



Chapter 11

Promoting Successful Communities

CHAPTER 11 – PROMOTING SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITIES

- 11.1 Cambridge’s role as a sub-regional centre extends beyond its retail offer, with a wide range of leisure, sporting and cultural facilities, which are used extensively by residents and visitors alike.
- 11.2 The NPPF recognises the role that the planning system has to play in promoting social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Cambridge, with its many multi-functional spaces and areas of open space offers residents an attractive environment in which to participate in a range of outdoor activities. Indoor sports facilities and other recreational activities also support health and well-being and create more vibrant and lively local centres. The promotion of inclusive communities is assisted by multi-purpose community centres and other community facilities. These also increase the chance for their users to experience a variety of activities and meet people.
- 11.3 The city has a wide range of cultural events and institutions, ranging from annual events such as the Cambridge Folk Festival and the University of Cambridge’s Science Festival to a number of well-established museums and theatres.
- 11.4 This section addresses the policy options related to open space and recreation and leisure, arts, cultural and community facilities. These form important elements in ensuring that Cambridge is a vibrant and socially inclusive city, with a high quality of life for all residents.

STRATEGIC PRIORITY

Option 163: A green and pleasant City with vibrant and culturally diverse neighbourhoods

To protect, enhance and provide open spaces, community facilities, leisure and recreation, arts and other cultural facilities in Cambridge to create vibrant, inclusive and thriving communities, which retain the character and appeal of Cambridge as a place to live, study, work and visit.

Key Facts

- A total of 305 protected open spaces have been identified in the City covering approximately 744 hectares¹; 395 hectares are private & 349 hectares have public access;
- Protected open spaces include such spaces as: allotments, amenity green spaces, cemeteries, churchyards, civic spaces, areas specifically for children and young people, natural and semi-natural green spaces, outdoor sports facilities, parks and gardens;
- A total of 305 protected open spaces have been identified in the City covering approximately 744 hectares²; 395 hectares are private & 349 hectares have public access;

¹ Open Space & Recreation Strategy 2011, (Cambridge City Council)

- Protected open spaces include such spaces as: allotments, amenity green spaces, cemeteries, churchyards, civic spaces, areas specifically for children and young people, natural and semi-natural green spaces, outdoor sports facilities, parks and gardens;
- Cambridge has slightly above the national average provision of sports halls.³
- Cambridge has the following:
 - 3 cinemas with a total of 20 cinema screens⁴;
 - 2 theatres and 5 concert halls/performing arts venues;
 - 9 fitness clubs (with 2 additional clubs north of the city boundary);
 - 3 nightclubs;
 - 3 snooker / pool halls;
 - 1 Tenpin bowling facility;
 - 1 soft play facility
- The city has a wide range of health facilities including doctors' surgeries and dentists. Addenbrooke's Hospital is the main local hospital for most of the sub-region (excluding Huntingdon). It is also the regional specialist centre for East Anglia and a centre of clinical education and biomedical research.
- There are approximately 16 public halls⁵, including church halls in Cambridge.
- Cambridge has 11 museums; 18 community centres; 6 public libraries; and 76 places of worship.

Two new libraries will be delivered through existing plans in Cambridge's urban extensions.

Objectives

- To protect and enhance the quality and type of the City's open spaces and to provide new open spaces and recreational facilities in accessible locations to meet the increased demand associated with the growing city;
- To protect and enhance the city's recreation and leisure facilities to serve the growing needs of Cambridge;
- To ensure that Cambridge is a healthy and socially inclusive community

² Open Space & Recreation Strategy 2011, (Cambridge City Council)

³ Cambridge City Council Sports Strategy 2009 – 2013

⁴ Cambridge Sub-Region Retail Study, Vol. One: Report & Plans, October 2008

⁵ A building used for public gatherings, social events and other recreational activities. These facilities are normally only able to accommodate one activity at a time.

with a broad range of community facilities serving the needs of everyone. Existing community facilities will be protected and, where appropriate, enhanced.

- To encourage the sustainable development of arts and cultural facilities in Cambridge in order to meet the needs of the growing city.

Protection and enhancement of existing open spaces and recreation facilities

- 11.5 Open spaces, regardless of ownership, are a key aspect of high quality urban environments and are fundamental to the character of the city. In addition to having an important role to play in the streetscape, these areas provide people with a place to relax and socialise as well as encouraging healthier lifestyles by providing opportunities for sport and informal play. They also provide important opportunities to support a wide range of citywide strategies, including biodiversity, climate change, green infrastructure, surface water management and flood risk prevention.
- 11.6 An essential part of Cambridge’s character stems from the relationship between the city’s buildings and open spaces, with many of the larger open spaces linked by the River Cam. Many of the open spaces in Cambridge link together to form an extensive green network, with frequent juxtaposition of public and private spaces of different sizes and functions. The transition between the relative peace and space of the open spaces and the bustle and intimacy of the densely packed City streets is very marked. These areas can create many positive aspects to the local environment by supporting sporting activities, improving the character and appearance of an area and creating more pleasant and desirable neighbourhoods. These qualities are highly valued by residents, workers and visitors; they are fragile, finite and irreplaceable, and should be safeguarded.
- 11.7 The River Cam running through the City forms a key component of many of the larger open spaces in Cambridge. Commons, college grounds and amenity green space sit alongside the river and form a green link that runs through the City. The multi-functional nature of the River Cam in terms of recreational activities (including punting, swimming, canoeing, sailing and rowing), biodiversity and floodwater management makes it a very important asset. It is essential for any new development along the riverbanks to respect the character and appeal that the River Cam affords Cambridge.
- 11.8 The NPPF recognises the role that access to high quality open space and opportunities for sport and recreation plays in the health and wellbeing of communities. It sets out the need for planning policies to protect open spaces to be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open spaces, sports and recreation facilities. The Council updated its Open Space and Recreation Strategy in 2011, including the assessment of all Protected Open Space in the city. This assessment forms the basis for future policy development. The NPPF introduced a supplementary designation - Local Green Space - for green areas of particular importance to local

communities. No guidance has been provided on this but the Council will look into this as the Local Plan is progressed.

- 11.9 Only one option has been put forward for policy development. The city's network of open spaces has a vital role to play in the health and wellbeing of the community, bringing wider economic and environmental benefits. The policy approach outlined below is considered to be in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF.

Option 164 – Protection of open space

This option would allow for the continuation of the Council's current policy position of protecting open spaces important for environmental or recreational reasons. Where a site is protected for environmental reasons, development would not be allowed which would harm the character of, or lead to the loss of the open space. Where a site is protected for recreation reasons only, development that leads to the loss of the open space only when it can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere. Open spaces protected under this policy would include:

- Areas designated as Green Belt on the proposals map;
- Areas designated as protected open space on the proposals map or designated as a Local Green Space;
- Areas assessed as meeting the criteria for protection in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011;
- Other areas that meet at least one of the criteria for protection (see Appendix F).

The advantage of this policy approach is that it would protect open spaces, while allowing some flexibility where the qualities of the site can be satisfactorily replaced.

All designated areas of open space to be protected have been subject to detailed assessment as required by the NPPF.

Questions

- 11.1. Is there a need for a policy addressing this issue?
- 11.2. Are there any points which have been missed and you feel should be added (perhaps even an entirely new option)?
- 11.3. Are there any other reasonable alternatives to this option?

Provision of new open spaces and recreation facilities

- 11.10 The provision of open space to meet the needs of new development is important to ensure that existing open spaces do not become overused. It is also an integral element of the high quality of new development being sought as part of chapter 5 (Creating Successful Places).

- 11.11 The adopted Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011 recommends the current Open Space and Recreation Standards should continue to be applied to new residential development with the following amendments:
- For informal open space, the standard is raised from 1.8 hectares per 1,000 people to 2.2 hectares per 1,000 people; and
 - The allotment standard is applied to all residential development and not just in the urban extensions (as in the 2006 Local Plan).
- 11.12 These changes are based upon a survey of existing provision of informal open space, within the Open Space & Recreation Strategy 2011. The rise in population associated with the new developments will generate the need for new informal open space provision and these new standards seek to ensure adequate provision for new development.
- 11.13 A study by Ashley Godfrey Associates for the Council examined allotment standards and provision in different cities and compared them with Cambridge. Existing provision of allotments in Cambridge is 0.38 hectares per 1,000 people. Applying the standard of 0.4 hectares per 1,000 people will help spread the provision of allotments across the city, and combined with changes to the management of allotments will help reduce waiting lists.
- 11.14 Concern over the application of policy 3/8 (Open Space and Recreation Provision Through New Development) and the issue of seeking on site provision has been raised by as an issue, especially in areas where there is a deficiency in open space.
- 11.15 The Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011 confirmed that on site provision should be provided as part of new developments. This document also identified a number of wards that either have relatively lower quality open spaces (Arbury, Cherry Hinton, Coleridge, East Chesterton, King's Hedges, Market, Petersfield and Romsey) or have large deficiencies in publicly accessible open space compared with the local population (Castle, Newnham, Petersfield, Queen Edith's, Romsey, Trumpington, West Chesterton).
- 11.16 Whilst the quality of open spaces can be improved with further investment, new areas of open space are also required to mitigate against the impact of additional residential development in the city, particularly in those areas with existing deficiencies in provision. In areas where a deficiency in open space has previously been identified, on-site provision of open space should be the norm within new residential developments. Financial contributions, in lieu of new provision, will only be acceptable where it is clearly not physically or financially viable to provide the open space required on-site and in exceptional circumstances
- 11.17 A number of options are presented below, which consider ways in which new open space and recreation facilities can be provided as part of new development.

Option 165 – Update the standards in line with the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2011)

One option could update the current standards for provision of open space and recreation facilities in new development to take into account the recommendations of the Open Space & Recreation Study 2011. The new standards would be:

- Outdoor sports facilities: 1.2 hectares per 1,000 people
- Indoor sports facilities: 1 sports hall per 13,000 people & 1 swimming pool per 50,000 people
- Provision for children & teenagers: 0.3 hectares per 1,000 people
- Informal open space: 2.2 hectares per 1,000 people
- Allotments: 0.4 hectares per 1,000 people

Currently, the allotment standards only apply to development in the urban extensions. This option proposes to amend this so that the allotment standards are applied to all new residential development in Cambridge.

Provision is sought on site as appropriate to the nature, location and scale of the development. Further guidance is provided in Appendices G & H.

The advantage of this policy approach is that these changes are based on an up to date evidence base that indicates a rise in the estimated population of Cambridge and a need to increase the quantity of informal open space that serves both local residents and visitors from outside Cambridge.

However, this approach is that the policy may affect the economic viability of new development.

Option 166 – Maintain the current standards for open space and recreation provision

A second option could continue with the current standards for provision of open space and recreation facilities in new development as set out in the 2006 Local Plan. The current standards are:

- Outdoor sports facilities: 1.2 hectares per 1,000 people
- Indoor sports facilities: 1 sports hall per 13,000 people & 1 swimming pool per 50,000 people
- Provision for children & teenagers: 0.3 hectares per 1,000 people
- Informal open space: 1.8 hectares per 1,000 people
- Allotments: 0.4 hectares per 1,000 people (applicable to large urban extensions only)

Provision is sought on site as appropriate to the nature, location and scale of the development. Further guidance is provided in Appendices G & H.

The advantage of this policy approach is that by maintaining existing

standards open space would continue to be provided through new development and that developers would not have additional financial and physical demands placed upon their schemes, with their associated impacts on viability.

However, this approach is that the policy would not necessarily meet the needs of Cambridge and would not be in keeping with the Council's evidence base.

- 11.18 Within the existing built up area of Cambridge, there are limited opportunities for creating new open space except on new development sites. Therefore some on site provision should be made on most housing sites. The optimum use of existing open space must be made, and opportunities must be sought to improve existing spaces and address deficits. Opportunities to link new and existing areas of open space to the city's green infrastructure should be explored where possible.

Option 167 – On-site provision

This option would, in accordance with the agreed standards, ensure the on-site provision of open space as appropriate to the nature and location of development. Where it is not possible to provide on-site provision, off-site provision will be agreed by means of financial contributions.

Provision will be sought on site as appropriate to the nature, location and scale of the development. Further guidance is provided in Appendices G & H.

The advantage of this policy approach is that it would strengthen the wording of the current policy, remove confusion as to which is the most appropriate (on site or financial contributions) and lead to the delivery of new open spaces.

- 11.19 New provision for open spaces should relate to the context of the site and the needs of local people. Appendix H provides guidance on where provision should be made and opportunities sought for the different types of provision. This section explains where different types of provision should be located, for example within smaller housing sites, within established open space, within existing built up areas, in urban extensions or within the Green Belt.

Questions

- 11.4. Is there a need for a policy addressing this issue?
- 11.5. Which of the options do you prefer?
- 11.6. Are there any points which have been missed and you feel should be added (perhaps even an entirely new option)?
- 11.7. Are there any other reasonable alternatives that should be considered at this stage?

Protection of existing leisure facilities

- 11.20 Cambridge’s role as a sub-regional centre encompasses a wide range of leisure, sporting and cultural facilities, which are used extensively by residents and visitors alike. Whether visiting the Fitzwilliam Museum, the Cambridge Leisure Park, using the British Film Institute archive at Cambridge Central Library or participating in an impromptu kickabout on Parker’s Piece, Cambridge has something for everyone.
- 11.21 Leisure facilities can enhance people’s lives by providing cultural and sporting activities supporting people’s health and well-being. Furthermore, leisure facilities support the vibrancy and vitality of the City. However, there are often pressures to redevelop leisure facility sites for higher-value uses, including residential uses. The effect of the closure of leisure facilities, either public or private will limit the range of available cultural and sporting activities and have a negative impact on the lively nature of Cambridge. There will also be increased pressure on other existing leisure facilities, leading to overcrowding.
- 11.22 The compact form of Cambridge helps minimise the need for people to travel to access local services such as leisure facilities. It is therefore important that existing facilities are retained and renovated, where possible, and they continue to serve the needs of both local residents and visitors to the City. Leisure facilities should therefore be allowed to adapt to changing lifestyles while retaining their leisure function. Any future policy should also allow some flexibility to take advantage of opportunities to relocate an existing facility with improved access.
- 11.23 In accordance with the NPPF, the following options have been put forward as appropriate ways of protecting leisure facilities while allowing these premises to adapt to changing lifestyles and needs:

Option 168 – Protection of existing leisure facilities

This option would involve developing a criteria based policy to protect existing leisure facilities. These criteria could include:

- The need for facilities to be replaced to at least their existing scale and quality within the new development;
- The relocation of the facility to another appropriate location with similar or improved accessibility for its users;
- The leisure facility could be lost only if it can be demonstrated there is no longer a need for the leisure facility in the area.

Leisure facilities need to be protected to retain the vibrancy and vitality of a growing city. However, some flexibility is also required to allow their redevelopment or relocation without affecting leisure provision.

Relevant evidence to demonstrate a leisure facility is no longer needed will come from:

- Up to date studies, including a local needs survey;

- 12 months marketing of the facility for leisure use;
- Details of spare capacity in alternative facilities and how remaining uses will cope with displaced users; and
- The accessibility of alternative facilities.

The marketing exercise should include extensive advertising. Both freehold and leasehold options should be made available without restrictive covenants preventing re-use as a leisure facility and potential competitors are not excluded.

All details of offers should be provided together with full reasons as to why any offer has not been accepted. The facility should only be marketed at an appropriate value agreed by the Council and an independent assessor for its existing purpose, i.e. a leisure facility.

Where an applicant is seeking to prove that the operation is no longer economically financially viable, full financial evidence produced by a suitably qualified independent assessor must be presented which clearly demonstrates that the premise is no longer capable of making a reasonable profit as an alternative leisure facility.

The advantage of this policy approach is that it would provide sufficient safeguarding of existing leisure facilities while still allowing for the relocation and modernisation of the premises in a more accessible location, minimising journey lengths. This approach also builds upon the current Local Plan policy 6/1.

However, this approach could also delay the delivery of alternative facilities.

Questions

- 11.8. Is there a need for a policy addressing this issue?
- 11.9. What criteria should be used to judge whether a leisure use could be lost?
- 11.10. Are there any points which have been missed and you feel should be added (perhaps even an entirely new option)?
- 11.11. Are there any other reasonable alternatives that should be considered at this stage?

New leisure facilities

- 11.24 As Cambridge grows, demand for leisure facilities will increase. Proposals for new and improved leisure facilities that enhance the range, quality and access to such facilities will be supported.
- 11.25 It is important that adequate leisure provision, based upon local need is provided in locations that minimise journey lengths. This will mean the capacity of existing leisure facilities will need to increase (without affecting the local amenity). Growth within the city and in new urban extensions will

need to minimise their impact on leisure provision by contributing to new facilities.

- 11.26 In accordance with the NPPF, the following option has been put forward as an appropriate way of addressing the issue of how to provide new leisure facilities.

Option 169 – New leisure facilities

This option would allow for the development of a policy of supporting new leisure facilities that:

- Improve the range, quality and accessibility to facilities;
- Are of an appropriate scale to the locality; and
- Do not have a negative impact on the vitality and viability of the City Centre.

Detailed policy site selection criteria would also be required to ensure compatibility with neighbouring uses and suitable access.

Where sports facilities are provided through educational development, community use may be sought through planning obligations.

The advantage of this policy approach is that it would protect the City Centre and improve the quality and range of leisure facilities available, while considering their impact on the built environment. This approach also builds upon the current Local Plan policy 6/2.

Questions

- 11.12. Is there a need for a policy addressing this issue?
- 11.13. Are there any points which have been missed and you feel should be added (perhaps even an entirely new option)?
- 11.14. Are there any other reasonable alternatives that should be considered at this stage?

Community Facilities

- 11.27 Cambridge has a wide range of community facilities, which offer a range of essential services to the city's residents. These facilities include 23 day nurseries, 23 primary schools, 6 secondary schools, 12 independent schools, 7 council-run community centres and 76 places of worship; all of which serve a diverse city where a large number of different faiths practise.
- 11.28 Community facilities, regardless of ownership are a key element of successful and social active communities. These premises can vary in size and shape and provide local people with an important venue to conduct many different community activities, including social gatherings, religious services, and activities for young and elderly people. Successful community facilities are often those that can support different activities at the same time, increasing

the chance of people to meet other community members that they might otherwise never socialise with.

What are Community Facilities?

- 11.29 Community facilities support community activities and can be both residential and non-residential institutions (C2 & D1 categories of the Use Class Order Guide). Examples of these facilities include hospitals, nursing homes, residential care homes, some education facilities, childcare provision, children’s centres, further education, specialist clinics, complementary healthcare, medical centres, dentists, public halls, church halls, community centres, libraries, crèches, emergency service faculties, court buildings and places of worship.
- 11.30 Other facilities that support community activities, not in Use Class C2 or D1, could be considered as a community facility, for example public houses. Language schools and tutorial colleges, while education facilities, are not defined as community facilities. The Universities are also not defined as community facilities.

Questions

- 11.15. Do you agree with this definition of community facilities?
- 11.16. Have we missed off any community facilities?
- 11.17. Are there any other reasonable alternatives that should be considered at this stage?

Protection of Existing Community Facilities

- 11.31 Community facilities are vital to the quality of life of the communities they serve, providing a variety of services that are valued by residents. It is important that existing community facilities are retained, and where possible improved, to ensure they meet the needs of the local community. Community facilities can come under pressure from redevelopment for higher value uses. This loss, if not properly managed can lead to a shortage of suitable community facilities and lead to overcrowding in remaining facilities.
- 11.32 In accordance with the NPPF, the following option has been put forward as an appropriate way of addressing the issue of how to retain community facilities while allowing these premises to adapt to changing needs:

Option 170 – Protect existing community facilities

This option would allow for the development of a policy of protecting community facilities from re-use or redevelopment for alternative uses unless:

- The facility is replaced on site; or
- The facility is relocated to an alternative but equally accessible site.
- The facility could be lost only if it can be demonstrated there is no

longer a need for a community facility in the area.

Community facilities need to be protected to support cohesive and active communities in a growing city. However, some flexibility is also required to allow their redevelopment or relocation without affecting their provision.

Where a facility is replaced on site, enabling development (e.g. residential units) could help fund improvements to the facility.

Relevant evidence to demonstrate a community facility is no longer needed will come from:

- Up to date studies, including a local needs survey;
- 12 months marketing of the facility for community use;
- Details of spare capacity in alternative facilities and how remaining uses will cope with displaced users; and
- The accessibility of alternative facilities.

The marketing exercise should include extensive advertising. Both freehold and leasehold options should be made available without restrictive covenants preventing re-use as a community facility and potential community groups are not excluded.

All details of offers should be provided together with full reasons as to why any offer has not been accepted. The facility should only be marketed at an appropriate value agreed by the Council and an independent assessor for its existing purpose, i.e. a community facility.

The advantage of this policy approach is that it would provide sufficient safeguarding of existing community facilities while still allowing for the relocation and modernisation of the premises in a more accessible location, minimising journey lengths. This approach also builds upon the current Local Plan policy 5/11.

However, this approach could delay the timely delivery of alternative facilities with layers of bureaucracy that prove the lack of demand for the existing facilities.

Questions

11.18. Is there a need for a policy addressing this issue?

11.19. Are there any points which have been missed and you feel should be added (perhaps even an entirely new option)?

11.20. Are there any other reasonable alternatives that should be considered at this stage?

Public Houses

11.33 Public houses can play a crucial role in maintaining the vibrancy and vitality of local neighbourhoods, helping to foster and maintain community spirit and

give a sense of identity to an area. Not only do they provide valuable services for visitors to the city, they also help create and sustain Cambridge's character and appeal as a place to live, work, visit and study.

- 11.34 In recent years, the number of public houses in Cambridge has fallen from 111 to 86⁶. Some have closed simply due to the general market decline in the pub trade while others have been converted into residential units or student accommodation; a process that requires planning permission. Many have also become restaurants; a process that does not require planning permission, subject to Environmental Health considerations.
- 11.35 The need to retain public houses is highlighted by the recent Portas Review, as previously mentioned in this document which supports the need to encourage both economic and community life back into our high streets so they become once again destinations for socialising, culture, health, well-being, creativity and learning.
- 11.36 Public houses are now considered community facilities in accordance with the NPPF. However, with the loss of approximately 20 public houses in recent years, various options now need to be considered to safeguard the remaining public houses.
- 11.37 In accordance with the NPPF, the following options have been put forward as appropriate ways of addressing the issue of how to protect public houses:

Option 171 – Public houses: Market led approach

One option could be to continue with the Council's existing approach, where public houses in Cambridge are not protected by any specific local planning policy.

Public houses are closing for a variety of reasons (the smoking ban, pub company debt, people going into the City Centre, cheap alcohol availability in supermarkets, or people staying at home) and trying to protect public houses may be a futile exercise because they are simply no longer viable in the changing market.

The continued loss of public houses to high valued uses is in part due to the constraints on new housing development.

Option 172 – Protection for all Public Houses

A second option could be to develop a policy that protects all public houses from redevelopment to alternative uses.

This will ensure that all public houses are not converted to higher value uses. However, this option cannot prevent the loss of public houses into restaurants (because this change does not require planning permission), subject to Environmental Health considerations. A restaurant can then apply for planning permission for conversion into residential development or student accommodation, avoiding policy protection granted to public

⁶ Cambridge Public House Survey (2012)

houses.

It is important that a balanced and flexible approach is adopted to allow these premises to adapt to changing lifestyles and market conditions.

This approach may not guarantee complete protection of public houses because they could simply become a restaurant before changing into an alternative use. In a declining market the policy would potentially be too restrictive, as genuine redundant public houses could remain empty affecting an area's vitality and vibrancy.

Option 173 – Safeguarding Public Houses (please see full list in Appendix I).

A third option could be to develop a policy which could protect all public houses from redevelopment to alternative uses unless the use was demonstrably not viable by another public house operator, as a community facility or a use falling within the 'A' use class.

This option would provide a criteria based policy that protect public houses from redevelopment for alternative uses unless:

- The facility is replaced on site; or
- The facility is relocated to an alternative but equally accessible site.
- The facility could be lost only if it can be demonstrated there is no longer a need for the public house in the area.

Relevant evidence to demonstrate a public house is no longer needed will come from:

- Pre-application consultation with local residents;
- Evidence that alternative diversification of the public house (i.e the introduction of food) has been proved to be economically unviable;
- 12 months marketing of the facility for as a public house, a community facility or other 'A' use class; and
- The accessibility of alternative public houses.

The marketing exercise should include extensive advertising. Both freehold and leasehold options should be made available without restrictive covenants preventing re-use as a leisure facility and potential competitors are not excluded.

All details of offers should be provided together with full reasons as to why any offer has not been accepted. The facility should only be marketed at an appropriate value agreed by the Council and an independent assessor for its existing purpose, i.e. a leisure facility.

Where an applicant is seeking to prove that the operation is no longer economically financially viable, full financial evidence produced by a suitably qualified independent assessor must be presented which clearly demonstrates that the premise is no longer capable of making a reasonable

profit as a public house.

The advantage of this policy approach is that it would provide sufficient safeguarding of public houses. The policy approach is also flexible because it tests the market in a fair manner and allows for its loss when it can be proved beyond reasonable doubt that it is no longer needed. It also ensures the community is made aware about the opportunity to purchase the public house at a fair market price.

Questions

11.21. Is there a need for a policy addressing this issue?

11.22. Which of the options do you prefer?

11.23. Are there any other reasonable alternatives that should be considered at this stage?

- 11.38 There are a number of former public house buildings in Cambridge that have been in alternative uses (e.g. established restaurants) for a considerable period of time. Some of these are in areas that add to the local character and attractive setting of Cambridge as a place to visit and enjoy. In certain circumstances, the loss of a local business operating in a former public house to higher value uses may affect the character of the locality and therefore may not be in the interests of the local community.

Option 174 – Extend the safeguarding option (No. 173) to former Public Houses (not listed in Appendix I).

A fourth option could be to extend Option 176 to include former public houses where the loss of the former public house's current use to other uses (excluding A-uses and community facilities) would harm the vibrancy and vitality of the local area.

The advantage of this policy approach is that the policy would provide the market with considerable flexibility for public houses to convert back to their original use, A1, A2, A3 & A5 or a community facility. Any conversion would be subject to Environmental Health considerations. This option would support the function of buildings previously occupied by former public house uses and safeguard them from higher value uses.

- 11.39 While no permission is required for a public house to become a restaurant, A2 office or shop (subject to Environmental Health considerations), planning permission is still required to change back to a public house.

Option 175 – Allow the flexible re-use of Public Houses

A fifth option could be to allow the re-instatement of a former public house use from a community facility, A1, A2, A3 or A5 use.

The advantage of this policy approach is that the policy would provide greater market flexibility for public houses to convert back to their original use from alternative uses such as takeaways, shops and other professional

services and community facilities. Any conversion would be subject to Environmental Health considerations. This option would support the vitality and vibrancy of former public house uses and safeguard them from higher value uses.

The disadvantage of this policy approach is that the policy may distort the market by creating too many A-uses for the market to support and restricting the creation of new residential units.

Questions

11.24. Which of the options do you prefer?

11.25. Are there any points which have been missed and you feel should be added (perhaps even an entirely new option)?

11.26. Are there any other reasonable alternatives that should be considered at this stage?

New Community Facilities

11.40 As Cambridge grows, demand for community facilities will increase. Proposals for new and improved community facilities that enhance the range, quality and access to such facilities will be supported.

11.41 It is important that adequate provision of community facilities, based upon local needs, is provided in locations that minimise journey lengths. This will mean the capacity of existing community facilities will need to increase where possible without affecting the local amenity. This will also lead to a more intense use of the existing premises. Additional community facilities linked to new urban extensions will need to minimise their impact on existing facilities and provide sufficient community infrastructure created by new development.

11.42 In accordance with the NPPF, the following option has been put forward as an appropriate way of addressing the issue of how to provide new community facilities:

Option 176 – New community facilities

This option would allow for the development of a policy to supporting proposals for new community facilities where there is a local need.

Proposals for new community facilities should aim to maximise opportunities to support as many different community activities as possible. This can be achieved by providing new buildings that support:

- A broad range of community activities and different groups' needs; and
- The concurrent usage of community facilities for different community activities.

The shared use of community facilities may not always be possible, due to conflicting demands and / or needs.

The advantage of this policy approach is that it would support new, multi-functional community buildings and foster interaction between community groups. Multi-functional community buildings may also mean that these buildings can be used to support leisure activities. This approach also builds upon the current Local Plan policy 5/12.

Option 177 – The provision of community facilities through development

This option would allow for the development of a policy requiring new community facilities where development leads to an increased demand for community facilities.

This option includes the requirement under the current policy for areas of major change (Local Plan policy 5/13) to provide appropriate community facilities.

This requirement should meet the needs of residents, employees and visitors to the City. A range of specific community projects should be clearly identified to ensure a transparent system of accountability for the delivery of community facilities.

The advantage of this policy approach is that by maintaining existing standards community facilities would continue to be provided through new development. This approach also builds upon the current Local Plan policy 5/14.

Questions

- 11.27. Is there a need for a policy addressing this issue?
- 11.28. Which of the options do you prefer?
- 11.29. Are there any points which have been missed and you feel should be added (perhaps even an entirely new option)?
- 11.30. Are there any other reasonable alternatives that should be considered at this stage?

11.43 Although there are considerable limitations in what we as a Council are able to do as a local authority, the Council is keen to better understand the current scope and long-term aspirations of each faith community and the range of services they offer their community/wider community.

11.44 The Council is planning to contact all active faith groups in Cambridge regarding the provision of places of worship. This survey will ask about the facilities they currently use, their adequacy in meeting their needs and their anticipated requirements between now and 2031. It is important that adequate provision for community groups and available to serve the growing population of Cambridge.

11.45 This information gathered will help inform the planning for community facilities and feed into the next stage of the Local Plan Review.

Questions

- 11.31. Is there a need for a policy addressing this issue?
- 11.32. Are there any points which have been missed and you feel should be added (perhaps even an entirely new option)?
- 11.33. Are there any other reasonable alternatives that should be considered at this stage?

Arts & Culture

- 11.46 Cambridge is home to a variety of arts and cultural centres. These include museums, art galleries, theatres, live music venues and dance performance centres. These help to support a diverse range of arts and cultural activities and further enhance Cambridge's position as an important sub-regional centre for arts and culture. It is important therefore that Cambridge maintains and enhances these activities as the city grows and takes advantages to increase the range and type of venues able to support these activities.
- 11.47 In accordance with the NPPF, the following option has been put forward as an appropriate way of addressing the issue of how to support the city's arts and cultural activities:

Option 178 – Support for arts and cultural activities

This option would allow for the Local Plan to protect and enhance existing arts and cultural facilities, support opportunities for new arts and cultural facilities and develop an appropriate policy. Any provision would be subject to proven need and support for such a facility as well as finding a suitable location.

When considering sub-regional or citywide facilities a sequential approach to development is expected, with the city centre being the top priority.

Whilst this option acknowledges that there may be a need for additional arts and cultural activities it is subject to proven need along with finding a suitable location. This location may not be in Cambridge or the surrounding area.

This option would have to compete with alternative and potentially higher value uses unless a specific site(s) can be allocated.

Questions

- 11.34. Is there a need for a policy covering this issue?
- 11.35. Are there any points which have been missed and you feel should be added (perhaps even an entirely new option)?
- 11.36. Are there any other reasonable alternatives that should be considered at this stage?

Provision for sub regional sporting, cultural and community facilities

- 11.48 As the City and the sub-region grows it is important that this is accompanied by a range of facilities to meet the wider needs of the area. The provision of a range of facilities enable people to develop pride in the places where they live and work, create local distinctiveness and help make communities healthy and sustainable. Cultural activity in Cambridge is key and plays a wider role in the knowledge based economy, making a major contribution to quality of life as well as adding to the diversity of the City.
- 11.49 There are currently no surplus arts, cultural, recreational and sports provision in the city and through work undertaken for Cambridgeshire Horizons, Cambridge has been identified as a possible location for new sub-regional facilities including a community stadium, ice rink and concert hall. There is also a proposal for a multi lane rowing facility in the sub region. However, there is limited land available in Cambridge and there are a number of competing uses. The NPPF requires Councils to plan positively for the provision of social, recreational and cultural facilities and services. On this basis a number of options have been proposed for consideration at this stage.

Questions

- 11.37 Are there any specific sub-regional needs that we need to be aware of?
- 11.38 If there is a need, what type and size of facility should they be?
- 11.39 If there is a need, where is the most appropriate location?

Community Stadium

- 11.50 The concept of a community stadium emerged a few years ago in the context of growth in the Cambridge area and was first referred to in a Major Sports Facilities Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (2006) which identified gaps in sports provision within the Cambridge Sub-Region. A further report was subsequently prepared by PMP for Cambridgeshire Horizons. This looked at the need for a community stadium in more detail (including possible enabling development) as well as searching for an appropriate location. The Cambridge Community Stadium – Feasibility Study (2007) by PMP concluded that three sites around the fringes of Cambridge could be suitable. These were Milton, Cambridge East and land at Cowley Road. However, it was found that for Milton the site was in the Green Belt, for Cambridge East timing and availability was a barrier and land at Cowley Road would restrict the size of a stadium.
- 11.51 The term ‘Community Stadium’ is used to reflect a stadium facility that delivers amenities and services to local communities beyond its core operations. These different services and provisions may include health, leisure and general community provisions and, or sports and education facilities as well as local retail and other local businesses. A Community Stadium also aims to be accessible to the communities it serves at all times, during the day and evening, on weekdays and weekends. It is believed that a

Community Stadium would benefit Cambridge by meeting the requirements of one or more of its major sports clubs as well as providing supporting facilities to local communities.⁷

- 11.52 It is relevant to first explore if there is a need for a Community Stadium, and second if there is a need, where the most appropriate location should be.
- 11.53 The 2007 Cambridge Community Stadium – Feasibility Study considered a range of evaluation criteria including site size, proximity to housing, ground condition, visibility, current facilities, neighbouring uses, other plans for the location, plans for the neighbouring sites, planning status, transport and access, ownership and development implications.

Questions

- 11.40 Is there a need for a Community Stadium in Cambridge?
- 11.41 If there is a need, what type and size of facility should it be?
- 11.42 If there is a need, where is the most appropriate location?

Option 179 – Community Stadium

This option would allow for the Local Plan to make provision for a Community Stadium and develop an appropriate policy. Any provision would be subject to proven need and support for such a facility as well as finding a suitable location.

Whilst this option acknowledges that there may be a need for a Community Stadium it is subject to proven need along with finding a suitable location. As this facility would be to serve the whole of the Cambridge Sub-Region, this location may not necessarily be in Cambridge or the surrounding area.

- 11.54 A specific proposal has been put to the Council and to South Cambridgeshire District Council by Grosvenor Estates for land west of Hauxton Road as an extension to the current proposals for development of Trumpington Meadows. Secondly, it is important to acknowledge that the concept and the early work looking at a community stadium are different from the proposals that Grosvenor Estates are currently proposing. Grosvenor bought the Abbey Stadium site in April 2010 and since then, has indicated their intentions to redevelop the Abbey Stadium and provide a community stadium elsewhere in Cambridge or South Cambridgeshire for Cambridge United Football Club. Grosvenor are currently proposing the provision of a new Community Stadium on land south of the current allocation at Trumpington Meadows, together with 420 dwellings and other supporting infrastructure. Other facilities may include outdoor community provision for active sports, a Country Park extension and facilities for sport science and sports medicine. They have advised the City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council that they have considered a wide range of sites in and on the edge of Cambridge but that all other sites have proved to be either unsuitable or not

⁷ Cambridge Community Stadium Feasibility Study 2008

deliverable because the landowner is not prepared to make it available. They advise that their evidence for this will be provided to the Councils, but it had not been received at the time of writing this report. Early site selection work by Grosvenor included an assessment of the following ten sites:

- Blue Circle (20 hectares)
- Marshall – North of Newmarket Road (51 hectares)
- Cowley Road (25 hectares)
- Trumpington Meadows – adjacent to the M11 (32 hectares)
- NIAB 2 (30 hectares)
- Addenbrooke’s (38 hectares)
- Peterhouse – adjacent to the Technology Park (57 hectares)
- Trumpington Road (32 hectares)
- Milton (70 hectares)
- Barton Road (165 hectares)

11.55 From this list, land at Barton Road, land North of Newmarket Road, NIAB 2 and Trumpington Meadows were looked at in more detail. Land at Barton Road has subsequently been ruled out on the grounds of inappropriate use and land North of Newmarket Road and NIAB 2 have been ruled out due to landowners being unwilling to put them forward for consideration for this form of development.

11.56 Given the proposals put forward by Grosvenor, the following questions have been outlined for comment.

Questions	
11.43	Do Grosvenor’s proposals accord with the definition of a Community Stadium?
11.44	Is there support for all or parts of the Community Stadium and Sporting Village proposals put forward by Grosvenor?
11.45	Is there support for Grosvenor’s proposals for enabling development?
11.46	If proposals for enabling development are not supported, how else can a Community Stadium be funded/delivered?
11.47	Should any other sites considered by Grosvenor be considered as potential sites?
11.48	Are there any other reasonable locations to be explored?
11.49	Should the Abbey Stadium be redeveloped for housing, or another use?
11.50	Should the Abbey Stadium be retained as a stadium?

Ice Rink

- 11.57 The concept of an ice rink emerged a few years ago and was first referred to in the Major Sports Facilities Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (2006, prepared by Cambridgeshire Horizons) which identified gaps in sports provision within the Cambridge Sub-region. Analysis showed that there is demand for a facility and proposals have been developed by a group known as Cambridge Leisure Ice Centre (CLIC). The Major Sports Facilities Strategy recommended that an ice rink is developed with a vision to provide an ice centre which offers a range of ice based activities (ice hockey, public skating, figure skating, curling etc) with a focus on providing opportunities for community, local clubs and the University.
- 11.58 CLIC have looked at various locations including North West Cambridge, Cambourne and West Cambridge but no firm proposals have been put forward.
- 11.59 Given this, the following questions and option have been put forward for consideration and comment.

Questions

- 11.51 Is there a need for an Ice Rink in Cambridge?
- 11.52 If there is a need, where should it be located?

Option 180 – Ice Rink

This option would allow for the Local Plan to make provision for an Ice Rink and develop an appropriate policy. Any provision would be subject to proven need and support for such a facility as well as finding a suitable location.

Whilst this option acknowledges that there may be a need for an Ice Rink it is subject to proven need along with finding a suitable location. As this facility would be to serve the whole of the Cambridge Sub-Region, this location may not necessarily be in Cambridge or the surrounding area.

Concert Hall

- 11.60 The concept of a concert hall also emerged a few years ago in the context of growth in the Cambridge area and was first referred to in the Arts and Cultural Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (2006, prepared by Cambridgeshire Horizons) which identified gaps in arts and cultural provision within the Cambridge Sub-region. The analysis found that although there is a wide range of music venues at the small and medium scale in and around Cambridge, there is a growing interest in testing the case for a purpose built auditorium for large scale music. Cambridge East was suggested as a possible location for a purpose built concert hall. Whilst the proposal has not yet been taken forward, it is appropriate for the Issues and Options consultation to establish and explore:
- 11.61 Given this, the following questions and option have been put forward for consideration and comment.

Questions

11.53 Is there a need for a Concert Hall in Cambridge?

11.54 If there is a need, where should it be located?

Option 181 – Concert Hall

This option would allow for the Local Plan to make provision for a Concert Hall and develop an appropriate policy. Any provision would be subject to proven need and support for such a facility as well as finding a suitable location.

Whilst this option acknowledges that there may be a need for a Concert Hall it is subject to proven need along with finding a suitable location. As this facility would be to serve the whole of the Cambridge Sub-Region, this location may not necessarily be in Cambridge or the surrounding area.

11.62 Due to the interrelationship with land in South Cambridgeshire, the City Council is committed to working in partnership with South Cambridgeshire District Council in order to provide appropriate provision in suitable locations.