expense of the local housing market.

The statement in the planning document refers to students from the sub region, but the schools targets international market.

Want policy to reference suitability of premises and recognise impact on surrounding residential property.

18031 Object

Summary: Secretarial Colleges and tutorial colleges should not be put at a disadvantage compared to language schools. Their students may be more mature than language school pupils? Expansion of the latter is creating problems in congestion on the pavements and streets,. Further expansion should be restricted.

18466 Object

Summary: The possibility of converting existing buildings, vis a vis additional purpose built accommodation should not be discounted; additional on site accommodation would reduce trip generation; the supervision of large groups of students is a management issue.

9384 Support

Summary: Can Cambridge Regional College help with extra courses and facilities?

12164 Support

Summary: The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European educational centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for the students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

9387 Object

Summary: No. They should be accommodated on-site wherever possible. This reduces traffic generation and also helps with "control" and oversight of behaviour and pastoral needs.

12409 Object

Summary: should we be looking at any vacated state schools sites whose land is presumably publicly owned. There have been a few such sites coming available in the last 10 years

18033 Object

Summary: Are there possible sites in CB1? Near transport links into Cambridge?

9385 Support

Summary: Can Cambridge Regional College help with extra courses and facilities?

12166 Support

Summary: The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European educational centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for the students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

12554 Object

Summary: Forecast growth does not have to be accommodated, particularly if such growth would bring more pressure on the centre.

18595 Support

Summary: No

13828 Object

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

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.

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.

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.

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).

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.

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.

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.

12487 Support

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

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

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.

7007 Support

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

7609 Support

Summary: The lack of criteria is unhelpful.

8485 Support

Summary: Yes

9513 Support

Summary: Yes

11526 Support

Summary: Support

12993 Support

Summary: Support. Some HMO are exploited.

14133 Support

Summary: Yes

15278 Support

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

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

17961 Support

Summary: Yes - current policy is sufficient.

18337 Support

Summary: Yes, however.

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.

18338 Object

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

9514 Support

Summary: Option 116

17962 Support

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

9515 Object

Summary: Car parking

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.

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.

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.

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.

17963 Object

Summary: A further option?

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

CHAPTER: 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.

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.

CHAPTER: 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.

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>

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.

CHAPTER: 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.

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>

CHAPTER: 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.

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.

CHAPTER: 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.

CHAPTER: 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.

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

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.

CHAPTER: 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.'

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.

16028 Object

Summary: Green Belt should not be used for purpose. Possibly the wildlife area in Option 40 could be used.

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.

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.

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.

18370 Object

Summary: 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.

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.

8120 Support

Summary: I believe this is necessary, but note the great difficulty which is always encountered in finding suitable sites.

8486 Support

Summary: Yes

9519 Support

Summary: Yes

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.

11549 Support

Summary: Support

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.

14138 Support

Summary: Yes

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.

14870 Support

Summary: Yes. Support Option 119

15046 Support

Summary: Yes, support.

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.

16559 Support

Summary: Yes.

17464 Support

Summary: Policy supported, and further site assessment needed.

17967 Support

Summary: Yes - as suggested.

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.

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.

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.

11551 Support

Summary: Efforts should be made to integrate the communities on both sides, rather than a 'them and us' culture which sometimes prevails.

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.

13896 Object

Summary: The national guidance has clearly thus far been insufficient given the failure to provide adequate site provision so far.

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.

14031 Object

Summary: This is not an acceptable outcome.

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.

11448 Object

Summary: No.

12802 Object

Summary: No

14871 Object

Summary: No. Absolutely not.

16562 Object

Summary: No

14139 Support

Summary: No

17968 Support

Summary: No

11453 Object

Summary: I do not believe the green belt should be released for this purpose.

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.

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

9215 Object

Summary: Green belt should be retained as it is.

9520 Object

Summary: Not in the green belt since such a location would destroy the whole idea of the green belt.

10772 Object

Summary: No

11457 Object

Summary: No.

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.

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).

14141 Object

Summary: No

14873 Object

Summary: No. Definitely not.

15048 Object

Summary: Do not support.

16050 Object

Summary: A new 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 valuable are to this abuse.

16563 Object

Summary: No. No more land in the Green Belt should be used for any development except for leisure and recreation purposes.

17970 Object

Summary: No - previous policy should be adhered to

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.

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.

14006 Support

Summary: Yes. Given the failure to find urban locations, the green belt must surely be considered.

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.

CHAPTER: 9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.52

9217 Object

Summary: In South Cambs or elsewhere in the county

11455 Object

Summary: No - green belt should be protected and this seems like a particularly detrimental use.

14143 Object

Summary: No

14874 Object

Summary: No. If the Council approves inappropriate Traveller sites it risks facing legal action from homeowners whose property values are adversely affected.

17971 Object

Summary: No

9987 Support

Summary: Beside Babraham P&R

13706 Support

Summary: Near park and ride sites?

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.

CHAPTER: 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.

17972 Object

Summary: Consider improving current sites & ensuring transport links to these sites are improved.

CHAPTER: 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.

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.

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?

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.

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.

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.

12608 Object

Summary: Needs to include the amenity of local residents (if appropriate) too i.e. loss of light, bin space, extra traffic etc.

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.

14073 Support

Summary: The present approach to residential moorings has much to recommend it, and its inclusion in the Local Plan would be sensible.

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).

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.

CHAPTER: 9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.38

11422 Support

Summary: Houses are ridiculously small.

CHAPTER: 9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.39

12597 Object

Summary: 73% seems a hugely high figure and suggests that developers are attempting to maximise returns by making developments as dense as possible - I would urge the council to have the courage to fight against these and deliver what's right for the area and the city first and foremost.

12644 Object

Summary: Although there's been an increase in the number of applications for studio apartments/flats, this does not mean that these actually adequately house people. All one-person properties should be built to a size that could accommodate a second person (e.g. if their partner moves in, or if they have a baby, or an older relative comes to live with them), therefore each one-person property should be at least a one-bedroom flat (NOT a studio) and should have the bedroom at least 12 sq m (as per HCA requirements, see Local Plan appendix D).

CHAPTER: 9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.40

6939 Object

Summary: Incorrect. There were very generous space standards applied by Parker Morris since 1961. "...a good house or flat can never be made out of premises which are too small. As well as a place where the family can gather together, there must be room in every home for activities demanding privacy and quiet; there must be space to allow for better planned and better equipped kitchens with room in which to take at least some meals, and for more satisfactory circulation and storage." it defined minimum sizes for a dwelling without specifying how the interior of the dwelling should be partitioned

CHAPTER: 9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.47

12388 Support

Summary: Additionally, there should be a high standard of noise insulation between adjacent dwellings (for flats, adjoined houses). Noise from outside the building is often not the major problem with new housing. This issue feeds into qualities of design, material and workmanship.

11008 Object

Summary: Bidwells objects to the inclusion of policies that impose minimum space standards. Bidwells considers that this should be determined by the market. Imposing minimum space standards could adversely affect viability and deliverability of constrained sites, and would reduce the total number of units delivered in the City. Furthermore, there is no need to repeat other legislation in the Local Plan.

11253 Object

Summary: Do not consider there is case for space standards for market and intermediate market homes. Those able to buy or rent in the open market can exercise choice in terms of the balance between standards, space, affordability and location.

Evidence from the HBF shows that whilst dwelling sizes may be smaller in the UK, the average occupancy level of new housing within the UK is amongst the lowest in Europe.

Increasing the size of homes necessarily increases costs to purchasers.

Increasing cost of homes will also affect the viability of schemes and the ability to deliver affordable homes and community facilities.

15494 Object

Summary: We object to Option 106 as there is no need for a policy of this nature. The Council can control the quality of new developments through normal development control mechanisms. This option would threaten the viability of development and the delivery of housing.

12598 Support

Summary: Agreed

13020 Support

Summary: I strongly support this. I disagree with the conclusion that this makes some sites not viable for development.

All it means is that some sites will have to be sold to developers or private individuals for a price that reflects their true value and perhaps this will correct some of the inflated prices for development land which currently results in very cramped housing.

13458 Support

Summary: Current developments often do not provide enough space for the requirements of ordinary living.

14866 Support

Summary: Combine with aspects of option 107 as there are good things in both of them.

15268 Support

Summary: Standards should take account of height as well as area.

16699 Support

Summary: There should be a minimum space standard based on occupancy levels.

11010 Object

Summary: Bidwells objects to the inclusion of policies that impose minimum space standards. Bidwells considers that this should be determined by the market. Imposing minimum space standards could adversely affect viability and deliverability of constrained sites, and would reduce the total number of units delivered in the City. Furthermore, there is no need to repeat other legislation in the Local Plan.

11254 Object

Summary: Do not consider there is case for space standards for market and intermediate market homes. Those able to buy or rent in the open market can exercise choice in terms of the balance between standards, space, affordability and location.

Evidence from the HBF shows that whilst dwelling sizes may be smaller in the UK, the average occupancy level of new housing within the UK is amongst the lowest in Europe.

Increasing the size of homes necessarily increases costs to purchasers.

Increasing cost of homes will also affect the viability of schemes and the ability to deliver affordable homes and community facilities.

15495 Object

Summary: We object to Option 107 as there is no need for a policy of this nature. The Council can control the quality of new developments through normal development control mechanisms. This option would threaten the viability of development and the delivery of housing.

9953 Support

Summary: Too many dwellings are far too small.

12599 Support

Summary: This appears to be the most attractive policy - developers will not voluntarily do this and it's in the interests of residents and the non-overdevelopment of a site to do this.

12988 Support

Summary: Ssupport. See too many developments with 'mean spaces' and illusionistic space internally. Ceiling heights and principle rooms need a miminum. External storage- cycles and garden space.

14867 Support

Summary: Combine with aspects of option 106 as there are good things in both of them.

15269 Support

Summary: Standards should take account of height as well as area.

11012 Object

Summary: Bidwells considers that there should not be a minimum standard for private outdoor amenity space; this should be determined by the market. Bidwells considers that there could be recommended standards for minimum private outdoor amenity space standards but with flexibility to tailor to specific circumstances, for example, it could be reduced if the site is constrained, or if there is a high proportion of public amenity space in close proximity.

15270 Object

Summary: Not acceptable as town houses can be developed on a garden square and city centre apartments have different space requirements. The space provided should be appropriate to the development and its location. Gardens that are contiguous have greater amenity and ecological value than separate fragments of land. I think this is an area where the overall open-space requirement coupled with a common-sense approach on a case by case basis can produce better results. Public scorn at the planning stage can be a powerful persuader.

15434 Object

Summary: Agree that minimum provisions need to be set for outdoor amenity space, though not to the exclusion of other space standards.

15496 Object

Summary: We object to Option 108 on the basis that the policy is unnecessary, and the Council can determine whether appropriate quality living accommodation (including amenity and open space) is delivered through the normal development control processes.

9954 Support

Summary: I think it is only reasonable for people to have some private outdoor amenity space.

12986 Support

Summary: Support

13016 Support

Summary: I am in strong support of this option

14868 Support

Summary: Support

13017 Object

Summary: I think while perhaps well intentioned, will just allow too many loopholes to be meaningful.

15271 Object

Summary: Not acceptable as town houses can be developed on a garden square and city centre apartments have different space requirements. The space provided should be appropriate to the development and its location. Gardens that are contiguous have greater amenity and ecological value than separate fragments of land. I think this is an area where the overall open-space requirement coupled with a common-sense approach on a case by case basis can produce better results. Public scorn at the planning stage can be a powerful persuader.

11424 Support

Summary: Obviously needed....

12989 Support

Summary: Yes. essential.
Room for a tree.

14869 Support

Summary: Support

15497 Support

Summary: Compared to Options 107 and 108, this option has some merit, and we would be content to support the principle of some delivery on each site, without specifying a minimum standard.

13018 Object

Summary: I think that standards are critical, so not doing anything is not a good option.

15272 Object

Summary: Not acceptable as town houses can be developed on a garden square and city centre apartments have different space requirements. The space provided should be appropriate to the development and its location. Gardens that are contiguous have greater amenity and ecological value than separate fragments of land. I think this is an area where the overall open-space requirement coupled with a common-sense approach on a case by case basis can produce better results. Public scorn at the planning stage can be a powerful persuader.

11257 Support

Summary: Support not having space standards for market and intermediate market homes.

Those able to buy or rent in the open market can exercise choice in terms of the balance between standards, space, affordability and location.

Evidence from the HBF shows that whilst dwelling sizes may be smaller in the UK, the average occupancy level of new housing within the UK is amongst the lowest in Europe.

Increasing the size of homes necessarily increases costs to purchasers.

Increasing cost of homes will also affect the viability of schemes and the ability to deliver affordable homes and community facilities.

11258 Object

Summary: Do not consider there is case for space standards for market and intermediate market homes. Those able to buy or rent in the open market can exercise choice in terms of the balance between standards, space, affordability and location.

Evidence from the HBF shows that whilst dwelling sizes may be smaller in the UK, the average occupancy level of new housing within the UK is amongst the lowest in Europe.

Increasing the size of homes necessarily increases costs to purchasers.

Increasing cost of homes will also affect the viability of schemes and the ability to deliver affordable homes and community facilities.

7116 Support

Summary: Yes

7762 Support

Summary: Yes, to ensure a wide mix of sizes of property - there seems to be a predominance of 2 bed flats, but not so many flats with a 3rd or 4th bedroom to make it suitable for families. Minimum space requirements also required so developers don't squeeze too much creating unacceptable living standards.

9498 Support

Summary: Yes

11504 Support

Summary: Support

12152 Support

Summary: The case for a policy is well argued in the I&O document, so yes.

12601 Support

Summary: Yes

14122 Support

Summary: Yes

16542 Support

Summary: Yes.

16841 Support

Summary: Yes - support.

17452 Support

Summary: As with 7.1-3, there is insufficient focus in the 2006 Plan on adequate internal space and quality requirements proportionate to household needs, including opportunities for spare rooms, adequate storage, etc. All homes designed for families should also have adequate gardens, wider outdoor amenity spaces and safe, relaxed, child-friendly access

17949 Support

Summary: Yes - most certainly

18243 Support

Summary: There is a need for a policy that refers to space standards.

18327 Support

Summary: Yes

7004 Object

Summary: Ideally there would be no further new buildings planned in Cambridge without existing buildings being removed.
However, if further developments are to be provided then I would prefer Option 106 to the others suggested.

9504 Object

Summary: Options 106 and 108

There is a possible loop-hole in the final paragraph of 106 because inaccuracies may occur in the number of bed spaces.

10432 Object

Summary: Object to policies 107 to 110 but support policy 106. This is more flexible and less draconian and interfering.

10733 Object

Summary: A combination of 107 and 109 is the best option. People need space to live satisfactory lives especially with young children.

11259 Object

Summary: Do not consider there is case for space standards for market and intermediate market homes. Those able to buy or rent in the open market can exercise choice in terms of the balance between standards, space, affordability and location.

Evidence from the HBF shows that whilst dwelling sizes may be smaller in the UK, the average occupancy level of new housing within the UK is amongst the lowest in Europe.

Increasing the size of homes necessarily increases costs to purchasers.

Increasing cost of homes will also affect the viability of schemes and the ability to deliver affordable homes and community facilities.

12157 Object

Summary: A combination of 107 and 109.

18245 Object

Summary: Option 106 proposes that such standards would dictate the gross internal area of the dwelling and that space standards would be based on the level of occupancy and dwelling types, which is to be welcomed. However, there is a danger that setting a minimum internal floor area for bedrooms could be used as a design criteria by developers rather than for a worst case scenario such as for a guest bedroom or in exceptional circumstances. Occupancy levels should be used to set minimum standards for all new residential developments. Option 106 need not be too onerous on the viability of a site. Option 109 providing for outdoor amenity space would work well in conjunction with a less prescriptive Option 106, or Option 107 if that were chosen.

7117 Support

Summary: Probably Option 107. In addition to having sufficient space to swing the proverbial cat there must be adequate storage space, both internally and externally.

8480 Support

Summary: Options 107 and 109

9207 Support

Summary: Options 106 and 108

10300 Support

Summary: 107

10623 Support

Summary: 107 and 108

11505 Support

Summary: Prefer Option 106

11515 Support

Summary: Prefer Option 106.

The tendency is for developers to increase the number of bedrooms without increasing the size of properties - this means the bedrooms become smaller and less habitable. If a bedroom is uninhabitable, the space is thus wasted as it's unusable for living space.

12602 Support

Summary: Option 106 as the most stringent (having read through them again!)

13374 Support

Summary: Our client considers that Option 109 which would be to introduce a policy outlining that all new residential development should seek to provide an area of outdoor private amenity space in the form of gardens, balconies, patios or roof terraces. This option would allow for flexibility in bringing forward new homes for Cambridge, in compliance with NPPF paragraph 21 ensuring an over-burden of combined requirements of planning policy expectations does not arise.

14120 Support

Summary: Option 106

15840 Support

Summary: We agree that minimum space standards for new housing, including external private amenity space are necessary. Recent planning applications in East Chesterton which have in our view constituted over development have ignored the need for adequate internal and external private spaces. We do not support Option 109 and 110.

16544 Support

Summary: Options 106 and 108 preferred.

16842 Support

Summary: We prefer option 106. The historical record shows that it is always a mistake in the long term to skimp on quality for short-term economic or social gain.

17950 Support

Summary: Option 107 - The current policy does not enforce sufficient living space or storage space. Developers are too keen to maximise their value for £ per sq. ft, rather than focusing on the need for acceptable living space.

18328 Support

Summary: Options 107 and 109

CHAPTER: 9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.26

12159 Object

Summary: 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.

12751 Object

Summary: The first bedroom (and the only bedroom in the case of one-bedroom properties) should always be big enough for two people i.e. 12 sq m (as per HCA indicators - Local Plan, Appendix D). This would allow for changes in circumstances to be accommodated without the need to move - e.g. a partner or older relative could move in. This would certainly help ease pressure on Council waiting lists (and free up the partners existing property). Exceptions could be made for student accommodation - students would not normally be expected to share during their course of studies.

12755 Object

Summary: We should make all properties built/developed for rent/sale have private outside space (N.B. not overlooked from road, + not including parking/turning space) depth of at least 10 sq m, and width at least same as property width. Communal developments should meet this also (even though there gardens might not be fenced off from each other). Exceptions should be made for owners building their own properties that they themselves are to live in.

18329 Object

Summary: As mentioned above, 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. How CCC cannot engineer occupancy rate in an open market. Furthermore, 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.

9208 Support

Summary: There should also be a policy on standards for shared outdoor space for blocks of flats etc (play areas, general open space, trees and shrubs).

12995 Support

Summary: The value of private gardens is not expressed or mentioned as a policy. There is immeasurable wellbeing and sustainable values to homes with gardens, small and large. Victorian terraces were built on the principle of each garden could hold an apple tree. Contiguous gardens create green corridors and privacy. Longterm views must be taken.

14167 Support

Summary: I am not an expert and find it hard to judge between the options - but I have a sense that residential developments are frequently built with too little outside amenity space. This leads to a sense of being hemmed in, allows little space for children to play outdoors or for people to grow their own vegetables for example.

17951 Support

Summary: No

CHAPTER: 9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.27

18330 Object

Summary: Yes, greater awareness building.

17952 Support

Summary: No

CHAPTER: 9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.28

9209 Object

Summary: No, they should apply in all cases

9506 Object

Summary: No. Every unit should comply.

16545 Object

Summary: No, every unit should comply with these standards.

17953 Object

Summary: Yes

12165 Support

Summary: Yes, it probably should but the threshold should be quite low.

14123 Support

Summary: Yes

18331 Support

Summary: Yes

CHAPTER: 9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.53

11425 Support

Summary: This is a very good idea with an aging population.

CHAPTER: 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".

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.

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.

15273 Support

Summary: Yes, definitely, nothing less should be acceptable.

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.

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

C - 23269 - 234 - Site Number E5 - 1 and 7 - 11 Hills Road - None

23269 Comment

H. Employment Site Options Within Cambridge

Site Number E5 - 1 and 7 - 11 Hills Road

Respondent: English Heritage (East of England Region)
(Katharine Fletcher) [234]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site E5: 1 and 7-11 Hills Road
While this site incorporates some post-war office buildings of no particular interest, No 7 Hills Road is a late Victorian villa of some significance which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area. English Heritage would expect any redevelopment of this site to retain No 7. Any new development on the site should seek to include a more satisfactory resolution to the corner at the north-west end of the site, while at the same time retaining/replanting the street trees along the Hills Road frontage.

Full Text: Site E5: 1 and 7-11 Hills Road
While this site incorporates some post-war office buildings of no particular interest, No 7 Hills Road is a late Victorian villa of some significance which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area. English Heritage would expect any redevelopment of this site to retain No 7. Any new development on the site should seek to include a more satisfactory resolution to the corner at the north-west end of the site, while at the same time retaining/replanting the street trees along the Hills Road frontage.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21178 - 1904 - I.1 - None

21178 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

I.1

Respondent: The I&O Working Group of Windsor Road
Residents' Association (The Secretary) [1904]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We agree it is necessary to have policies on both minimum residential unit sizes and external amenity space.

Full Text: We agree it is necessary to have policies on both minimum residential unit sizes and external amenity space.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 22303 - 3991 - I.1 - None

22303 Comment

I. Residential Space Standards

I.1

Respondent: Richard Robertson [3991]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Developers have been pushing to reduce space standards and we risk allowing them to build the slums of the future. Good minimum space standards should be set both internally and externally. On the latter, the size of back garden provided for each house should be at least as much as the footprint of the house.

Full Text: Developers have been pushing to reduce space standards and we risk allowing them to build the slums of the future. Good minimum space standards should be set both internally and externally. On the latter, the size of back garden provided for each house should be at least as much as the footprint of the house.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 24209 - 4530 - I.1 - None

24209 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

I.1

Respondent: MR J HURST [4530]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A Cambridge specific standard for all housing of all types should be researched, consulted upon and adopted as soon as possible but in the interim period Option I1 should be used.

I am an employee of the City Council.

Full Text: I am a long standing resident of Histon Road and an employee of the Cambridge City Council. The comments can be summarised as concern that non-residential sites are being seen as potential residential sites within regard to providing mixed uses throughout the City and that the stated 'potential capacity' of sites is not clearly explained which may lead to assumptions being made about the scale of development possible which may lead to overscale and excessively fail buildings being proposed.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 19550 - 3060 - I.3 - None

19550 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

I.3

Respondent: Miss Victoria Gaillard [3060]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We need many more 3/4 bed properties in Romsey to accomodate families as the grow. These need to be decent sized rooms that will allow parents justify staging in the city without disadvantaging their children in terms of space.

Full Text: We need many more 3/4 bed properties in Romsey to accomodate families as the grow. These need to be decent sized rooms that will allow parents justify staging in the city without disadvantaging their children in terms of space.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21180 - 1904 - I.6 - None

21180 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

I.6

Respondent: The I&O Working Group of Windsor Road Residents' Association (The Secretary) [1904]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We are pleased that housing which exceeds the minimum dwelling sizes will be encouraged.

Full Text: We are pleased that housing which exceeds the minimum dwelling sizes will be encouraged.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 22309 - 3991 - I.6 - None

22309 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

I.6

Respondent: Richard Robertson [3991]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Standards must be applied to all developments to avoid creating ghetto housing for those with more limited means. Flexible use of the housing is also supported.

Full Text: Standards must be applied to all developments to avoid creating ghetto housing for those with more limited means. Flexible use of the housing is also supported.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 22920 - 3755 - I.6 - None

22920 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

I.6

Respondent: CHS Group (Nigel Howlett) [3755]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support the unit size guidance to be the same for affordable and private housing. The distinction between the two sectors is being eroded in the sense that people wanting affordable housing will increasingly have to live in private housing due to the shortage of the former. Private housing should therefore meet minimum space standards to ensure that it provides a suitable long term home meeting a range of household needs and expectations. The proposed policy is not over-prescriptive about how most of the space is used inside the dwelling.

Ensuring sufficient storage is a highly desirable aim.

Full Text: Support the unit size guidance to be the same for affordable and private housing. The distinction between the two sectors is being eroded in the sense that people wanting affordable housing will increasingly have to live in private housing due to the shortage of the former. Private housing should therefore meet minimum space standards to ensure that it provides a suitable long term home meeting a range of household needs and expectations. The proposed policy is not over-prescriptive about how most of the space is used inside the dwelling.

Ensuring sufficient storage is a highly desirable aim.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 21273 - 2124 - Option I.1 Minimum Internal Space Standards for Residential Development - None

21273 Object

I. Residential Space Standards

Option I.1 Minimum Internal Space Standards for Residential Development

Respondent: **Januarys (Mr Justin Bainton) [2124]**

Agent: **Januarys (Mr Justin Bainton) [2124]**

Summary: Under Option I.1 the minimum sizes are high and this will potentially have the effect of not being able to utilize space efficiently within conversion or provide a balance of accommodation on new build. The unit sizes as suggested a minimum are out of kilter with the market requirements.

Full Text: Januarys fully endorse the need to provide good quality residential accommodation whether it be for the private sector or affordable housing, however I am concerned if the planning system becomes too prescriptive as this will not be able to take into account the different commercial needs within specific locations. Under Option I.1 the minimum sizes are high and this will potentially have the effect of not being able to utilize space efficiently within conversion or provide a balance of accommodation on new build. The unit sizes as suggested a minimum are out of kilter with the market requirements. Many of the occupiers within Cambridge are relatively transient due to the nature of contracts with the University and courses, whilst the size of accommodation might be small, they have good access to communal facilities within the colleges and the city in general. If the minimum size of unit is forced up, in some circumstances this will have a direct result of the overall numbers of units available on the scheme due to the physical constraints and there may well be instances where the number of units are therefore reduced and I question whether this is necessarily putting the land to best use. In our opinion it is the quality of design, fixtures, fittings and furniture that play the major part in providing good amenity to occupiers, and it is not appropriate to set standards with no little appreciation of the market requirements. It site must be assessed on its own merits and whilst it is reasonable to regard the future amenity of occupiers, and this could possibly informed by guidance, to impose a specific policy to seek to control development in such a way without appreciation of the wider site context and the balance of accommodation within any given scheme is in our view the wrong approach.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21342 - 3809 - Option I.1 Minimum Internal Space Standards for Residential Development - None

21342 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Option I.1 Minimum Internal Space Standards for Residential Development

Respondent: **Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Mr Terence Gilbert) [3809]**

Agent: N/A

Summary: Our houses are said to be the smallest in Europe. While there are reasons for this - cost and land scarcity - it is important to try to rectify it, for example by encouraging 3-storey houses. The space allocations in Option I.2 are too small to ensure reasonable living conditions, especially for families with children.

Full Text: Our houses are said to be the smallest in Europe. While there are reasons for this - cost and land scarcity - it is important to try to rectify it, for example by encouraging 3-storey houses. The space allocations in Option I.2 are too small to ensure reasonable living conditions, especially for families with children.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 22307 - 4016 - Option I.1 Minimum Internal Space Standards for Residential Development - None

22307 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Option I.1 Minimum Internal Space Standards for Residential Development

Respondent: **Robin Heydon [4016]**

Agent: N/A

Summary: What about 3 storey, 4 bedroom houses? What about 4 storey houses?

Full Text: What about 3 storey, 4 bedroom houses? What about 4 storey houses?

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 22864 - 4053 - Option I.1 Minimum Internal Space Standards for Residential Development - None

22864 Object

I. Residential Space Standards

Option I.1 Minimum Internal Space Standards for Residential Development

Respondent: Grosvenor Developments//Wrenbridge Ltd [4053] Agent: Savills (Mr Colin Campbell) [1299]

Summary: Increasing the size of homes will necessarily increase build costs. The value of a dwelling takes its reference from the existing built stock and comparable new dwellings. If sizes rise, then the relevant properties will move up the value chain and that 2 and 3 bed properties in particular built to larger space standards are likely to quickly fall outside the affordability levels of first and second time buyers. The proposals are likely to exacerbate affordability problems. The Council should be looking for ways to reduce costs, not to increase them.

Full Text: We do not consider that there is case for space standards for market and intermediate market homes. Those able to afford to buy or rent in the open market can exercise choice in terms of the balance between standards, space, affordability and location.

Evidence from the HBF shows that whilst dwelling sizes may be smaller in the UK, the average occupancy level of new housing within the UK is amongst the lowest in Europe.

The issue of affordability is closely related to standards. Increasing the size of homes will necessarily increase build costs. The value of a dwelling takes its reference from the existing built stock and comparable new dwellings. It follows that if sizes rise, then the relevant properties will move up the value chain and that 2 and 3 bed properties in particular built to larger space standards are likely to quickly fall outside the affordability levels of first and second time buyers. The proposals are likely to increase build cost and hence value of properties and exacerbate affordability problems. The Council should be looking for ways to reduce costs, not to increase them.

If the Increase in cost were passed onto developers of homes, that will affect the viability of schemes and the ability of developers to deliver affordable homes and community facilities.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 21275 - 2124 - Option I.2 Minimum Internal Space Standards for Residential Development (Range of Unit Sizes) - None

21275 Object

I. Residential Space Standards

Option I.2 Minimum Internal Space Standards for Residential Development (Range of Unit Sizes)

Respondent: Januarys (Mr Justin Bainton) [2124] Agent: Januarys (Mr Justin Bainton) [2124]

Summary: Having a range is a more sensible approach compared to Option I.1, and the unit sizes are more realistic. However, in our opinion it is the quality of design, fixtures, fittings and furniture that play the major part in providing good amenity to occupiers, and it is not appropriate to set standards with no little appreciation of the market requirements. To impose a specific policy to seek to control development in such a way without appreciation of the wider site context and the balance of accommodation within any given scheme is in our view the wrong approach.

Full Text: Having a range is a more sensible approach compared to Option I.1, and the unit sizes are more realistic. However, in our opinion it is the quality of design, fixtures, fittings and furniture that play the major part in providing good amenity to occupiers, and it is not appropriate to set standards with no little appreciation of the market requirements. A site must be assessed on its own merits and whilst it is reasonable to regard the future amenity of occupiers, and this could possibly be informed by guidance, to impose a specific policy to seek to control development in such a way without appreciation of the wider site context and the balance of accommodation within any given scheme is in our view the wrong approach.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 21797 - 3880 - Option I.2 Minimum Internal Space Standards for Residential Development (Range of Unit Sizes) - None

21797 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Option I.2 Minimum Internal Space Standards for Residential Development (Range of Unit Sizes)

Respondent: RAON (Mr Andrew Tucker) [3880]

Agent: N/A

Summary: RAON prefers option 1.2, which is less restrictive and will therefore give more scope to design buildings that are fit for a wide range of purposes and sites.

Full Text: RAON prefers option 1.2, which is less restrictive and will therefore give more scope to design buildings that are fit for a wide range of purposes and sites.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 22869 - 4053 - Option I.2 Minimum Internal Space Standards for Residential Development (Range of Unit Sizes) - None

22869 Object

I. Residential Space Standards

Option I.2 Minimum Internal Space Standards for Residential Development (Range of Unit Sizes)

Respondent: Grosvenor Developments//Wrenbridge Ltd [4053]

Agent: Savills (Mr Colin Campbell) [1299]

Summary: Increasing the size of homes will necessarily increase build costs. The value of a dwelling takes its reference from the existing built stock and comparable new dwellings. If sizes rise, then the relevant properties will move up the value chain and that 2 and 3 bed properties in particular built to larger space standards are likely to quickly fall outside the affordability levels of first and second time buyers. The proposals are likely to exacerbate affordability problems. The Council should be looking for ways to reduce costs, not to increase them.

Full Text: We do not consider that there is case for space standards for market and intermediate market homes. Those able to afford to buy or rent in the open market can exercise choice in terms of the balance between standards, space, affordability and location.

Evidence from the HBF shows that whilst dwelling sizes may be smaller in the UK, the average occupancy level of new housing within the UK is amongst the lowest in Europe.

The issue of affordability is closely related to standards. Increasing the size of homes will necessarily increase build costs. The value of a dwelling takes its reference from the existing built stock and comparable new dwellings. It follows that if sizes rise, then the relevant properties will move up the value chain and that 2 and 3 bed properties in particular built to larger space standards are likely to quickly fall outside the affordability levels of first and second time buyers. The proposals are likely to increase build cost and hence value of properties and exacerbate affordability problems. The Council should be looking for ways to reduce costs, not to increase them.

If the Increase in cost were passed onto developers of homes, that will affect the viability of schemes and the ability of developers to deliver affordable homes and community facilities.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 19569 - 1384 - Question I.1 - None

19569 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.1

Respondent: Rustat Neighborhood Association (Mr Roger Crabtree) [1384]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We prefer Option I1. It is better to be definitive on minimum standards than give developers a range to choose from. Their need to maximise returns would suggest they would tend to apply the lower end of a range thus being able to fit slightly more dwellings into a given development. Having a clearly defined minimum, takes one

Full Text: We prefer Option I1. It is better to be definitive on minimum standards than give developers a range to choose from. Their need to maximise returns would suggest they would tend to apply the lower end of a range thus being able to fit slightly more dwellings into a given development. Having a clearly defined minimum, takes one

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 19570 - 1384 - Question I.1 - None

19570 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.1

Respondent: Rustat Neighborhood Association (Mr Roger Crabtree) [1384]

Agent: N/A

Summary: we support option I1. It is better to have a clearly defined minimum. Offered a range, we believe developers would naturally tend towards the lower end of that range as their aim has to be to maximise returns and using the low end of the range they could well squeeze more dwellings into a given development site. Having an undisputable minimum size would simplify negotiations

Full Text: we support option I1. It is better to have a clearly defined minimum. Offered a range, we believe developers would naturally tend towards the lower end of that range as their aim has to be to maximise returns and using the low end of the range they could well squeeze more dwellings into a given development site. Having an undisputable minimum size would simplify negotiations

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 20106 - 1376 - Question I.1 - None

20106 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.1

Respondent: allan Brigham [1376]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Option 1.1

Full Text: Option 1.1

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

C - 21091 - 1863 - Question I.1 - None

21091 Comment

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.1

Respondent: Heather Coleman [1863]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Option 1 - most new build houses I have visited have felt like rabbit hutches.

Full Text: Option 1 - most new build houses I have visited have felt like rabbit hutches.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 21144 - 2304 - Question I.1 - None

21144 Comment

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.1

Respondent: PSRA Committee (Cornelis van Rijsbergen) [2304] Agent: N/A

Summary: It would be better to exceed national space standards if funds are available.

Full Text: It would be better to exceed national space standards if funds are available.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 21181 - 1904 - Question I.1 - None

21181 Comment

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.1

Respondent: The I&O Working Group of Windsor Road Residents' Association (The Secretary) [1904] Agent: N/A

Summary: We support option I.1 We can't see the point of a range (as in option I.2) when what is being stated is a 'minimum', which is surely a fixed point.

Full Text: We support option I.1 We can't see the point of a range (as in option I.2) when what is being stated is a 'minimum', which is surely a fixed point.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 21343 - 3809 - Question I.1 - None

21343 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.1

Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Mr Terence Gilbert) [3809] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: Our houses are said to be the smallest in Europe. While there are reasons for this - cost and land scarcity - it is important to try to rectify it, for example by encouraging 3-storey houses. The space allocations in Option I.2 are too small to ensure reasonable living conditions, especially for families with children.

Full Text: Our houses are said to be the smallest in Europe. While there are reasons for this - cost and land scarcity - it is important to try to rectify it, for example by encouraging 3-storey houses. The space allocations in Option I.2 are too small to ensure reasonable living conditions, especially for families with children.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21366 - 1380 - Question I.1 - None

21366 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.1

Respondent: Trumpington Residents Association (Mr Andrew Roberts) [1380] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: The Trumpington Residents' Association supports the need for a policy on minimum residential unit sizes. We support option I.1 based on the London Plan, on the basis that this will provide slightly more space than option I.2 and could be applied equally to private and affordable homes.

Full Text: The Trumpington Residents' Association supports the need for a policy on minimum residential unit sizes. We support option I.1 based on the London Plan, on the basis that this will provide slightly more space than option I.2 and could be applied equally to private and affordable homes.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 21460 - 3864 - Question I.1 - None

21460 Comment

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.1

Respondent: peter cutmore [3864] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: design layout is the more important than providing minimum standards

Full Text: design layout is the more important than providing minimum standards

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 21734 - 3775 - Question I.1 - None

21734 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.1

Respondent: RICHMOND ROAD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION (MR RICHARD FOOTITT) [3775] Agent: N/A

Summary: Support option 1.1 which provides more generous space standards - current standards applied locally are insufficient and provide little scope for adaptation.

Full Text: Support option 1.1 which provides more generous space standards - current standards applied locally are insufficient and provide little scope for adaptation.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21996 - 2166 - Question I.1 - None

21996 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.1

Respondent: Ms Lisa Buchholz [2166] Agent: N/A

Summary: Option I.1

Full Text: Option I.1

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 22314 - 3991 - Question I.1 - None

22314 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.1

Respondent: Richard Robertson [3991] Agent: N/A

Summary: The higher standards offered by Option 1 must be set. Otherwise the accommodation will be far too small.

Full Text: The higher standards offered by Option 1 must be set. Otherwise the accommodation will be far too small.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

C - 22430 - 4035 - Question I.1 - None

22430 Comment

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.1

Respondent: Dr Anne McConville [4035]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support first option with more generous space-people are getting taller/bigger and there is increasing demand for storage. Cambridge should build quality housing and not cause a downwards spiral. We are building houses for the future and for life-need to cope with different mobilities and an ageing population

Full Text: Support first option with more generous space-people are getting taller/bigger and there is increasing demand for storage. Cambridge should build quality housing and not cause a downwards spiral. We are building houses for the future and for life-need to cope with different mobilities and an ageing population

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 22487 - 2407 - Question I.1 - None

22487 Object

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.1

Respondent: Alison Power [2407]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I was keen to see minimum space standards and was even one of the people who suggested it previously. However, I feel that neither of the proposed options goes anywhere near far enough - existing social housing I know locally has houses that are 4 bedroom (each room to house a single person) and over 120sq metres in total (and each bedroom is more than 14 sq metres). Standards must be this as a minimum, otherwise people won't have a quality of life. If standards brought in, I worry that some developers will only seek to achieve the bare minimum.

Full Text: I was keen to see minimum space standards and was even one of the people who suggested it previously. However, I feel that neither of the proposed options goes anywhere near far enough - existing social housing I know locally has houses that are 4 bedroom (each room to house a single person) and over 120sq metres in total (and each bedroom is more than 14 sq metres). Standards must be this as a minimum, otherwise people won't have a quality of life. If standards brought in, I worry that some developers will only seek to achieve the bare minimum.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 22544 - 2670 - Question I.1 - None

22544 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.1

Respondent: Mr Michel Bond [2670]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Minimum space standards are a sensible requirement and Option I.1 provides an unambiguous lower level for new development. The Planning Committee can always grant specific permission if there is a special reason why the standard cannot be met, e.g. the development is in a listed building. If we are to move to whole of life approach to housing the space standard needs to be coupled with an access standard that allows the occupier to freely use a wheelchair to enter and move around the dwelling.

Full Text: Minimum space standards are a sensible requirement and Option I.1 provides an unambiguous lower level for new development. The Planning Committee can always grant specific permission if there is a special reason why the standard cannot be met, e.g. the development is in a listed building. If we are to move to whole of life approach to housing the space standard needs to be coupled with an access standard that allows the occupier to freely use a wheelchair to enter and move around the dwelling.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

C - 22922 - 3755 - Question I.1 - None

22922 Comment

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.1

Respondent: CHS Group (Nigel Howlett) [3755]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support option I.2 but set a minimum rather than a range; the bottom end of the range will become the standard and this should be set at a reasonable level in which case the range is not required. The larger space standards in I.1 would be more desirable but in the current financial climate, there is a trade-off between space/capital cost and rent affordability. Having homes which are large but not affordable to people on modest incomes is not helpful

Full Text: Support option I.2 but set a minimum rather than a range; the bottom end of the range will become the standard and this should be set at a reasonable level in which case the range is not required. The larger space standards in I.1 would be more desirable but in the current financial climate, there is a trade-off between space/capital cost and rent affordability. Having homes which are large but not affordable to people on modest incomes is not helpful

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 21092 - 1863 - Question I.2 - None

21092 Comment

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.2

Respondent: Heather Coleman [1863]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Size of kitchen. It is no wonder people buy ready meals if the kitchen is too small to allow storage of food and utensils and sufficient work space to actually allow the safe preparation of food.

Full Text: Size of kitchen. It is no wonder people buy ready meals if the kitchen is too small to allow storage of food and utensils and sufficient work space to actually allow the safe preparation of food.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 21182 - 1904 - Question I.2 - None

21182 Comment

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.2

Respondent: The I&O Working Group of Windsor Road Residents' Association (The Secretary) [1904]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Yes. Need to add requirement for bicycle shed or garage big enough to take same number of bicycles as BEDSPACES.

Full Text: Yes. Need to add requirement for bicycle shed or garage big enough to take same number of bicycles as BEDSPACES.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 21344 - 3809 - Question I.2 - None

21344 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.2

Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Mr Terence Gilbert) [3809] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: All new homes should be built to the Lifetime Homes Standard to enable 'general needs' housing to provide from the outset design solutions that meet the existing and changing needs of diverse households.

Full Text: All new homes should be built to the Lifetime Homes Standard to enable 'general needs' housing to provide from the outset design solutions that meet the existing and changing needs of diverse households.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 21798 - 3880 - Question I.2 - None

21798 Comment

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.2

Respondent: RAON (Mr Andrew Tucker) [3880] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: No

Full Text: No

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 22432 - 4035 - Question I.2 - None

22432 Comment

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.2

Respondent: Dr Anne McConville [4035] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: the need for sustainable housing across the lifecourse-so need to accommodate mobility aids for an ageing population and to recognise increased flexible working with the need for home office space (so cutting carbon of travel to work) and build in fast broad band and IT

Full Text: the need for sustainable housing across the lifecourse-so need to accommodate mobility aids for an ageing population and to recognise increased flexible working with the need for home office space (so cutting carbon of travel to work) and build in fast broad band and IT

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 22550 - 2670 - Question I.2 - None

22550 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.2

Respondent: Mr Michel Bond [2670]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The access to any new dwelling must be such as to allow any future occupant to enter and move freely about it in a wheelchair. New dwellings should also have power-points and light switches that are wheelchair accessible.

Full Text: The access to any new dwelling must be such as to allow any future occupant to enter and move freely about it in a wheelchair. New dwellings should also have power-points and light switches that are wheelchair accessible.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 23456 - 688 - Question I.2 - None

23456 Comment

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.2

Respondent: Cambridge Colleges' Bursars' Building and Planning Sub Committee (BBPSC) [688]

Agent: Savills (Mr William Lusty) [257]

Summary: It is not clear from this chapter about whether it is intended that these standards will apply to student accommodation development. Assuming a student accommodation unit could be described as a 'studio', under the options identified by the Council, a floorspace of 30 m² - 37 m² would be required. The Colleges have previously agreed student accommodation standards with the City Council as follows:

Full Text:

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21095 - 1863 - Option I.3 General Provision of External Amenity Space - None

21095 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Option I.3 General Provision of External Amenity Space

Respondent: Heather Coleman [1863]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Having lived in a first floor flat which had no balcony, and having tried to sit on the grass outside (by the parked cars) with my book on a nice sunny day and being stared at as if I was some kind of freak, I agree with the expectation of direct access to some kind of private amenity space. I also agree that there must be provision for cycle parking. I could not have owned a cycle in this flat as car parking was open car ports and there was nowhere else to park a cycle.

Full Text: Having lived in a first floor flat which had no balcony, and having tried to sit on the grass outside (by the parked cars) with my book on a nice sunny day and being stared at as if I was some kind of freak, I agree with the expectation of direct access to some kind of private amenity space. I also agree that there must be provision for cycle parking. I could not have owned a cycle in this flat as car parking was open car ports and there was nowhere else to park a cycle.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 21183 - 1904 - Option I.3 General Provision of External Amenity Space - None

21183 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Option I.3 General Provision of External Amenity Space

Respondent: The I&O Working Group of Windsor Road Residents' Association (The Secretary) [1904]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Excellent suggestions for quality of life of local residents.

Full Text: Excellent suggestions for quality of life of local residents.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21735 - 3775 - Option I.3 General Provision of External Amenity Space - None

21735 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Option I.3 General Provision of External Amenity Space

Respondent: RICHMOND ROAD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION (MR RICHARD FOOTITT) [3775]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Essential to allow some external space access to allow for flexibility.

Full Text: Essential to allow some external space access to allow for flexibility.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 22318 - 3991 - Option I.3 General Provision of External Amenity Space - None

22318 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Option I.3 General Provision of External Amenity Space

Respondent: Richard Robertson [3991]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support for these ideas. The quality of life is very important, not just the provision of homes.

Full Text: Support for these ideas. The quality of life is very important, not just the provision of homes.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 22488 - 2407 - Option I.3 General Provision of External Amenity Space - None

22488 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Option I.3 General Provision of External Amenity Space

Respondent: Alison Power [2407]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I agree there needs to be a minimum outdoor space standard. This will improve quality of life and mental health, which in turn will mean less people relying on Council services to support them. Everyone must have accessible outdoor private enclosed space.

Full Text: I agree there needs to be a minimum outdoor space standard. This will improve quality of life and mental health, which in turn will mean less people relying on Council services to support them. Everyone must have accessible outdoor private enclosed space.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 22553 - 2670 - Option I.3 General Provision of External Amenity Space - None

22553 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Option I.3 General Provision of External Amenity Space

Respondent: Mr Michel Bond [2670]

Agent: N/A

Summary: These appear to be sensible requirements.

Full Text: These appear to be sensible requirements.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 22929 - 3755 - Option I.3 General Provision of External Amenity Space - None

22929 Comment

I. Residential Space Standards

Option I.3 General Provision of External Amenity Space

Respondent: CHS Group (Nigel Howlett) [3755]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Suitable play space for children living in flats has become very important with the Council now requiring family size flats to be provided. It is hard to be more prescriptive about this space but we have looked at schemes recently which did not satisfactorily address this. Particular care needs to be taken on mixing car parking and access to family flats; if children do not have space to kick a ball around, they will use car parking space

Full Text: Suitable play space for children living in flats has become very important with the Council now requiring family size flats to be provided. It is hard to be more prescriptive about this space but we have looked at schemes recently which did not satisfactorily address this. Particular care needs to be taken on mixing car parking and access to family flats; if children do not have space to kick a ball around, they will use car parking space

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 18792 - 3049 - Question I.3 - None

18792 Object

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.3

Respondent: Dr Helen Way [3049]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Outdoor space should include areas for gardening - either for beauty or productivity - gardening has proven impact on physical and mental health of all ages.

Full Text: Outdoor space should include areas for gardening - either for beauty or productivity - gardening has proven impact on physical and mental health of all ages.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 20522 - 2230 - Question I.3 - None

20522 Comment

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.3

Respondent: Cherry Hinton Rd and rathmore Rd resident's Association (Mr Christopher Kington) [2230]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Not just space for bins and refuse etc but sensible allowance at pavement level outside the property on collection day so that public space is passable.

Full Text: Not just space for bins and refuse etc but sensible allowance at pavement level outside the property on collection day so that public space is passable.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21345 - 3809 - Question I.3 - None

21345 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.3

Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Mr Terence Gilbert) [3809]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The challenges and opportunities of a promoting an inclusive society need to be addressed in the planning and design of neighbourhoods. It should be acknowledged that it is not just the homes, but also the neighbourhoods where we live that have a significant role in keeping us well and independent as we grow older. Therefore, in planning new and existing neighbourhoods a wide range of planning issues need to be balanced in order to plan and deliver 'lifetime neighbourhoods' that can meet the needs of all sections of a community now and in the future.

Full Text: Against the background of increasing longevity, the challenges and opportunities of a promoting an inclusive society need to be addressed in the planning and design of neighbourhoods. It should be acknowledged that it is not just the homes, but also the neighbourhoods where we live that have a significant role in keeping us well and independent as we grow older. Therefore, in planning new and existing neighbourhoods a wide range of planning issues need to be balanced in order to plan and deliver 'lifetime neighbourhoods' that can meet the needs of all sections of a community now and in the future. These include the importance of inclusive design in the provision of external amenity space. All developments must have ready public access to nearby green open space, playing fields to kick a ball around, children's play area, and allotments where residential units do not have gardens. Creating a vibrant thriving community involves much more than just building houses - local shops, café, pubs, meeting places, community rooms are all essential ingredients. Opportunities to meet neighbours and to combat loneliness are of prime importance.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 21367 - 1380 - Question I.3 - None

21367 Support

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.3

Respondent: Trumpington Residents Association (Mr Andrew Roberts) [1380] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: The Trumpington Residents' Association supports the need for a policy on external space and agrees with the concept of flexible criteria.

Full Text: The Trumpington Residents' Association supports the need for a policy on external space and agrees with the concept of flexible criteria.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 21799 - 3880 - Question I.3 - None

21799 Comment

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.3

Respondent: RAON (Mr Andrew Tucker) [3880] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: RAON does not agree with the increase in car spaces from 1 to 1.5 for 1-2 bedroom houses outside the Controlled Parking Zone; increasing the spaces will worsen Cambridge's already serious traffic problems. RAON agrees with the criteria based approach and with the standards being expressed as 'no more than'

Full Text: RAON does not agree with the increase in car spaces from 1 to 1.5 for 1-2 bedroom houses outside the Controlled Parking Zone; increasing the spaces will worsen Cambridge's already serious traffic problems. RAON agrees with the criteria based approach and with the standards being expressed as 'no more than'

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 22435 - 4035 - Question I.3 - None

22435 Comment

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.3

Respondent: Dr Anne McConville [4035] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: Garages cannot accommodate cars, bikes and bins, especially not in family homes. Separate secure cycle storage is needed, as is off-pavement storage for 3 wheelie bins per dwelling. Failure to plan for this blights recent developments eg Fairsford Place

Full Text: Garages cannot accommodate cars, bikes and bins, especially not in family homes. Separate secure cycle storage is needed, as is off-pavement storage for 3 wheelie bins per dwelling. Failure to plan for this blights recent developments eg Fairsford Place

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

C - 22489 - 2407 - Question I.3 - None

22489 Comment

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.3

Respondent: Alison Power [2407]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I note the Plan says "One bedroom dwellings would not be expected to provide space for children to play, due to the low likelihood of children occupying these units". I am confused by this, as I know many families and children living in one-bedroom flats in Cambridge, and who desperately need outdoor space. Until such time as our housing stops being overcrowded, one-bedroom flats must also provide outdoor space, which must include space for children to play.

Full Text: I note the Plan says "One bedroom dwellings would not be expected to provide space for children to play, due to the low likelihood of children occupying these units". I am confused by this, as I know many families and children living in one-bedroom flats in Cambridge, and who desperately need outdoor space. Until such time as our housing stops being overcrowded, one-bedroom flats must also provide outdoor space, which must include space for children to play.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 24182 - 2960 - Question I.3 - None

24182 Comment

I. Residential Space Standards

Question I.3

Respondent: Southacre, Latham and Chaucer Road Residents' Association (SOLACHRA) [2960]

Agent: Mr Ian Gaseltine [2757]

Summary: We are disappointed to note that there are no proposals for the height of developments. This is a subject which has been considered before and we thought that there had been a decision by the Council not to allow the construction of buildings which were out of keeping with their surrounding buildings, typically not more than 4 storeys high. This seems to have gone out of the window with the Le Marque building at the corner of Hills Road and Cherry Hinton Road which is 9 storeys high. These buildings are out of place with the overall scale of Cambridge. Policy to restrict this should be included in the Plan.

Full Text:

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 18832 - 3098 - J.1 - None

18832 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

J.1

Respondent: Mr Robert Heap [3098]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The allocation of a maximum of 1 car parking space makes no allowance for visitor parking. This leads to local on-street parking congestion. All car parking provision should include 10% in excess of 1 space per dwelling, to be designated for visitor parking.

Full Text: The allocation of a maximum of 1 car parking space makes no allowance for visitor parking. This leads to local on-street parking congestion. All car parking provision should include 10% in excess of 1 space per dwelling, to be designated for visitor parking.

Change To Plan: N/A

Appendix F: Section Nine – Policies 83, 84 and 85

Policy 83: Aviation Development

Aviation development at Cambridge Airport will only be supported where it would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment and on residential amenity.

Supporting text:

- 9.32 Cambridge Airport, operated by Marshall, lies within the administrative boundaries of both Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. The area within Cambridge comprises part of the runway and a number of hangars, whilst the terminal building is within South Cambridgeshire. The airport is a base for general aviation as well as aircraft repair.
- 9.33 Consideration needs to be given to airport activity and the approach that would apply to any future aviation development proposals coming forward at Cambridge Airport. This is to ensure that any development would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and residential amenity. Whilst airports have permitted development rights which mean that some types of development in connection with the provision of services and facilities do not need planning permission, other proposals do. These include the construction or extension of a runway, or new passenger terminal above 500m² or increasing the size of the existing building by 15% or more.
- 9.34 Any further aviation development proposals which fall within the scope of this policy will need to be carefully assessed, particularly in terms of impact on noise, air quality, landscape, nature conservation, transport and public safety. It is likely that any planning applications for major works will require an Environmental Impact Assessment, to assess the potential significant impacts of the development on the environment.

How the policy came about:

1. In preparing their local plans, local planning authorities are required to have regard to policies and advice issued by the Secretary of State, including the Aviation Policy Framework as relevant to a particular local authority area. The Aviation Policy Framework (March 2013) may also be a material consideration in planning decisions depending on the circumstances of a particular application.
2. Respondents to the Issues and Options consultation (Summer 2012) commented that the airport, for both employment and aviation reasons, was important to the economic success of the city. However, balancing this importance, respondents also commented on the impact of increased air

traffic on residential amenity, climate change, noise and air pollution, and biodiversity. In the sustainability appraisal which accompanied the Issues and Options report, it was reported that this option should help mitigate adverse impacts of development on the health and well-being of Cambridge residents and upon the environment and biodiversity. It was also noted that the economic effects of this policy approach were uncertain.

3. Land at Cambridge East was taken out of the Cambridge Green Belt in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and Cambridge East Area Action Plan 2008 for the development of a major new urban extension. This was dependent on the current operator relocating, something they were actively seeking to do at the time. In 2010, it became clear that the site operator could not find a new site to relocate to and they announced that they would remain at the Airport for the foreseeable future. This left the councils with decisions to be made as to how to plan for land at Cambridge East, with residential development across the wider site unlikely in the plan period.
4. In June 2012, Cambridge City Council consulted upon three broad options in the Issues and Options consultation as to how Cambridge East should be planned for. These were:
 - Retain the current allocation – this would keep the area as a housing allocation for a major new urban quarter. However, the full level of housing provision would not be relied upon in plans, as it would be unlikely to be developed. This approach would provide flexibility if development could occur in the plan period, although it would also create uncertainty, and residential delivery options elsewhere would still have to be explored.
 - Safeguard the land – this would keep the area as ‘safeguarded land’ that could be developed in the longer term, outside the plan period. This would allow a future review of the plan to consider the wider site again if circumstances change.
 - Return the land to the Green Belt – this would return the site in whole or in part to the Cambridge Green Belt, on the basis that development would not occur.
5. In reviewing the future options for this large site, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council have concluded that it is appropriate that this site remain out of the Green Belt and safeguarded as a strategic reserve of land that may be developed at a later date. There is also potential for residential development for a number of parcels of land while the airport remains on the site. Careful consideration of how the ongoing airport activities will interact with any new residential use will need to be made, to ensure that the new residences have an acceptable level of amenity, and that they do not impede on the ongoing use of the airport. In terms of how any development may impede on the ongoing use of the airport, it will be for the airport operators to demonstrate how the development does this.

Furthermore, any development that comes forward in advance of the wider site will have to be carefully planned such that it is capable of working both with and without the wider development.

Policy 84: Telecommunications

Planning permission will be granted for telecommunications development where it can be demonstrated that:

- a. the proposal does not cause significant and irremediable interference with other electrical equipment, air traffic services or instrumentation that is operated in the national interest;
- b. visual impact is minimised through design and location, with equipment sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate;
- c. pre-application consultation has been undertaken, particularly where a mast is to be installed near a school or college, or within a statutory safeguarding zone surrounding an aerodrome or technical site. The relevant highways authority should be consulted where works are in the highway or in close proximity to the Cambridgeshire guided busway;
- d. applications for an addition to an existing mast or base station are accompanied by a statement that self-certifies that the cumulative exposure, when operational, will not exceed the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection's (ICNIRP) guidelines; and
- e. applications for a new mast or base station are accompanied by evidence that the applicant has explored the possibility of erecting antennas on an existing building, site, mast or other structure and a statement that self-certifies that, when operational, International Commission guidelines will be met.

Supporting text:

- 9.35 New communications technology is continually developing and it is important that residents and businesses have the best access to new technology, making the most of the resulting implications of lifestyle changes, such as reducing the need to travel. It is important that the council supports the growth of telecommunications systems while keeping the environmental impact to a minimum. The National Planning Policy Framework supports this approach, noting that sites for telecommunications should be kept to a minimum consistent with the efficient operation of the network. Existing sites should be used where possible and where new sites are required their design should be sympathetic to context.

How the policy came about:

6. New communications technology is continually developing and it is important that residents and businesses have the best access to new technology. It is important that the Council supports the growth of telecommunications systems while keeping the environmental impact to a minimum. The National Planning Policy Framework supports this aspiration (paragraphs 42 – 46). The

Interim Sustainability Appraisal of the Issues and Options Report (2012) noted that a criteria based policy for the siting, design, appearance, and impact mitigation of telecommunication developments may result in mitigating concerns regarding visual, health and landscape impact concerns. The proposed criteria should also help address issues relating to the quality of the built environment, open spaces and conservation areas across the city.

7. Responses to the Issues and Options consultation were generally supportive of the development of a telecommunications policy, with some suggested additions to the criteria contained within the policy. There was one suggestion that a tighter definition than 'significant interference' should be used. In response to this, the wording of the policy has been changed to 'significant and irremediable interference' to reflect the wording in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 44). Reference to consultation with the relevant highways authority where works are in the highway or close to the Cambridgeshire guided busway has also been added. A separate policy dealing with high speed digital infrastructure will also be added to the local plan.
8. The aim of this policy is to guide and support telecommunications development while keeping the environmental impact to a minimum. While the council is aware of public concerns regarding the health impacts of telecommunications development, the National Planning Policy Framework sets out that it is not the role of local planning authorities to consider further health aspects if a proposal meets the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines for public exposure.

Policy 85: Infrastructure Delivery, Planning Obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy

Permission will only be granted if it can be demonstrated that there is, or will be, sufficient infrastructure capacity to support and meet all the requirements arising from the new development. Where existing infrastructure will be placed under strain due to the impact of new development, improvements to existing infrastructure or compensatory provision should be made such that an appropriate level of infrastructure is maintained.

Infrastructure provision will reflect the council's priorities for infrastructure set out in the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Delivery Study and its successor documents. The council will work positively with neighbouring authorities and Cambridgeshire County Council on infrastructure issues including the introduction of the Cambridge Community Infrastructure Levy. The council is committed to introducing Community Infrastructure Levy in 2014. Until the introduction of Community Infrastructure Levy, and to a lesser degree thereafter, the council will continue to use planning obligations under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to ensure developer contributions towards necessary infrastructure are maximised.

Planning permission for new developments will only be supported/permitted where there are suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision and phasing of infrastructure, services and facilities necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms.

Planning obligations and/or a future Community Infrastructure Levy could be required for the following:

- a. transport infrastructure;
- b. public transport;
- c. drainage and flood protection;
- d. waste recycling facilities;
- e. education;
- f. health care;
- g. leisure and recreation facilities;
- h. community and social facilities;
- i. cultural facilities, including public art;
- j. emergency services;
- k. green infrastructure;
- l. open space; and
- m. Affordable Housing.

The above list is not exhaustive and there may be scope for requiring developer contributions towards a wider range of infrastructure measures.

Contributions could also be used to secure ongoing maintenance where this is deemed appropriate.

The introduction of Community Infrastructure Levy in 2014 will be accompanied by a review of the council's guidance on planning obligations, and will ensure that the range and level of contributions towards local infrastructure needs are kept up to date and maximised in the context of emerging Community Infrastructure Levy practice and guidance.

Supporting text:

Infrastructure Provision

- 9.36 The delivery of new or improved infrastructure and services to support new development in a timely and phased manner will be an important element in ensuring the appropriate and sustainable implementation of new growth in Cambridge and its sub-region. It will be important to ensure that certain infrastructure is provided ahead of development to safeguard against adverse impacts. To facilitate this, it is important that the local planning authority understands the infrastructure needs and costs early on as part of plan making.
- 9.37 Planning for infrastructure provision has been, and continues to be, an ongoing process through the development of Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council Infrastructure Delivery Study (IDS) and partnership working with stakeholders. The IDS has been produced in collaboration with South Cambridgeshire District Council. The IDS examines three infrastructure categories: physical (transport, energy, water and drainage, waste), social (education, health care, leisure and recreation, community and social and emergency services) and green (open space). The IDS includes an infrastructure delivery schedule; the intention is to update the IDS and infrastructure delivery schedule on a regular basis.
- 9.38 The Infrastructure Delivery Study provides an overview of infrastructure required to support new development, an overview of who is responsible for delivery and a broad indication of phasing, costs and funding mechanisms. It will act as a focus for delivery but should not be seen as a detailed investment programme.
- 9.39 In order to aid prioritisation of delivery, the council has categorised the prioritisation of infrastructure in the IDS as critical, necessary and desirable.

Critical Infrastructure

- 9.40 Critical and necessary infrastructure are essential to support development, but the differing factor between them is the timing of their delivery. Critical infrastructure is largely physical and enabling infrastructure, which must be

delivered on time to allow proposed development to proceed. Failure to provide critical infrastructure could result in significant delays to the delivery of development.

Necessary Infrastructure

- 9.41 This infrastructure is required if development is to be achieved in a timely and sustainable manner. Infrastructure in this category is unlikely to prevent physical development in the short term, however failure to invest could lead to delays in the medium term. The most common type of necessary infrastructure is social and community infrastructure such as schools, health facilities and children’s play space. The category has the potential to allow infrastructure prioritisation if funding shortfalls occur.

Desirable Infrastructure

- 9.42 This category has been included so more aspirational schemes to support sustainable development could be included within the IDS.

Funding Infrastructure and services

- 9.43 Infrastructure provision will be funded through a number of sources. Mainstream funding, such as council capital programmes, service providers investment programmes, and Government grant, will continue to provide for the bulk of infrastructure spending. However, other initiatives such as planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy can provide a substantial resource for locally determined priorities.

- 9.44 As part of planning for infrastructure provision, the council needs to consider the role that developers can play in helping to provide the physical, social and green infrastructure that is required as a result of new growth. When planning permission is granted for new development, the council can seek contributions from developers towards a range of infrastructure, for example, school places, affordable housing and open spaces.

- 9.45 Infrastructure funded by the development industry will occur either through legal agreements known as ‘planning obligations’ or the emerging Community Infrastructure Levy, a tariff based charge.

- 9.46 Planning obligations (Section 106 Agreements or S106) are voluntary legal obligations attached to planning applications. A local planning authority normally requests a developer to enter into an obligation to mitigate the impacts of the development being proposed. Any S106 planning obligation must be:

- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- directly related to the development; and

- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development.
- 9.47 The Community Infrastructure Levy will replace planning obligations for many forms of infrastructure, although planning obligations can still be used for site-specific mitigation measures and for affordable housing provision. The Government considers that the Community Infrastructure Levy is a more transparent and simple method of collecting funds for infrastructure to support development than the current system of planning obligations.
- 9.48 The Community Infrastructure Levy takes the form of a standardised charge applied per square metre of new development. Community Infrastructure Levy will allow the council to raise money to support development and the money raised through this charge will assist the funding of a wide range of infrastructure projects needed as a result of development. Community Infrastructure Levy rates will be set out in a charging schedule. The infrastructure to be funded by Community Infrastructure Levy will be defined alongside the Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule in something known as a Regulation 123 list. The Infrastructure Delivery Schedule, which identifies a list of critical, necessary and desirable infrastructure, will form the starting point for the Regulation 123 list.
- 9.49 The council needs to strike a balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential effect of the levy upon the economic viability of development. A viability assessment has been undertaken by the council which will inform the charging schedule and ultimately the amount of Community Infrastructure Levy to be charged. The council seeks to ensure that a Community Infrastructure Levy charge is identified that is of a sufficient level to provide the infrastructure that is required, but which is not too onerous as to make development unviable.
- 9.50 A capped 15% proportion of Community Infrastructure Levy revenue will need to be spent on locally determined infrastructure in areas where development takes place. This will rise to 25% for those areas with an adopted neighbourhood plan in place.
- 9.51 The council will work with South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council to ensure that development is supported by the right infrastructure and that contributions towards infrastructure are collected on an equitable basis.
- 9.52 With the introduction of Community Infrastructure Levy, S106 Agreements will only be used in restricted circumstances. A Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document will be prepared about the use of S106 Agreements in light of Community Infrastructure Levy approval.

How the policy came about:

9. It is important that the council ensures the delivery of new or improved infrastructure to support development in a timely and phased manner. This will be an important element in ensuring the appropriate and sustainable implementation of new growth. As part of planning for infrastructure provision the council needs to consider the role that developers can play in helping to provide infrastructure to support growth.
10. Paragraph 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires local planning authorities to plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area.
11. Paragraph 156 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that Local Plans include policies to deliver:
 - The provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat); and
 - The provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities.
12. Planning for infrastructure provision has been an ongoing process through the development of an Infrastructure Delivery Study (IDS), first commissioned in 2009, and partnership working with stakeholders. The IDS has been produced in collaboration with South Cambridgeshire District Council and will form part of the Council's case at submission and examination of the Local Plan.
13. Paragraph 21 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that in drawing up Local Plans, local planning authorities should identify priority areas for the provision of infrastructure. The Infrastructure Delivery Study (IDS) will set out when and where infrastructure will need to be provided, the scale of funding needed to achieve this and potential sources of funding. The IDS will also identify infrastructure critical to the delivery of the Local Plan.
14. Traditionally, infrastructure funding has been secured from developers through legal agreements known as 'planning obligations.' Planning obligations (Section 106 Agreements or S106) are voluntary legal obligations attached to planning applications. This is the approach currently taken by the council and details of that approach are set out in the Cambridge City Council Planning Obligations SPD – March 2010.
15. More recently the Government has introduced the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The CIL was introduced in the Planning Act 2008 and put into force by the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended) on 6 April

2010. In order to adopt CIL the council needs prepare and adopt a CIL Charging Schedule. The council committed to taking a CIL forward in parallel with its Local Plan Review at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee on 22-03-2011. A six week consultation on the Cambridge CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule concluded on April 29th 2013. The CIL is intended to supplement (not replace) other funding streams. A number of contributions will still be acquired through S.106 Planning Obligations. These include affordable housing requirements and site specific on site infrastructure necessary to make a development acceptable in planning terms.

16. Paragraph 173 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that the sites and scale of development identified in the Local Plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. It states that:

‘In order to ensure viability, the costs of any requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing landowner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.’

17. The potential impacts of this policy on viability have been taken into account in a suite of viability documents produced on behalf of the council. These are The Cambridge City Council Local Plan – Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment; The Cambridge City Council Local Plan - SHLAA and Potential Site Allocations High Level Viability Assessment; and, the Cambridge City Council Local Plan – Student Housing Affordable Housing Study (Summer 2013).
18. At Issues and Options the majority of respondents were in favour of this policy option to continue to seek funding from developers for infrastructure requirements related to new developments. Some concerns were raised about the monitoring and enforcement of this policy and also that there is a lack of transparency with how S.106 monies are collected and spent.
19. The Interim Sustainability Appraisal of the Issues and Options Report (2012) noted that this policy option is likely to contribute to positive effects across multiple sustainability topics and thematic areas. Health, leisure and community facilities can contribute to wellbeing. Improvements to water, and flood protection infrastructure can also bring benefits. Green infrastructure and open spaces provision could enhance biodiversity. Furthermore this option should help maintain cultural facilities and improve the quality of the open and built environment citywide. The sustainability benefits of this option on the transport and renewable energy sustainability topics will depend on the nature of the infrastructure and services provided and therefore it is difficult to appraise them with any certainty at this stage.

7167 Object

Summary: A policy supportive of employment and aviation will help enhance the economic growth of the Cambridge area. The location is sustainable and particularly well served by public transport. Convenient access by air is important to global companies already in Cambridge, and will be a positive factor to attract further similar investment. Marshall is an important employer, in its own right.

12887 Object

Summary: Whilst the airport provides a very important facility in the City, and is an important employer in its own right, I would be concerned about any development that resulted in increased air traffic - we have already had a large and noticeable increase in air traffic in Romsey in recent years. We certainly do not want to lose Marshalls from the City, but any development must be considered with care, for the above reason.

14915 Object

Summary: Development of the airport should be welcomed, not unreasonably restricted.

15295 Object

Summary: Cambridge Airport is here to stay and its development should be supported not opposed. The policy proposal is woolly and not helpful. There is enough environmental legislation and regulatory hoops for any airport development to go through without adding gratuitous ones.

9594 Support

Summary: This seems sensible.

11631 Support

Summary: The air port is located close to housing and increase aviation levels can lead to noise pollution

12179 Support

Summary: Aviation noise is a major pollutant.

12583 Support

Summary: Marshall's is tolerable at present, but it would be bad news if it grew and flights of larger planes increased. After all, the flight paths cross the city.

13026 Support

Summary: I strongly support this proposal. Whilst some aviation development may be beneficial, residential amenities need to be safeguarded. This airport is located close to quite a number of densely populated areas, thus any development could have a significant impact on Cambridge residents.

13320 Support

Summary: CCF opposes airport expansion across the UK for its impact on the global climate. Significant UK expansion in aviation is impossible if we are to meet the 2008 Climate Change Act targets. We strongly oppose any expansion of Cambridge Airport and urge the Council to have a policy preventing this. The impact on the residential areas surrounding the airport would be significant.

A policy in this area is vital in the event that Cambridge Airport does seek to expand. The wider environmental impacts must be fully taken into account.

13430 Support

Summary: I support the policy not to permit aviation development at Cambridge airport. Intensification of activity at the airport would have an adverse impact on residents living nearby.

14357 Support

Summary: Agree. The airport is not in a suitable place for increased activity

14373 Support

Summary: I think the proposal is too restrictive and any adverse effect on the environment and residential amenity should be balanced against economic and wider benefits.

14814 Support

Summary: Support

16787 Support

Summary: It is important that the amount and size of traffic at Cambridge Airport is not permitted to increase substantially.

17796 Support

Summary: The SA identifies that the options relating to promoting and delivering sustainable transport and infrastructure are likely to contribute positively to sustainability issues. Option 198 Cambridge Airport - Aviation development is also likely to help minimise impacts on the local natural environment and biodiversity.

13557 Object

Summary: no need for a specific policy at this time.

18201 Object

Summary: No - seems current policy is sufficient

8511 Support

Summary: yes

8990 Support

Summary: Yes

10990 Support

Summary: Too many flights of large jets would have an extremely detrimental effect

11962 Support

Summary: Yes and I support this option.

13629 Support

Summary: Broadly support a policy along existing lines.

14344 Support

Summary: Yes

14360 Support

Summary: Yes

15793 Support

Summary: Yes there needs to be a policy as a lot can change in the years covered by the Local Plan.

16641 Support

Summary: Yes.

13636 Object

Summary: While we support the need to consider both the environment and nearby residential amenity (most of our Residents Association members are under the Marshalls flight path), we must also consider the economic benefits to the city of a thriving local airport when considering any proposed expansion.

15794 Object

Summary: Option 198 seems rather vague. I believe specific reference could be made to air pollution (there are already considerable fumes in the area), noise pollution, airport opening hours, and frequency of use.

17035 Object

Summary: Cambridge Airport - growth of the engineering, manufacturing and aviation opportunities and also as an important regional airport to encourage inward investment and communications through improved transportation links.

8512 Support

Summary: I am appalled that Marshall's is going to start scheduled flights. Has the city forgotten the tremendous protest when a new terminal building was proposed? All of us living under the flight path suffer; residents off Mill Road, for example, suffer from the revving of engines. School teachers have to wait for noise to subside before they can continue their lessons. Surely Stansted is near enough for Cambridge residents.

9562 Support

Summary: Future national policy might work against local protectionism, and we also need support such an established employer.

10467 Support

Summary: Again this is neither support or objecting but making the comment that current flight options to Jersey and Verona for example help to provide local amenities without disruption to Cambridge and these should be encouraged. Aerobatics causes more disturbance than these commercial flights - do aerobatics above Cambridge country side bring in money?

11658 Support

Summary: The noise caused by aviation activity around Cambridge is a blight on the whole city. There are a large number of light aircraft flying over the city, and for anyone under the flight path the nuisance of these light aircraft is compounded by the noise of passenger jet aircraft.

**CHAPTER: 12 - Promoting and
Delivering Sustainable**

12.33

13693 Support

Summary: "Broadband" is not specific enough. The council should adopt a policy of requiring fibre optic to the premises to be installed in new developments; and should encourage its installation across the city to upgrade the existing infrastructure. The council needs to encourage a competitive market in provision of services over the infrastructure so that residents and businesses can obtain reasonably priced services under reasonable contract terms. The council's plans and strategy in this area need to be developed in much greater detail.

**CHAPTER: 12 - Promoting and
Delivering Sustainable**

12.35

16647 Support

Summary: Yes

**CHAPTER: 12 - Promoting and
Delivering Sustainable**

Option 199 - Telecommunications policy criteria based

14397 Object

Summary: support: We believe it is insufficient to state the "significant interference" should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference and real-world measures need to be included in the policy to remove uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

15734 Object

Summary: We believe it is insufficient to state that 'significant interference' should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference, and real-world measures need to be included in the policy to remove uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

16440 Object

Summary: We believe it is insufficient to state that 'significant interference' should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference, and real-world measures need to be included in the policy to remove uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

8991 Support

Summary: Yes

12584 Support

Summary: Common sense.

15296 Support

Summary: I support this approach as reasonable and proportionate.

16646 Support

Summary: Bullet point 4: agree that consultation should take place before installation near a school or college.

8992 Support

Summary: Yes

13560 Support

Summary: Yes

13642 Support

Summary: we support the need for a policy and the criteria set out seem adequate.

14346 Support

Summary: yes

14399 Support

Summary: We believe it is insufficient to state the "significant interference" should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference and real-world measures need to be included in the policy to remove uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

16643 Support

Summary: Yes, emphatically.

18204 Support

Summary: Yes - as suggested

18498 Support

Summary: Support

9526 Object

Summary: Yes all the hygiene factors are important, but the text misses the point that good provision of telecommunications infrastructure can have a major impact on transport network requirements

10468 Object

Summary: Again neither an objection or support but a question.

Should there not be somewhere a policy that limits the electromagnetic field intensities? I expect that we are no where near the health limit but a policy should exist to ensure that we do not get near health limits with electromagnetic hotspots are prohibited.

13689 Object

Summary:

The council should adopt a policy of requiring fibre optic to the premises to be installed in new developments; and should encourage its installation across the city.

The council needs to encourage a competitive market in provision of services over the infrastructure so that residents and businesses can obtain reasonably priced services under reasonable contract terms.

This would make the city attractive to those working in technology, boost the city's economy, and potentially reduce the amount of travel people need to undertake.

14401 Object

Summary: We believe it is insufficient to state the "significant interference" should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference and real-world measures need to be included in the policy to remove uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

15736 Object

Summary: We believe it is insufficient to state that 'significant interference' should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference, and real-world measures need to be included in the policy to remove uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

16442 Object

Summary: We believe it is insufficient to state that 'significant interference' should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference, and real-world measures need to be included in the policy to remove uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

18499 Object

Summary: Consultation should also include the Highway Authority where appropriate if works may be in the highway or near the guided busway, or a safeguarded line of a highway, and also the SuDs Approval Body in due course.

We would recommend the inclusion of a policy that requires new developments to make provision for communications / broadband infrastructure. New employment and residential development should be served by a high-quality digital infrastructure and a specific reference to the provision of ducting to industry standards should aid transparency and promote delivery. There are economic and social gains for doing so.

9563 Support

Summary: There should also be a bullet point forbidding masts/sites within an agreed distance (say 50 metres) from any residential property.

13562 Support

Summary: Favour a policy as outlined in Option 199.

16645 Support

Summary: Has the impact of existing masts been assessed locally?

14416 Support

Summary: We believe it is insufficient to state the "significant interference" should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference and real-world measures need to be included in the policy to remove uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

8995 Support

Summary: Essential to have robust for funding infrastructure.

9785 Object

Summary: The policy should also ensure Developer contributions to non-vehicular infrastructure should be encouraged, with links to the existing networks

15298 Object

Summary: It is easy to add to the cost of development by levying charges through infrastructure payments. In general major developments should meet their own infrastructure needs and this provision should be completed before the overall scheme is complete, perhaps withholding consent for 20% of the development might encourage early delivery.
I would stress that these costs add directly to the costs of housing inc Cambridge and need to be fully justified and kept within limits.

8996 Support

Summary: These are essential requirements

12589 Support

Summary: Again perfectly reasonable to insist on this.

12761 Support

Summary: agree

13216 Support

Summary: We would support appropriate and relevant provision of infrastructure and services which is derived from demand created by new development. Improvements and provision for infrastructure would need to be proportionate and related to the scale of development proposed taking account of the developments own impact on local infrastructure whilst not providing infrastructure to make up for infrastructure not provided by existing development which generates demand but has not contributed financially to infrastructure provision.

14772 Support

Summary: We support the need for a policy in this respect and that developers should be required to support the provision of infrastructure.

15737 Support

Summary: We support the need for a policy in this respect and that developers should be required to support the provision of infrastructure.

16065 Support

Summary: This appears to be the basis for a necessary policy offering clear conditions relating to development.

16443 Support

Summary: We support the need for a policy in this respect and that developers should be required to support the provision of infrastructure.

16649 Support

Summary: Support strongly. All these points are essential.

17799 Support

Summary: Option 201 Provision of infrastructure and services - green infrastructure and open spaces provision could enhance biodiversity and is therefore welcomed.

13523 Object

Summary: Any policy should ensure that contributions from developers should only be sought where necessary to make a scheme acceptable in planning terms and should be fair and reasonable in both scale and kind.

The level of contributions sought should strike a balance between the need for funding and the impact on the viability of development.

17038 Object

Summary: The Plan should provide a realistic and deliverable strategy which identifies the key infrastructure constraints and highlights how any constraints will be overcome. This should be set out in a delivery and broader implementation plan.

Although planning for a 20 year period, it is essential that the development strategy can be delivered and implemented with reasonable confidence. In assessing development sites we would ask that the Council considers the changing circumstances of sites within the plan area and clearly understands any delivery constraints at both a site and the wider area.

7145 Support

Summary: Yes, I fully support Option 201

8514 Support

Summary: yes

8626 Support

Summary: Based on the experience with the agreed developments in the Southern Fringe, the Trumpington Residents' Association supports Option 201 and the need for a policy to require developers to support the provision of infrastructure.

8997 Support

Summary: yes

10315 Support

Summary: All new developments need infrastructure and services.

10634 Support

Summary: The Wildlife Trust supports such a policy as planning obligations / CIL are one of a number of essential sources of funding to help deliver the 2011 Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy, the 2006 Cambridge Nature Conservation Strategy and the policies within the Local Plan aimed at increasing quality of life for new and existing residents of the city.

13572 Support

Summary: Option 201 to provide adequate cover.

13646 Support

Summary: we support the need for a policy along the lines proposed

14774 Support

Summary: Yes. We support the need for a policy in this respect and that developers should be required to support the provision of infrastructure.

15045 Support

Summary: - Yes. We support the concept of CIL/S106, and it is important to ensure that policies are robust so that they cannot be challenged by developers.

- We do not accept the view of some that such funds constitute a 'bribe'. New developments usually generate traffic and other problems, which create costs to existing users; it is not acceptable for a developer to offload these externalities onto the taxpayer, and so the CIL/S106 payments ensure that these costs are properly accounted for.

- There is a real need to keep Area Corridor Plans updated.

15133 Support

Summary: Yes, support.

15738 Support

Summary: We support the need for a policy in this respect and that developers should be required to support the provision of infrastructure.

16444 Support

Summary: We support the need for a policy in this respect and that developers should be required to support the provision of infrastructure.

16650 Support

Summary: Yes.

18209 Support

Summary: Yes - as suggested

18500 Support

Summary: The County Council supports in principle a policy for the provision of infrastructure and services. The County Council notes that the list given in Option 201 "is not exhaustive and there may be scope for requiring contributions towards a wider range of infrastructure measures".

18539 Support

Summary: Based on the experience with the agreed developments in the Southern Fringe, we support Option 201 and the need for a policy to require developers to support the provision of infrastructure.

CHAPTER: 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable

Question 12.39

8998 Object

Summary: There is no statement about how this policy will be monitored and enforced

12888 Object

Summary: Yes we should ask for developer contributions towards various costs, however I think that exceptions should be made for housing co-operatives and community land trusts. This is because housing co-operatives usually have little money and in any case are not-for-profit. Also, the benefits they provide are usually greater than any perceived initial impact e.g. a housing co-operative would usually seek to develop in a way that is environmentally friendly, innovative, uses renewable and sustainable energy (e.g. solar panels, carbon neutrality) and favours green transport over car-travel.

13652 Object

Summary: a continuing complaint from resident associations is the lack of information and transparency of the amount and use of S106 moneys from developments. The City Council should, in our view, develop a policy on how such information should best be available and communicated

15047 Object

Summary: There is currently a massive democratic deficit with regards to how S106 moneys are spent. For instance, the Arbury Park development resulted in very regressive changes to King's Hedges Road that had no democratic input. By contrast, the Traffic Management Area Joint Committee can easily spend half an hour on discussing a relatively small matter such as single parking space, and it only reaches that committee because the funding is from public funds. There is a high-priority need to ensure both publicly- and privately- funded changes which affect the public highway are subject to the same levels of democratic scrutiny.

15797 Object

Summary: The democratically elected parts of the council must have more control over how such monies from developers are spent. At present, there is insufficient democratic oversight of the spending of private money from developers.

18501 Object

Summary: The services included in Option 201 is not exhaustive, library services should be included because of funding and their use as hubs.
The need for the new HRCs is generally through allocations made in the adopted Minerals and Waste SSP Plan 2012. The Inspector advised that the 3 planning authorities concerned should work together to identify a suitable site for a new HRC to serve Cambridge South.

The County Council considers that 1.30 should still acknowledge the role waste will play in emerging developments, recognizing the district role as collection authority and the County's role as disposal authority.

9564 Support

Summary: Infrastructure must be in place before any of the development is occupied, although phasing may be appropriate for larger developments.

CHAPTER: 14 - Appendices

Appendix E: Figure E.1 Air Quality Management Area

17687 Object

Summary: I note from Appendix E that I live in a "likely to exceed" area. The traffic on this road is very likely to increase with the Science Park Station.

CHAPTER: 14 - Appendices

Appendix F: Criteria for Protecting Open Spaces

9206 Object

Summary: Response to Appendix F as no other opportunity given.
In general we support these criteria, namely a-c for environmental importance and b-e for recreational importance. However, it is unclear whether in order to satisfy any one of the 6 criteria it is necessary to fulfill all of its points with roman numbers.
We propose the following changes to the wording:
specify that "meeting the criterion" (page 341 lines 8-10; page 342 lines 1-3) does not necessarily mean meeting all the numbered points for that particular criterion.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix G: Employment Land Review Update 2013

Employment Land Review Update: Addendum

Analysis of demand for employment land, based on employment projections from EEFM

May 2013

Introduction

In April 2013, Cambridge City Council commissioned SQW to complete a short piece of work, the aim of which was to re-run the estimates of future demand for employment land in Cambridge City over the period 2011 to 2031. Previously, estimates had been derived as part of the **Employment Land Review Update** (completed in July 2012 for both Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire). However the City Council required that the re-run should use a different set of employment projections:

- the original study relied on a set of baseline projections prepared by Cambridge Econometrics using its Local Economy Forecasting Model (LEFM)
- the re-run was based on a set of baseline projections developed by Oxford Economics using the East of England Forecasting Model (EEFM).

Differences between EEFM and LEFM

Headline numbers

Both sets of projections were prepared at roughly the same time (in spring 2012) which ought to make them comparable (in terms of underlying macro-economic assumptions). In the original study, both sets of projections were analysed: LEFM in Annex A and EEFM in Annex B. However *it is important to note that the EEFM baseline projections were re-issued after the analytical work for the original study was completed. Therefore there are some differences between the data used in this paper (i.e. the re-issued numbers) and those that were reported in Annex B of the original report.*

In very headline terms, the table below summarises some of the principal metrics generated through these different sources.

Table 1: Headline comparison of employment estimates/projections ('000)

	LEFM 2012 (which provided the basis for our original report)	EEFM 2012 (as reported in our original report)	EEFM 2012 (as re-issued <i>and as used here</i>)
Cambridge City – employment 2001	101.8	95.5	95.5
Cambridge City – employment 2011	102.7	97.9	95.9
Cambridge City – employment 2021	108.5	117.3	111.3
Cambridge City – employment 2031	117.5	128.4	118.0
Growth: 2011-2031	14.8	30.5	22.1

Source: SQW

Two important points need to be taken from this summary table:

- first, the re-issued EEFM projections were more cautious than the original set which were reported in last year's report (i.e. 8,400 fewer jobs are projected in Cambridge City between 2011 and 2031)
- second, the re-issued EEFM projections are still a good deal more bullish than the LEFM baseline: the re-issued EEFM projections suggest 22,100 additional jobs whereas LEFM pointed to 14,800 over the period 2011-2031.

Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Codes

Another important difference between LEFM and EEFM concerns the manner in which sectoral employment data are presented – and this is very important in relation to estimates of demand for employment land. In short, at the time, LEFM relied on SIC 2003 whereas EEFM used SIC 2007.

Whilst on the face of it a technicality, there are in practice some substantial differences between these two taxonomies. Ideally, in re-running the model, the sectoral definitions would have been identical and hence the only difference between the two sets of numbers should have been those deriving from the projections. However this “pure” re-run proved impossible, for three different reasons:

- at the highest level in the SIC taxonomy (“Sections”) there is not a straightforward read-across between SIC 2003 and SIC 2007: some Sections have been disaggregated (so that there was one sector under SIC 2003 but three under SIC 2007) and one has been amalgamated (so that there were two under SIC 2003 but there is now one)
- even where the name of Sections appears consistent, the composition of some of the Sections has been changed at a lower level in the hierarchy (e.g. publishing has been moved from one Section to another)
- neither OE nor CE provide sectoral information in a sufficiently fine-grained form to map one classification onto the second.

These challenges were compounded by the fact that – in the context of an Employment Land Review – the sectoral distribution of employment is only a “means to an end” for it needs to be translated into a series of assumptions about the Use Classes (i.e. “*of the employment to be generated in Sector Y, what proportion is likely to be accommodated in B1a, B1b, B2, B8 and non-B sites/premises?*”).

In last year's study, we made some broad-brush assumptions about the allocation of sectors to Use Classes. Where the sectoral definitions in SIC 2003 and SIC 2007 are identical/similar, these assumptions have been carried forward. But where the sectoral definitions are different, new assumptions were clearly needed.

In order to inform these new assumptions, we worked through the detailed description of SIC 2007¹, and the component sectors within each Section, Group, Class and Sub-Class, and

¹ UK Standard Industrial Classification of Economic Activities, 2007: Structure and Explanatory Notes, ONS, 2009

then made a judgement. These judgements were calibrated in discussion with Cambridge City Council as part of this review. The outcomes from this process are summarised in Annex A.

Findings from the model re-run on the basis of EEFM projections

As set out in Chapter 2 of our 2012 Employment Land Review update, the process of deriving estimates of land requirements from employment forecasts involves three distinct “steps”. Each one of these relies on a number of underlying assumptions; and throughout, it is important to recognise that small changes in the assumptions can have an enormous impact on the overall findings.

Step 1: Consider projected employment by SIC sectors and the types of property occupied by these sectors

The first step is to apply judgements in terms of the proportion of jobs in each employment sector accommodated in property of different Use Classes. As far as possible, the assumptions within our Employment Land Review update were simply rolled forward in this context; where this was not possible (because of the transition from SIC 2003 to SIC 2007) new apportionment assumptions were applied (see Annex A).

The overall findings from this exercise are shown in the table below. This confirms the observation reported in Table 1: that the overall jobs growth projected by EEFM across Cambridge City is 22,100 (which is higher than both LEFM scenarios).

In addition:

- overall, the quantum of employment growth that will need to be accommodated within B-Use Class provision is estimated to be 8,800 jobs; this is higher than the estimates deriving from LEFM on either the baseline or policy-led scenario
- the distribution of employment growth by Use Class is really quite different from that estimated through LEFM: EEFM points to stronger growth for B1a and B1b-related employment but an absolute reduction in the number of jobs that might have been accommodated in B2 and B8 provision.

Table 2: Distribution of employment growth ('000 jobs) by Use Class, 2011-2031

Use Class	B1a	B1b	B2	B8	Non-B	(All)	All B	B as % of all
EEFM (2012)	7.0	2.7	-0.3	-0.6	13.3	22.1	8.8	40%
<i>LEFM comparison – Baseline</i>	3.8	1.6	0	0.3		14.7	5.7	39%
<i>LEFM comparison – Policy</i>	5	1.6	0	0.4		19.6	7	36%

Source: LEFM-based numbers taken from Employment Land Review Update, 2012; EEFM-based numbers calculated by SQW

Step 2: Convert employment estimates to floorspace requirements

The second step in the process involves a shift from a focus on jobs to a consideration of floorspace requirements, and it is driven by assumptions with regard to employment densities. The assumptions that were used in the Employment Land Review Update (2012)

have been rolled forward applied to the EEFM projections; the findings are summarised in Table 3. Compared to estimates based on LEFM, this suggests far greater demand for B1a and B1b floorspace, but a reduction in demand for both B2 and B8.

Table 3: Estimates of forecast net floorspace change, 2011-31 ('000 sq m GEA)

Use Class	B1a	B1b	B2	B8	All B
EEFM (2012)	83.0	32.7	-11.8	-33.7	70.2
<i>LEFM comparison - Baseline</i>	45	19	0.7	18	83
<i>LEFM comparison - Policy</i>	59	20	1.5	21	101

Source: LEFM-based numbers taken from Employment Land Review Update, 2012; EEFM-based numbers calculated by SQW

Step 3: Using plot ratios, convert floorspace estimates to an estimate of site areas (and hence land required for B Use Classes)

The third and final stage is driven by the application of plot densities, and again, the underlying assumptions have been rolled forward from the Employment Land Review Update (2012). The findings are summarised below. Despite higher estimates of employment growth through EEFM, the overall finding is theoretically for a lower requirement of additional employment land (i.e. 7.4 ha compared to either 13.1ha or 16.2 ha). The reason for this is that projected employment growth is concentrated in sectors with high employment densities while the shake-out in employment linked to (lower density) B2 and B8 uses theoretically has a disproportionately large dampening effect on overall levels of demand for land.

Table 4: Deriving estimates of forecast land requirements, 2011-31 (ha)

Use Class	B1a	B1b	B2	B8	All B
EEFM (2012)	12.2	4.8	-2.8	-6.7	7.4
<i>LEFM comparison – Baseline</i>	6.7ha	2.7ha	0.2ha	3.6ha	13.1ha
<i>LEFM comparison – Policy</i>	8.7ha	2.9ha	0.4ha	4.3ha	16.2ha

Source: LEFM-based numbers taken from Employment Land Review Update, 2012; EEFM-based numbers calculated by SQW

Conclusion

Because of the shift from SIC 2003 to SIC 2007, the differences in the estimates generated by EEFM and LEFM are not simply explicable in terms of the different employment projections. For this reason, some care is needed in comparing the findings: tweaks in the nominal allocation of sectors to Use Classes would have a disproportionate bearing on overall projected demand *in addition to* that driven by the two forecasting houses' models. For that reason, considerable care and judgement is needed in using the findings set out in this paper.

Nevertheless, the principal findings from our re-run of the model may be summarised as follows:

- projected jobs growth over the period 2011-2031 is a good deal higher under EEFM than either of the scenarios developed by CE through LEFM

- however, projected land requirements are actually higher on the basis of LEFM than EEFM. The reason for this relates to sectoral composition; under EEFM, the implication is that there could already be a surplus of B2 and B8 employment land while noticeably more provision is needed in relation to B1a and B1b.

Annex A: Projected employment change from EEFM, and Use Class assumptions in relation to SIC 2007

Based on EEFM (rather than LEFM), and SIC 2007 (rather than SIC 2003), the table which follows sets out the key assumptions which have changed since the Employment Land Review Update in 2012. These assumptions are based on broad-brush judgements and they have been calibrated through discussion with Cambridge City Council. However changes in the assumptions would impact significantly on the overall estimate of demand; because of this, the findings need to be regarded as indicative and not definitive, and subject to change.

Table 5: Nominal allocation of SIC 2007 sectors to Use Classes, and projected employment change by SIC 2007 sector from EEFM, 2012

Sector	Nominal allocation of different sectors across Use Classes					Projected employment change, 2011-2031 (‘000 jobs)
	B1a	B1b	B2	B8	Non-B	
Agriculture	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.0
Mining and Quarrying	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.0
Food Manufacturing	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.0
General Manufacturing	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	-0.2
Chemicals	0.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.0
Pharma	0.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.0
Metals	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	-0.1
Transport	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.0
Electronics	0.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.00	-0.6
Utilities	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	-0.1
Waste and remediation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.0
Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.6
Wholesale	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.50	-1.4
Retail	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.9
Land Transport	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.75	0.4
Water and air transport	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.75	0.0
Hotels and restaurants	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.1
Publishing and broadcasting	0.40	0.00	0.50	0.10	0.00	0.1
Telecoms	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.60	0.1
Computer related activity	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.6
Finance	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.75	-0.5
Real Estate	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.80	0.9
Professional services	0.50	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.25	5.7
R+D	0.10	0.80	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.5
Business services	0.30	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.60	1.8
Employment activities	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.75	1.5
Public Administration incl land forces	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50	-0.2

Sector	Nominal allocation of different sectors across Use Classes					Projected employment change, 2011-2031
Education	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.75	3.6
Health and care	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.75	3.6
Arts and entertainment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.8
Other services	0.20	0.00	0.10	0.10	0.60	0.2
Total						22.1

Cambridge City Council Draft SHLAA

Technical Appendix

ANNEX 15 Undevelopable Sites -Summary of reasons for rejection and maps of rejected sites

May 2013

Introduction

1. The Council have prepared a Draft Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which is the subject of public and stakeholder consultation from 30th September 2011. This document compliments the main SHLAA document, but owing to size limitations the Council have published this document as a separate technical Appendix.
2. It details sites that were rejected in the SHLAA assessment process along with a summary of the reasons for rejection. Sites are listed in ward order. Ward maps and individual site maps are included at the end of this report.
3. The methodology and assessment process used to reach these conclusions are listed in Stages 7-8 of the main report and Annexes1 and 1A.

Rejected Sites: As At May 2013– Summary of conclusions

Site No. (ID)	Site Name	Ward	Site Area (ha)	Summary – reason for rejection
146	Land to R/O 33 - 37 Thorley Road	Abbey	0.24	Site 146 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it will result in the loss of a community facility (scout hut). The site also meets the criteria in Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space. Access to site also considered poor and narrow.
105	Abbey Stadium and land fronting Newmarket Road	Abbey	2.88	Satisfactory replacement of open space and other constraints in assessment not resolved. The Council is not convinced of the need for a Community Stadium following the Local Plan Issues and Options 2 Site Options Review and SA of Sub Regional Facilities. Access and constrained nature of frontage. Covenant on south stand re allotments

201	Beadle Industrial Estate	Abbey	1.52	Site 201 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it would result in the loss of a Protected Industrial Site (there is also considerable concern over the amount of land that falls within Flood Zone 2 and the impact that mitigating for this would have on the viability of development).
202	1 Ditton Walk	Abbey	0.28	Counted in AMR 2012 Remove from SHLAA
413	Open space north of Fison Road	Abbey	0.30	Site 413 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it meets the criteria in Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space.
419	Open space in front of 44 to 84 Ditton Lane	Abbey	0.26	Site 419 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it has a considerable number of amber scores against Level 1, 2 and 3 considerations. Notably the site is constrained by existing buildings, integrating the site into the existing area may prove difficult and the site contributes to the openness of the area
425	Open space in front of 15 to 21 Jack Warren Green	Abbey	0.15	Site 425 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as the impact of a new proposal on the existing properties will be hard to overcome; serves as public open space with amenity value. The site also meets the criteria in Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space.
426	Open space west of 82 to 114 Jack Warren Green	Abbey	0.24	Site 426 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space.
430	Catholic Church of St Vincent de Paul	Abbey	0.16	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
433	Open space between Wadloes Road and	Abbey	0.32	Site 433 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: The shape of the site and the layout

	Headford Close			of the existing dwellings to the east at 1-20 Headford Close make it difficult to develop the site. Also the residential amenity of the existing properties, loss of trees and the spacious quality of the site and surroundings renders site undevelopable.
439	Car park east of Cambridge Technopark	Abbey	0.19	Site 439 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: Development of this site would relate poorly to the adjoining Cambridge Technopark buildings; would occupy one of its car parks; and, would suffer from noise disturbance from traffic travelling along the adjoining Newmarket Road.
440	Car park in front of Cambridge Technopark	Abbey	0.19	Site 440 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: Development of this site would relate poorly to the adjoining Cambridge Technopark buildings; would occupy one of its car parks; and, would suffer from noise disturbance from traffic travelling along the adjoining Newmarket Road.
447	Open space in front of 73 to 87 Peverel Road	Abbey	0.19	Site 447 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space.
448	Open space in front of 33 to 47 Peverel Road	Abbey	0.18	Site 448 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as because of its awkward shape; it also adds to the amenity of the local area. Site is also unsuitable for development because it meets criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space (currently unused open space, formally allotments).
450	Car park north of the Quorum	Abbey	0.44	Site 450 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it posts an amber score against Level 1 criteria - Green Belt. It adjoins the Green Belt to the west -

				Coldham's Common; and, a RED Score against the potential loss of the use of the site as an Office Location and a New General Industrial/Business Area as highlighted in the Cambridge Employment Land Review. Any development will result in the loss of tree cover on the site, and is likely to present a hard, as opposed to the present soft edge that could harm the open views of this land resulting in an adverse impact on the character and openness of the adjoining Green Belt.
451	Tree belt west of the Quorum and garage on Barnwell Road	Abbey	0.34	Site 451 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it posts an amber score against Level 1 criteria - Green Belt. It adjoins the Green Belt to the west - Coldham's Common; and, a RED Score against the potential loss of the use of the site as an Office Location and a New General Industrial/Business Area as highlighted in the Cambridge Employment Land Review. Any development will result in the loss of tree cover on the site, and is likely to present a hard, as opposed to the present soft edge that could harm the open views of this land resulting in an adverse impact on the character and openness of the adjoining Green Belt.
453	Open space west of Barnwell Road	Abbey	0.68	Site 453 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it posts a RED score against Level 1 criteria - Green Belt. It adjoins the Green Belt to the west - Coldham's Common. Any development will harm the open views of this land resulting in an adverse impact on the character and openness of the Green Belt. The site is also unsuitable for development because it is too narrow and the current site adds to the amenity of the area.

454	Garages and trees south of Barnwell Drive	Abbey	0.32	Site 454 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: The site forms the car park serving the adjoining car dealership. The car park is a fundamental requirement for the permitted use of the site as a car dealership, and its loss would give rise to additional on-street parking in the area. The site is close to Barnwell Road, which links major routes into and out of Cambridge; and, to Cambridge Airport. Residential development of the site would relate poorly to its surroundings. The new houses would be isolated from other developments, and occupants of any properties would experience a low level of amenity due to the proximity of the car dealership, road, and airport.
459	Workshops at 615 Newmarket Road	Abbey	0.73	Site 458 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it is used for Use Class B1(c), B2 and B8 purposes. Development that results in the loss of floorspace within Use Classes B1(c), B2 and B8 will not be permitted unless the criteria relating to unprotected sites outlined in the Policy are met. In addition, the site is overlooked from the rear aspects of dwellings to the east in Ditton Fields, and to the south in Newmarket Road.
463	Various warehouses, depot etc, Ditton Walk north	Abbey	1.14	Site 463 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it is in use for employment uses already and the site was identified in the ELR to be retained for employment use.
468	Open space with pond in Regatta Court	Abbey	0.15	Site 468 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it would result in the loss of the existing open space adjacent to the Green Belt which acts as the communal gardens for the Regatta Court Flats, and which make this a pleasant place to live. This loss of amenity

				would be detrimental to the amenities of occupants of the flats, and harmful to the immediate setting of this part of Cambridge due to the loss of trees on site which provide it with a soft edge to the adjoining playspace and countryside.
471	Depots west of 18 Stanley Road	Abbey	0.19	Site 471 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it is currently in use as an employment site and an electricity sub station adjoins.
475	Car park serving Comet and Staples	Abbey	0.35	Site 475 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it is a car park for the adjoining Comet electrical, and other stores - any development of the site would be poorly related to the existing store resulting in poor amenity levels for any occupant of the new dwellings. Residential development of the site in isolation, would render the continued operation of the store(s) very difficult. The retail uses of the site complement those of the larger area of the Cambridge Retail Park - Site 481; and, Tesco's Supermarket - Site 477.
476	Cheddars Lane Industrial estate	Abbey	2.08	Site 476 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it was identified in the ELR to be retained for employment use.
477	Tesco's car park	Abbey	1.35	Site 477 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it is the existing parking serving Tesco and is well used.
480	Open space at the end of Silverwood Close	Abbey	0.16	Site 480 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it would result in the loss of the landscaped area around which the original dwellings comprising this development are set.
481	Various warehouses, car parks etc at	Abbey	13.48	Site 481 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it would result in the loss of the Cambridge

	Cambridge Retail Park, west of the railway			Retail Park, which makes a major contribution to the retail economy, and employment situation in Cambridge. Residential development of the site would mean the loss of the retail units and the jobs therein, and would diminish Cambridge's status as a regional shopping centre
855	Telephone Exchange south of 1 Ditton Lane	Abbey	0.17	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
863	Warehouse north of 133 Ditton Walk	Abbey	0.38	Site 863 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it is in use already and recommended in the ELR to remain in employment use.
870	Ditton Fields Nursery School, Wadloes Road	Abbey	0.19	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
889	CambridgeTechnopark Newmarket Road	Abbey	0.70	Site 889 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: Although initially considered suitable, the owner is not interested in developing the site for residential.
894	Land to r/o 551-555 Newmarket Road	Abbey	0.11	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
46	West's Garage, 217 Newmarket Road	Abbey	0.33	Site 46 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because although initially considered suitable, the owner is not interested in developing the site for residential.
54	9-12 Gerard Close	Abbey	0.16	Site 54 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because although initially considered suitable, the owner is not interested in developing the site for residential.
12	162 - 184 Histon	Arbury	0.23	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance

	Road			
150	Lock-up garages adjacent to 1 Rutland Close	Arbury	0.17	Site 150 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. It comprises three rows of garages in blocks that serve the adjoining flats, and are therefore, closely related to them for ease of access and security. This close relationship means that any new development would be poorly related to these adjoining flats owing to their height, scale and close proximity to the site. The loss of parking for flat occupants would also need to be addressed.
251	Open space and car park south of Borrowdale	Arbury	0.17	Site 251 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it would result in the loss of a useable open space and would be overlooked by nearby dwellings. The site also meets the criteria in Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
280	Green space at the end of Harris Road	Arbury	0.26	Site 280 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as although it is not currently Protected Open Space, the site does meet the criteria in Policy 4/2 of the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space.
302	Supermarkets, petrol station and car park at corner of Histon Road and Windsor Road	Arbury	0.69	Site 302 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it would result in the loss of a considerable amount of floorspace within A1 use and harm the vitality and viability of the Local Centre.
303	Chesterton Mills	Arbury	0.51	Site 303 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it would result in the loss of employment land in B1(c), B2, B8 use on an unsuitable site that was also identified for continued safeguarding in the Council's Employment Land Review, also there is a Grade II listed building onsite

316	Car park and land behind Arundal House Hotel	Arbury	0.35	Site 316 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it is the hotel car park and is needed by the hotel. There would be a problem of overlooking from the hotel itself, too.
868	Rear of gardens, 1-12 Linden Close	Arbury	0.17	Site 868 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as the site scores a considerable number of amber scores against Level 1, 2 and 3 considerations. Notably the site has access problems, will have problems integrating into the existing community and there are numerous trees onsite that are likely to have significant biodiversity value.
115	Surface Car Park at Castle Hill	Castle	0.33	Site 115 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it is overlooked on all sides (residential to the west of the site and offices to the east) so issues of overlooking would be significant. It is also felt that getting a housing scheme to work in design terms would be very difficult on this site and as such it is not considered to be suitable for development. In addition, Site 115 is retained on a 130 year lease and is unlikely to be available
383	Open space east of 42 Carisbrooke Road	Castle	0.25	Site 383 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. Any development would remove a positive feature from the street. Also development right next to the school playground could prove problematic. The site also meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space.
393	Car park south of Department of Zoology Field Station	Castle	0.38	Site 393 is not considered to be suitable for residential development due to incompatibility with surrounding uses.
395	Car park south of 76	Castle	0.29	Site 395 is not considered to be suitable for residential

	Storey's Way			development as it would not fit in with surrounding uses or built form and there would be the loss of a well used car park.
398	Recreation ground on Shelly Row	Castle	0.13	Site 398 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. There would be a loss of open space and a well used play area. The site meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
400	Open space east of St Edmund's College	Castle	0.15	Site 400 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as the site meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space.
406	Car parks and open space east of Shire Hall	Castle	0.23	Site 406 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it would have a detrimental effect on the scheduled ancient monuments nearby also there would be a substantial loss of parking for the Council. Shire Hall is also a protected office site in ELR.
899	St Johns College Playing Fields	Castle	10.31	Site 899 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. The site is designated in the Local Plan as Protected Open Space. Any development will result in the loss of Protected Open Space and a very significant archaeological site location. A section is within Flood Zone 3b and is unsuitable for development. Any development will harm the open views of this land resulting in an adverse impact on the character and openness of the north western edge of the City Centre.
909	Shire Hall Site, Old Police Station, Castle Mound, and 42 Castle St	Castle	2.91	Land owner no longer wishes to pursue
57	BP Garage, 452	Cherry	0.26	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance

	Cherry Hinton Road & garages off Glenmere Close	Hinton		
126	Land to the r/o 268 Queen Edith's Way	Cherry Hinton	0.33	Site 126 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as the land owner has no interest in its development
649	Open space west of Coldhams Lane Business Park	Cherry Hinton	11.56	Site 649 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. The site is identified for Employment Land purposes in the ELR, however, it presently contributes to the openness and setting of the City. It has an historical use as a landfill site following cessation of quarrying activities, and contamination and gas generation from decaying refuse are likely to be significant issues. It is considered unsuitable for housing purposes as any development would be poorly related to its surroundings. In addition, it falls in part, under the Cambridge Airport Flight Path Public Safety Zone.
672	Land R/O Next Generation Sports Centre	Cherry Hinton	0.44	Site 672 is not considered to be suitable for residential development due to its irregular shape and its position between tennis courts as part of the Next Generation Sports Centre and the Cambridge - Newmarket railway, where it acts as a buffer zone. Access to the site is also an issue. In addition, residential development would not sit well with the surrounding uses.
676	Various warehouses etc at Church End, Cherry Hinton	Cherry Hinton	5.32	Site 676 is not considered to be suitable for residential development, excluding the eastern part of the site that benefits from extant permission for residential development. See File Refs: 06/0063/OUT and 09/0403/REM. Whilst it is noted that part of the site benefits from an extant residential planning permission, it also encompasses the College

				Business Park - a Protected Industrial Site in the Local Plan 2006 - See Policy 7/3 - which is excluded from the site but bounded on 3 sides by it, is 3. It is considered that, on balance, the majority of the site is inappropriate for residential development.
681	Garages and open space between 98 to 111 and 114 and 131 Teversham Drift	Cherry Hinton	0.23	Site 681 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. The use of the site as the access road; garaging and parking areas; and informal landscaping associated with adjoining dwellings in Teversham Drift, plus its close proximity to adjoining dwellings, render it inappropriate for residential development.
686	Land north of Teversham Drift	Cherry Hinton	0.33	Site 686 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. The irregular shape and limited depth of the site (it is too long and narrow); its use as structural landscaping and informal amenity space plus its close proximity to adjoining dwellings, render it inappropriate for residential development.
690	Open space at Queen's Meadow	Cherry Hinton	0.23	Site 690 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. Any development of this site would result in the loss of the present open space and car parking area serving the adjoining dwellings in Queens Meadows. Whilst the site is large enough to accommodate new housing, the present space reflects the design and setting of the present development as a whole. Any new development on the site would appear out of keeping with the existing houses, resulting in a poor outlook from and a greatly diminished setting to these adjoining properties. The site also meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space.

691	Open space south west of 85 to 95 Kelsey Crescent	Cherry Hinton	0.19	Site 691 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. Any development of this site would result in the loss of the present open space area serving the adjoining dwellings in Kelsey Crescent, and would integrate poorly with surrounding amenity space including the play park and neighbouring School fields (which are in South Cambs. District). The amenity area forms an important part of the overall amenity/playspace that serves the area as a whole.
701	Open space south of Langdale Close	Cherry Hinton	0.18	Site 701 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. Development of this site would integrate poorly with surrounding residential development due to it being overlooked from the front aspects of adjoining 3-storey flats to the north-east in Langdale Close. It provides the amenity area and setting serving these adjoining dwellings. Access to the site is also poor.
703	Playground south of 14 and 16 Tenby Close	Cherry Hinton	0.31	Site 703 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it is part of a school, and the site meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space.
709	Car parks west of 5 to 13 Lisle Walk	Cherry Hinton	0.20	Site 709 is unsuitable for residential development as it would be overlooked from surrounding dwellings in Welstead Road, Lisle Walk and Sunmead Walk; would result in a loss of amenity space and TPO'd trees; and, car parking between existing dwellings.
731	Car park north of the pub at 20 and 22 Mill End Road	Cherry Hinton	0.17	Site 731, the Red Lion car park, would be unacceptable for residential development because: The Red Lion is a Grade II Listed Building; Its setting and character would be harmed as a result of the development, especially if the

				protected trees on site were affected. Also, there would be issues of noise in relation to the public house. Development would result in the loss of the pub car park, and give rise to additional on-street car parking in an area where parking restrictions are already in force along the High Street.
742	Open space behind 66 to 80 Colville Road	Cherry Hinton	0.28	Site 742 is considered to be unacceptable for residential development. There is no direct access from the site to the public highway. The site is landlocked. The only possible vehicular access would be via the Baptist Church car park (Site 743) and this is very narrow. It is also overlooked from the rear aspects of the adjoining 3-storey dwellings at 66 to 80 Colville Road.
754	Open space north of Fulbourn Road	Cherry Hinton	1.02	Site 754 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it adds to the character and amenity of the area, and meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as protected open space.
755	78 and 80 Fulbourn Road and the open space to the south	Cherry Hinton	0.59	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
920	Blue Circle Site - Coldhams Lane	Cherry Hinton	9.11	Site 920 is not considered to be suitable for residential development because of the site's serious contamination issues, protected open space and City Wildlife site designations.
79	Flats on Fanshawe Road, Cambridge	Coleridge	0.94	Site 79 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
86	Flats on Davy Road	Coleridge	1.19	Site 86 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space

800	Land with trees east of Sycamore Close	Coleridge	0.28	Site 800 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it is landlocked with no direct access to any public highway and is surrounded by residential properties and their rear gardens. It is likely that the mature trees on site support a range of small mammals (Bats) and birds for nesting/roosting. The wildlife/amenity value of this site should be carefully assessed, if it were to be considered for development. As it stands, any development of the site would destroy these characteristics, which would be unacceptable.
812	Car park north of Purbeck Road	Coleridge	0.21	Site 812 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: The site forms the car park serving Hills Road Sixth Form College. If developed the parking facility would be lost and the new houses would be poorly related to the College buildings. They would also be isolated from any other residential development.
813	Car park west of the Travelodge, Hills Road	Coleridge	0.15	Site 813 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: It forms the car park serving the Travel-Lodge Hotel. If developed the parking facility would be lost and the new houses would be poorly related to the 5-storey Hotel building. They would also be isolated from any other residential development. There would also be the likelihood of excessive noise from traffic on Hills Road, and the adjoining railway.
814	Multi storey car park at the Leisure Park, Clifton Road	Coleridge	0.22	Site 814 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: It forms a multi-storey car park that serves the Cambridge Leisure Park complex (Hotel/Cinema/Theatre/'The Junction'/Shops). Its loss would have a direct adverse impact on the viability of the complex.

				Any houses would be isolated, and would have poor amenities due to the proximity of the Complex and the adjacent Cambridge - London railway line
823	Play area north of 30 Ashbury Close	Coleridge	0.18	Site 823 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: The site provides a well-used, publically available, recreation ground with fixed play equipment, and amenity area. If developed, this area along with its mature trees would be lost.
826	Play area between Neville Road and Lichfield Road	Coleridge	0.25	Site 826 is unsuitable for residential development because of access problems and loss of open space and recreation facilities
874	Rustat House, Rustat Avenue	Coleridge	0.68	Site 874 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it would result in a loss of employment land, something the ELR advises against.
890	Vetinary Clinic 89a Cherry Hinton Road	Coleridge	0.20	Site 890 is unsuitable residential development as it is already has planning consent for 14 apartments
63	Lock up garages adjacent to 2 Derwent Close	Coleridge	0.19	Site 63 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because of issues relating to car parking, site contamination and overlooking onto neighbouring properties. It is also uncheivable as many garage lease/freeholders are unwilling to relinquish their garages. Anglian Water's Pumping Station is also represents a further constraint upon the sites development.
854	Railway sidings west of Rustat Road	Coleridge	2.11	Site 854 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because the railway is too close to satisfactorily overcome noise and design issues.
237	Nuffield Road Industrial Area	East Chesterton	6.66	Site 237 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it was identified in the recent Employment Land Review (ELR) to be retained in employment use.

238	Cowley Road Business Park	East Chesterton	8.50	Site 238 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it was identified in the recent Employment Land Review (ELR) to be retained in employment use.
364	Car park in front of Elizabeth House	East Chesterton	0.42	Site 364 is not suitable for residential development as it would result in loss of parking for the offices. The 4 storey office building constrains the site physically, also residential development would not sit well so close to the office building. There are also TPO'd trees on site. Also part of office site is protected in the ELR.
879	72-76 St Andrew's Road	East Chesterton	1.31	Site 879 is considered to be unacceptable for residential development. The Employment Land Review identifies it as an office employment site which should be retained.
39	Land adjacent to and behind 195 High Street, East Chesterton	East Chesterton	0.39	Site 39 was initially considered to be suitable for development but the mutiplicity of ownerships and poor access along with parking displacement will mean very unlikely to happen. Would not accord with new advice on garden development.
379	Petrol station and garage, Elizabeth Way	East Chesterton	0.29	Site 379 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: Although the site was initially considered suitable, the leaseholder has a long lease and doesn't want to surrender it for residential development
352	Shirley Infants School, Green End Road	East Chesterton	0.91	Site 352 although assessed as suitable previously its development is no longer acheivable as the landowner has indicated they wish to retain site for educational use. Site to be removed from SHLAA.
38	Land to the r/o 1-3 Kendal Way	East Chesterton & Kings Hedges	0.22	Site 38 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. Given that the site is in the process of being converted into allotments (and given that the site has been considered to be unsuitable for housing by the Council's

				Housing Department), it is considered that it is not suitable for housing
119	Surface car park adjacent to Colleges Nursery, Campkin Road	Kings Hedges	0.16	Site 119 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as the loss of car parking could have a negative impact on the adjacent community facilities and potential highways implications. It is felt that this site could be more usefully safeguarded for the expansion of the community facility
151	Land to R/O 1 - 28 Jackson Road (Car parking and lock-up garages)	Kings Hedges	0.27	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
213	Kirkwood Road Business Estate	Kings Hedges	2.68	Site 119 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as the site was identified in the recent Employment Land Review (ELR) to be retained in employment use and is a protected industrial site.
223	Play area and car parks by North Arbury Chapel, Cameron Road	Kings Hedges	0.27	Site 119 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as the site is actually below 0.25 ha and meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
225	Open space at Hanson Court	Kings Hedges	0.42	Site 225 is not suitable for residential development because it constitutes amenity space, and is constrained by existing buildings, access is also difficult. The site meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
227	Open space south of Hanson Court	Kings Hedges	0.20	Site 227 is not suitable for residential development because integrating any development into the surrounding residential development may be difficult - the site has existing buildings fronting onto the site from two sides, and the site has

				amenity value. The site meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
228	Open space south of Turpyn Court	Kings Hedges	0.30	Site 228 is not suitable for residential development because Integrating the development into the surrounding residential development may be difficult - the site has existing buildings fronting onto the site from two sides, and the site has amenity value. The site also meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
229	Garages between Whitfield Close and Crowland Way	Kings Hedges	0.23	Site 229 is not suitable for residential development because it is too narrow and access would be problematic. Also, a small part of the site already has a permission for two dwellings.
233	Open space and garages south of Woodhouse Way	Kings Hedges	0.37	Site 233 is not suitable for residential development because it would involve loss of open space and a recreation facility. The site also meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
281	Playground at Arbury Court	Kings Hedges	0.43	Site 281 is not suitable for residential developments as it meets the criteria in the Local Plan for designation as Protected Open Space
285	Garages behind 2 to 36 Cratherne Way	Kings Hedges	0.21	Site 285 is not suitable for residential development because it is narrow and constrained by existing buildings and it constitutes access to adjoining properties
298	Land in the centre of Ramsden Square	Kings Hedges	0.29	Site 298 is not suitable for residential development because it would result in the loss of open space and the site adds to the character and amenity of the local area. The site also meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
230	Garages south of Hawkins Road	Kings Hedges	0.25	Site 230 is no longer achievable as the Council as land owner has decided to not pursue the site in its housing

				programme. The site is also now considered to be unsuitable for residential development because of its shape, community integration and access difficulties the development would create.
236	Vindis Garage Milton Road	Kings Hedges	0.44	Site 236 is not achievable for residential development because the landowner has confirmed the existing use is likely to continue.
887	98 -144 Campkin Road	Kings Hedges	0.52	Not viable
902	Land south of the Ship, including the car park	Kings Hedges	0.34	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
923	Land at George Nuttall Close	Kings Hedges	0.0	Site 923 is not suitable for residential development because one part of the site is in use as entrance/amenity space for existing flats. The other section represents an entrance to a car park built on seriously contaminated land.
109	Lion Yard/Grand Arcade Multi-Storey Car Park	Market	0.36	Site 109 is not suitable for residential development because it is one of the main multi-storey car parks serving the City Centre and the Grand Arcade, and its loss could have a negative impact on the viability of the City Centre. As such, it is not considered to be suitable for development. Site is also in the CPZ.
110	Park Street Multi-Storey Car Park	Market	0.26	Site 110 is not suitable for residential development because it is one of the main multi-storey car parks serving the City Centre and the Grand Arcade, and its loss could have a negative impact on the viability of the City Centre. As such, it is not considered to be suitable for development. Site is also in the CPZ.
112	Grafton Centre East	Market	0.46	Site 112 is not suitable for residential development because

	Multi-Storey Car Park			it is one of the main multi-storey car parks serving the City Centre and the Grafton Centre, and its loss could have a negative impact on the viability of the City Centre. As such, it is not considered to be suitable for development. Site is also in the CPZ.
113	Grafton Centre West Multi-storey car park, Fitzroy Lane	Market	0.30	Site 113 is not suitable for residential development because it is one of the main multi-storey car parks serving the City Centre and the Grafton Centre, and its loss could have a negative impact on the viability of the City Centre. As such, it is not considered to be suitable for development. Site is also in the CPZ.
204	48-61 Burleigh Street	Market	0.30	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
565	Car park behind 1 Regent Street	Market	0.19	Site 565 is unsuitable for residential development given the sites main function as a car park serving the adjoining office/commercial premises at 1 Regent Street (a protected office site in the ELR), and the proximity of adjoining buildings (one listed Grade II) which area of differing heights and scale, it is unsuitable for residential development. It would also result in the loss of car parking within the Controlled Parking Zone.
568	Open space and car park in front of The Judge Institute of Management Studies	Market	0.26	Site 568 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development. It lies adjacent to Grade II Listed Buildings which overlook the site. Residential development is likely to result in an adverse impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Buildings (Judge Institute of Management Studies) which overlook the site, and on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Development would result in the loss of car parking within the Controlled Parking Zone.
572	Car park behind the	Market	0.21	Site 572 is considered to be unsuitable for residential

	Royal Cambridge Hotel			development because it would result in overlooking from the adjacent 3-storey, Grade II Listed, Royal Cambridge Hotel, and the University's Engineering Building to the west; the potential loss of mature trees on site; an adverse impact on the setting of the Listed Hotel building; and, on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
892	64-68 Newmarket Rd	Market	0.27	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
917	Auckland Road Clinic	Market	0.20	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
140	Lock-up garages to R/O 33 -56 Eltisle Avenue	Newnham	0.39	Site 140 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it is used for Use Class B1 purposes - Motor vehicle repair workshops and MOT Testing Stations. Policy 7/3 indicates that development that results in the loss of floorspace within Use Classes B1(c), B2 and B8 will not be permitted unless residential more appropriate
142	Land to R/O St Marks Vicarage, Barton Road	Newnham	0.17	Site 142 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: The site is landlocked with no direct vehicular access to the public highway. It is directly overlooked from 3 sides, and features a number of TPO'd trees which would be lost as a result of any development.
190	Hockey Ground at Cranmer Road	Newnham	0.35	Site 190 is unsuitable for residential development because it meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space, and would result in partial loss of a community facility.
484	Car parks at Thirkill Court	Newnham	0.44	Site 484 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it would not sit well with the surrounding University uses. Access would be down a private access road.and the site is currently in use for parking.

489	Car parks in front of Manor Court and Grange Court	Newnham	0.27	Site 489 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it would integrate poorly with surrounding residential development. The site is directly overlooked by the adjoining 5-storey blocks of flats at Manor Court and Grange Court immediately to the south. The TPO'd trees on site would be lost, as would the car parking area serving the adjoining flats. Overall, there would be harmful visual impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
490	Area of trees east of Pinehurst	Newnham	0.29	Site 490 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it would result in the loss of a substantial number of mature trees. This would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and to the spacious quality of the adjoining development to the west which forms the larger part of the site. The site also meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space .
483	Open space north of the Paul Mellon building	Newnham	0.35	Site 483 was initially considered to be suitable for residential development, however there is no interest from the landowner in residential development.
895	Downing Playing Field Grantchester Rd- Edge of City strategic site	Newnham	4.83	Faces a number on constraints and judged to be unsuitable for allocation in Local Plan Site Options Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. In Green Belt. Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes. No evidence of land owner intentions. Poor scores on accessibility to existing centres and services. Loss of protected open space. Not needed in relation to our objectively assessed needs. Not deliverable or developable

896	Pembroke Playing Field Grantchester Road- Edge of City strategic site	Newnham	3.76	Faces a number on constraints and judged to be unsuitable for allocation in Local Plan Site Options Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. In Green Belt. Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes. No evidence of land owner intentions. Poor scores on accessibility to existing centres and services. Loss of protected open space. Not needed in relation to our objectively assessed needs. Not deliverable or developable.
897	St Catherine's Playing Field Grantchester Road- Edge of City strategic site	Newnham	2.71	Faces a number on constraints and judged to be unsuitable for allocation in Local Plan Site Options Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. In Green Belt. Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes. No evidence of land owner intentions. Access issues, poor scores on accessibility to existing centres and services. Loss of protected open space. Not needed in relation to our objectively assessed needs. Not deliverable or developable.
898	Trinity Old Fields Grange Road	Newnham	3.9	Site 898 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development. Any development will result in the loss of Protected Open Space and have an adverse impact on the character and openness of the locality. There is also no evidence of the landowners intentions to develop open market housing therefore it cannot be judged to be achievable.
900	Corpus Christi College Playing Fields to west Leckhampton House	Newnham	4.29	Site 900 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development. Any development will harm the open views of this land resulting in an adverse impact on the character and openness of the locality. There is also no public highway

				access to this site. There is also no evidence of the landowners intentions to develop open market housing therefore it cannot be judged to be achievable.
901	West's Renault RUFC Grantchester Road- Edge of City strategic site	Newnham	8.55	Faces a number on constraints and judged to be unsuitable for allocation in Local Plan Site Options Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. In Green Belt. Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes. No evidence of land owner intentions. Flooding issues, poor scores on accessibility to existing centres and services. Loss of protected open space. Not needed in relation to our objectively assessed needs. Not deliverable or developable.
910	21-29 Barton Road	Newnham	0.55	Impact on Conservation Area.
912	Owlstone Croft	Newnham	0.96	Site 912 (former Site 28) is not suitable for open market residential development because of its potential impacts upon the character of the Conservation Area; the lack of consideration of ecology impacts upon the adjacent Paradise Nature Reserve and Cam corridor; concerns over safe access and egress by large numbers of walkers from the Nature Reserve; difficult vehicular access issues as a result of restricted road widths in adjoining streets, and heavy reliance on on-street parking. The development for open market housing will also result in the loss of much needed student accommodation. The development is also not achievable as the proposed access is in multiple ownership and support for alterations is not likely to be forthcoming.
916	Grange Farm- Edge of City	Newnham	44.03	Faces a number on constraints and judged to be unsuitable for allocation in Local Plan Site Options

	strategic site			Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. In Green Belt. Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes. Difficult access issues unless developed in conjunction with other sites. Air quality and noise issues near the M11. Poor public transport. Distance from health facilities. Not needed in relation to our objectively assessed needs. Not deliverable or developable
921	Land North & South Of Barton Road-Edge of City strategic site	Newnham	36.97	Faces a number on constraints and judged to be unsuitable for allocation in Local Plan Site Options Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. In Green Belt. Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes. Difficult access issues unless developed in conjunction with other sites. Air quality and noise issues near the M11. Poor public transport. Distance from health facilities. Not needed in relation to our objectively assessed needs. Not deliverable or developable
877	Land at Wilberforce Road	Newnham	0.60	Site 877 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development. Any development will result in the loss of Green Belt.
182	Emmanuel Sports Ground & City Hockey Club	Newnham	6.44	Site 182 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development. Planning Inspector for the 2006 Local Plan concluded that there was "No reasonable prospect of it [the site] coming forward for college or university faculty development" or that it was suitable for open market housing. He concluded the site's environmental and recreational value merited protection under Policy 4/2.
95	Former Cambridge Regional College/Ragged	Petersfield	0.35	Site 95 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as the site has been acquired by Anglia Ruskin University who intend to develop the site for educational

	School site, Young Street			use.
111	Queen Anne Multi-storey Car Park, Gonville Place	Petersfield	0.38	Site 111 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development. The site provides car parking for the City Centre, as well as Parkside Pools and Kelsey Kerridge leisure centre. Loss of this car parking could impact on the viability of the uses that the car park serves as well as impacting on the viability of the City Centre. Site is in the CPZ. Redevelopment of this site would also result in the loss of a significant leisure facility and would be contrary to Policy 5/11. It is felt that it would difficult to relocate this facility to a location of equal accessibility.
522	Communal open space in the centre of St Matthew's Gardens	Petersfield	0.44	Site 522 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development. This is due to its primary function as a strategically important formal landscaped amenity area serving the adjoining St Matthew's Gardens development. Site will be allocated for Protected Open Space
527	Offices, warehouse/industrial buildings and car parking west of 13 to 37 Gwydir Street	Petersfield	0.23	Site 527 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development due to its primary function for employment/business uses, with associated car parking, it is desirable to safeguard it for employment use given the shortage of this space in the City. Site also identified in ELR.
540	Tree belt and service road east of York Street	Petersfield	0.28	Site 540 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because due to the narrowness of the site; its use as a service road serving retail units on a busy retail park, and for a tree/landscape belt screening the retail units from adjoining dwellings in York St.
541	The Beehive Centre	Petersfield	6.86	Site 541 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it would result in the loss of a

				significant retail site, with consequent impact on Cambridge's retail economy.
551	Area with trees west of 55 to 67 Highsett	Petersfield	0.30	Site 551 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it provides open space for Highsett, and residential development of the site would compromise the design of Highsett.
543	Workshops 72a Ainsworth Street	Petersfield	0.17	Site 543 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: Although initially considered to be suitable for development, the landowner has confirmed that they are not interested in residential development in timescale of next Local Plan
64	5-15 Tenison Road and land adjacent	Petersfield	0.74	Site 54 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because although initially considered suitable, the 3 owners are not interested in developing the site for residential.
20	Strangeways Research Laboratory, 2 Worts Causeway	Queen Edith's	0.74	Site 20 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it is established for research and employment use and is recommended to be retained in the Employment Land Review.
196	31 Queen Edith's Way	Queen Ediths	0.23	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
836	Garages behind Lady Jane Court, Cavendish Avenue	Queen Edith's	0.21	Site 836 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: The site is poorly related to the adjoining 3-storey flats to the south at 1 - 21 Lady Jane Court. Any new development would result in overlooking and a loss of amenity between occupants of the new and existing buildings; the loss of a lot of surrounding tree cover; and, would be harmful to the character of the area. Also loss of parking for existing residents.

850	Play area north of 25 to 37 Godwin Way	Queen Edith's	0.32	Site 850 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it forms a formal recreation area and playspace, and is recognised as a Community Facility. There is no road access link to the site from the public highway - access is via two footpaths. These issues aside, any new development of this site should integrate well with surrounding residential development. Although the potential loss of the Community Facility and lack of access preclude its development. The site also meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
852	Car park H, Addenbrookes, Hills Road	Queen Edith's	0.45	Site 852 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it forms part of Addenbrookes Hospital complex and is used as a public car park. The Hospital has a long history of parking issues and the loss of any parking serving it would have an adverse effect on the surrounding area whilst placing additional pressure on its other car parks. Any new housing on the site would appear out of keeping with its surroundings and would have a low level of amenity due to traffic noise from the very busy Hills Road/Fendon Road roundabout.
853	Michael Young Centre	Queen Edith's	1.26	Site 853 is a 'Nominated Sites with Potential for Sustainable Employment Development' in the Employment Land Review. Given its protected employment land status, the site is considered to be unsuitable for residential development.
911	Cambridge South East-Land south Fulbourn Road r/o Peterhouse Technology Park	Queen Edith's	116.55	Faces a number on constraints and judged to be unsuitable for allocation in Local Plan Site Options Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. In Green Belt. Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes. Large section of site affected by Cambridge Airport Air

	extending south & west of Beechwood on Worts Causeway, land west of Babraham P&R- Edge of City strategic site			Safeguarding constraints. Loss of protected open space. Air quality issues by virtue of its size though it could provide good community integration. Poor public transport and cycle access at present. Not needed in relation to our objectively assessed needs. Not deliverable or developable
925	Land South of Addenbrookes and Southwest of Babraham Road- Edge of City strategic site	Queen Ediths	39.80	Faces a number on constraints and judged to be unsuitable for allocation in Local Plan Site Options Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. In Green Belt. Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes. No evidence of land owner intentions. Loss of agricultural land. Air quality issues by virtue of its size though it could provide some of its own community facilities. Not needed in relation to our objectively assessed needs. Not deliverable or developable.
70	213 - 217 Mill Road	Romsey	0.22	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
617	Various warehouses, car parks etc at Cambridge Retail Park, east of the railway	Romsey	3.86	Site 617 is unsuitable for residential development because sections lie in the floodplain. In addition, the loss of existing employment uses would be unacceptable (safeguarded in ELR). (Size - 38.6ha; its existing uses of Class B1, B2 and B8 activities; poor access; constraints by Green Belt; distance from schools and GP Surgery; and proximity to 2 railway lines with potential for adverse noise generation).
618	Green's Health and Fitness, Coldhams Lane	Romsey	0.86	Site 618 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because of the Community Use of the site as a Health and Fitness Centre and its proximity to Coldhams Lane railway bridge.
619	Car park and open	Romsey	0.37	Site 619 is considered to be unsuitable for residential

	space west of Winstanley Court			development because of its shape; its small size, and its relationship to adjoining housing mean that it is unlikely to prove suitable for residential development. Site is also used for car parking.
637	Car park within Brookfields Hospital complex	Romsey	0.18	Site 637 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it comprises a parking area serving the Brookfields Hospital and associated Healthcare facilities. These spaces would be lost if the site were developed in a piecemeal manner.
646	Sainsbury's car park	Romsey	1.60	Site 646 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because any development of this site would result in the loss of the car parking area serving the adjoining Sainsbury's Supermarket; it would have an impact on TPO trees; and a City Wildlife Site. There are issues of flood risk; and, any new development is likely to be poorly related to its surroundings.
647	Open Space on the north side of Coldhams Lane, opposite Sainsbury's petrol filling station	Romsey	0.29	Site 647 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it contains a functional floodplain and contributes to the character and amenity of the local area. Integrating the development of this site into the surrounding residential development may be difficult - the site is isolated from surrounding residential development. It has an irregular shape and is of limited depth; Cherry Hinton Brook runs through the middle of the site; site levels vary as site rises to meet railway forming an embankment prior to the railway crossing Barnwell Road by the railway over-bridge. The site provides small area of public open space and forms part of railway infrastructure.
648	Territorial Army Centre	Romsey	0.32	Site 648 is considered to be unsuitable for residential

	- Car park			development because of its use as a car park serving the Cambridge Territorial Army Centre; its proximity to the TA buildings; and, its separation from any existing residential development, means that any new development is likely to be mismatched in terms of adjoining land use, and divorced from any nearby housing. It is, therefore, considered to be unsuitable for residential development.
68	Railway depot adjacent to 125a Cavendish Road	Romsey	0.30	Site 68 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development. The site is considered to be unsuitable for development because it has no current highway frontage and there are also noise issues associated with the site. Network Rail has also confirmed the existing use likely to continue to 2031 so the development is unachievable.
918	18 Vinery Road	Romsey	0.20	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
574	Car park to rear of UCLES buildings, Hills Road	Trumpington	0.30	Site 574 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development due to the loss of office parking within the CPZ (office identified in ELR); impact on TPO trees; and, on neighbours amenities.
576	Car park west of Unilever House	Trumpington	0.24	Site 576 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development due to the loss of office parking within the CPZ. In addition, the height, scale and proximity of neighbouring buildings and the potential impact on adjoining Listed dwellings and the character of the Conservation Area, render it unsuitable for residential development.
582	Car park and garages west of Southacre Park	Trumpington	0.22	Site 582's is considered to be unsuitable for residential development due to its primary function as a garage court/car park, and access road serving adjoining existing housing.
587	Car park south and	Trumpington	0.41	Site 585's is considered to be unsuitable for residential

	east of Eastbrook			development due to its primary function as a car parking area serving adjoining office accommodation (which has been identified in the ELR); its close proximity to the office buildings, and the loss of workplace car parking that would arise in an area close to the Controlled Parking Zone.
592	Savill's car park	Trumpington	0.22	Site 592 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development as any development is likely to prove difficult due to its poor relationship to adjoining commercial property to the north, proximity to noise sources (railway/guided bus route), and restricted access. The site benefits from an extant consent for office and car parking which would be a more suitable use than residential.
606	Car park west of 48 to 58 High Street, Trumpington	Trumpington	0.36	Site 606 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it is constrained by the adjoining office building and there would be a considerable loss of parking. Allocation of the site would be inconsistent with treatment of other protected office sites in the ELR.
609	Waitrose car park	Trumpington	0.68	Site 609 is not suitable for residential development by virtue of its existing use which is required for the supermarket to operate.
122	Land adjacent to the Unicorn Public House, Church Lane	Trumpington	0.23	Site 122 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because although the site was initially considered to be suitable for development, it has recently been extended to provide B&B accommodation. It is also an awkward shape and is not really developable given constraints
21	158 Shelford Road	Trumpington	0.29	Site 21 was initially considered to be suitable for development, however the site may result in a gain of only 8 on redevelopment which is not enough to be SHLAA site as

				less than 10. In addition, on the 17/8/11 a letter was received from the land owner who envisages current use continuing throughout the plan period.
22	Bishops Court, Trumpington	Trumpington	1.56	Site 22 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because although the site was initially considered to be suitable for development, the multiplicity of ownerships and poor access along with parking displacement will mean very unlikely to happen.
878	Land East of Hauxton Road (part Cambridge South)- Edge of City strategic site	Trumpington	20.46	Faces a number on constraints and judged to be unsuitable for allocation in Local Plan Site Options Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. In Green Belt. Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes. Distance from local facilities and inability to provide its own. Poor public transport in a City context. Noise and air quality issues over parts of the site due to proximity to the M11. Loss of agricultural land. Not needed in relation to our objectively assessed needs. Not deliverable or developable
904	Land South of Addenbrookes Road- Edge of City strategic site	Trumpington	9.22	Faces a number on constraints and judged to be unsuitable for allocation in Local Plan Site Options Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. In Green Belt. Significant impact on Green Belt purposes. Distance from local facilities and a primary school. Poor public transport in a City context. Not needed in relation to our objectively assessed needs. Not deliverable or developable
914a	Land West Of Hauxton Road- Predominantly	Trumpington	4.65	Faces a number on constraints and judged to be unsuitable for allocation in Local Plan Site Options Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. In Green Belt.

	Residential option- Edge of City strategic site			Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes. Distant from existing services and facilities. Poor transport accessibility in City context but very good accessibility in South Cambridgeshire context. Close to M11 and Hauxton Road, air quality and noise concerns over part of site due to proximity to M11. Not needed in relation to our objectively assessed needs. Not deliverable or developable
914b	Land West Of Hauxton Road- Community Stadium option- Edge of City strategic site	Trumpington	4.65	Faces a number on constraints and judged to be unsuitable for allocation in Local Plan Site Options Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. In Green Belt. Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes. Distant from existing services and facilities. Poor transport accessibility in City context but very good accessibility in South Cambridgeshire context. Close to M11 and Hauxton Road, air quality and noise concerns over part of site due to proximity to M11. Non residential proposal Not needed in relation to our objectively assessed needs. Not deliverable or developable
924	Land West of Trumpington Road- Edge of City strategic site	Trumpington	45.30	Faces a number on constraints and judged to be unsuitable for allocation in Local Plan Site Options Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. In Green Belt. Very significant impact on Green Belt purposes. No evidence of land owner intentions. Loss of protected open spaces, which are attractive features in their own right and contribute positively to the landscape setting. Loss of agricultural land. Air quality issues by virtue of its size though it could provide some community facilities. Not needed in relation to our objectively

				assessed needs. Not deliverable or developable.
8	Land to the rear of 29 & 31 Bateson Road	West Chesterton	0.31	Site 8 is unlikely to be considered to be developable as it would lead to the loss of an allotment site that meets the criteria in the Local Plan for Protected Open Space
329	Open space on Mulberry Close	West Chesterton	0.21	Site 329 is not suitable for residential development because it involves the loss of open space and the site adds to the character and amenity of the local area. It also meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be Protected Open Space
337	Open space east of College Fields	West Chesterton	0.28	Site 337 is not suitable for residential development because it involves the loss of open space and the site adds to the character and amenity of the local area. It also meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be Protected Open Space
338	Open space west of College Fields	West Chesterton	0.28	Site 338 is not suitable for residential development because it involves the loss of open space. Fitting the development in between the surrounding buildings may prove problematic. Site also meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
908	Cambridge Student Support Centre (CSSC) Ascham Road	West Chesterton	0.58	Site 908 is not suitable for new development that involves the demolition of a listed building.

This page is intentionally left blank

ANNEX 16 -AUDIT OF CHANGES SINCE MAY 2012 SHLAA

Sites Considered Suitable May 2013

SHLAA Site Ref	LP Site Options Ref	SHLAA Site Name	Estimated No	Comments
81	R8	152 Coleridge Road	6	Develop 81with 87
87	R8	149 Cherry Hinton Road	27	See above
102	R10	Mill Road Depot	167	
312	R2	R/o 129-133 Histon Road	11	Develop with allocation to N
443	R6	636-656 Newmarket Road	75	
583	R14	Car Park E of Porson Court	21	Develop with allocation to S
629	R11	Horizons Centre Coldhams Lane	40	
872	M5	82-90 Hills Rd & 57- 63 Bateman St	20	
903	R24C	Glebe Farm 2	35	
905	R16	Professional Dev Centre Paget Rd	67	
906	R5	Camfields & Oil Depot Ditton Walk	35	
913	M2	Clifton Industrial Estate Clifton Road	555	
919	R17	Mount Pleasant House	50	
922	R12	Ridgeons 75 Cromwell Road	217	
929	GB2	Worts' Causeway South	200	
930	GB1	Worts' Causeway North	230	
934	R21	Brookfields Hospital Site Mill Road	98	Develop with allocation to S

Rejected Sites May 2013 (See Annex 15 for details)

SHLAA Site Ref		Site Name	Estimated No	Comments
105	Abbey Stadium and land fronting	Abbey	2.88	Faces a number on constraints
202	1 Ditton Walk	Abbey	0.28	Counted in AMR 2012
430	Catholic Church of St Vincent de Paul	Abbey	0.16	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
855	Telephone Exchange south of 1 Ditton Lane	Abbey	0.17	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
870	Ditton Fields Nursery School, Wadloes Road	Abbey	0.19	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
894	Land to r/o 551-555 Newmarket Road	Abbey	0.11	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
12	162 - 184 Histon Road	Arbury	0.23	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
909	Shire Hall Site, Old Police Station, Castle Mound, and 42 Castle	Castle	2.91	Land owner no longer wishes to pursue

57	BP Garage, 452 Cherry Hinton Road & garages off Glenmere Close	Cherry Hinton	0.26	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
755	78 and 80 Fulbourn Road and the open space to the south	Cherry Hinton	0.59	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
151	Land to R/O 1 - 28 Jackson Road (Car parking and lock-up garages)	Kings Hedges	0.27	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
887	98 -144 Campkin Road	Kings Hedges	0.52	Not viable
902	Land south of the Ship, including the car park	Kings Hedges	0.34	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
204	48-61 Burleigh Street	Market	0.30	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
892	64-68 Newmarket Rd	Market	0.27	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
917	Auckland Road Clinic	Market	0.20	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
895	Downing Playing Field Grantchester Rd- Edge of City strategic site	Newnham	4.83	Faces a number on constraints
896	Pembroke Playing Field Grantchester	Newnham	3.76	Faces a number on constraints
897	St Catherine's Playing Field Grantchester	Newnham	2.71	Faces a number on constraints
901	West's Renault RUFC Grantchester Road-	Newnham	8.55	Faces a number on constraints
910	21-29 Barton Road	Newnham	0.55	Impact on Conservation Area.
916	Grange Farm- Edge of City strategic	Newnham	44.03	Faces a number on constraints
921	Land North & South Of Barton Road-Edge of	Newnham	36.97	Faces a number on constraints
196	31 Queen Edith's Way	Queen Ediths	0.23	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
911	Cambridge South East-Land south	Queen Ediths	116.55	Faces a number on constraints
925	Land South of Addenbrookes and	Queen Ediths	39.80	Faces a number on constraints
70	213 - 217 Mill Road	Romsey	0.22	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance
918	18 Vinery Road	Romsey	0.20	Below 0.5ha and covered by windfall allowance

878	Land East of Hauxton Road (part Cambridge	Trumpington	20.46	Faces a number on constraints
904	Land South of Addenbrookes Road-	Trumpington	9.22	Faces a number on constraints
914a	Land West Of Hauxton Road-Predominantly	Trumpington	4.65	Faces a number on constraints
914b	Land West Of Hauxton Road-Community	Trumpington	4.65	Faces a number on constraints
924	Land West of Trumpington Road-	Trumpington	45.30	Faces a number on constraints

This page is intentionally left blank