

Schedule of Consultation Representations

Interim Planning Policy Guidance (IPPG) on The Protection of Public Houses in the City of Cambridge

Public Consultation 15th June until 27th July 2012

N.B.: The representations are grouped according to the section of the IPPG to which they refer and ordered by each IPPG section.

Interim Planning Policy Guidance on The Protection of Public Houses in the City of Cambridge

Report Date:

20/08/2012

CHAPTER: 1. Introduction

1. Introduction

8081 Object

Respondent: Januarys (Mr Justin Bainton) [2124]

Agent: N/A

Summary: -Representations made on behalf of Bondsway Ltd (BL) and Lucy Cavendish College (LCC), prospective joint applicants for the proposed redevelopment of the former Ranch PH for essential new Student Accommodation for mature female students to be occupied by LCC.
-BL have considerable concerns over the proposed policy approach towards the change of use of ALL Public Houses and are especially concerned that unfair opposition could be attracted to their application on the basis of the IPPG, which has not been fully considered.
-Concern that the Council has overreacted, bowed to pressure groups and not thought clearly on the issue.

Full Reference: O - 8081 - 2124 - 1. Introduction - None

8141 Object

Respondent: Januarys (Mr Justin Bainton) [2124]

Agent: N/A

Summary: GVA report
Appendix B
-No evidence that the individual sites have been properly assessed, or indeed visited.
-Misleading to categorise the individual pubs in this way unless this is backed up by a proper assessment. It is only those adjudged to be of value by the local community which should be safeguarded.
Paragraph 6.17 recommends, a flexible policy approach, and provides criteria for the consideration of the re-development of such sites in appropriate circumstances. The IPPG fails to reflect this and cuts across the NPPF and therefore the IPPG cannot be progressed in isolation of a wider Local Plan review.

Full Reference: O - 8141 - 2124 - 1. Introduction - None

8142 Object

Respondent: Januarys (Mr Justin Bainton) [2124]

Agent: N/A

Summary: GVA's commission and the LPA's subsequent brief should be made available. The Public House Study is fundamentally unsound to deal with this issue in isolation of the range of issues that inform a Local Plan review.
-GVA are potentially compromised to comment on the subject given their vested interest in the protection of Public Houses.
-Are GVA Humberts (a Leisure Surveyor) best placed to evaluate the issue?
-We question whether the report is appropriately commissioned as the report appears to be a defence of the Pub industry and of public houses, and not a balanced or objective assessment.

Full Reference: O - 8142 - 2124 - 1. Introduction - None

13083 Object

Respondent: Caldecotte Consultants (Mr Aaron Smith) [767]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I object to the introduction of this Interim Planning Policy Guidance as the rationale behind the 'community catchments' is unsound, furthermore the guidance in part is onerous, inflexible and disproportionate which will place unnecessary financial burdens on development; conflicting with paragraphs 21 and 153 of the Framework.

Full Reference: O - 13083 - 767 - 1. Introduction - None

14809 Object

Respondent: Charles Wells Ltd [2710]

Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [1524]

Summary: No stakeholder consultations with operators, breweries and owners of public houses in Cambridge.
Necessary prior to the adoption of the IPPG.
The survey carried out from which the Cambridge Public House Study was a tick-box exercise based on a visual drive-by - no initial consultations. Consultations and resulting input are vitally important prior to any adoption of the IPPG to ensure the Council fully understand business models, social and economic change and their effects on the day to day operations of pubs, and the reasons why both disposal and acquisition of licensed properties takes place.

Full Reference: O - 14809 - 2710 - 1. Introduction - None

6859 Support	Respondent: Mr Owen Dunn [1848]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	I approve of this plan, but the Council will need to be vigilant to ensure that public house owners do genuinely exert their best efforts to keep buildings open as pubs.	
Full Reference:	S - 6859 - 1848 - 1. Introduction - None	
8657 Support	Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	CambridgePPF broadly welcomes the proposals contained within the IPPG and that these provisions will become a 'material consideration' in determining planning applications in the City. We believe these provisions are urgently required in order that the new protections, given to Public Houses under NPPF paragraph 70, are properly and consistently applied in the City.	
Full Reference:	S - 8657 - 178 - 1. Introduction - None	
13035 Support	Respondent: Natural England (Mr Jamie Melvin) [2548]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No comment	
Full Reference:	S - 13035 - 2548 - 1. Introduction - None	
CHAPTER: 1. Introduction Scope and Purpose		
6947 Object	Respondent: Daniel Durrant [1870]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- The section could be more positive about the benefits of the city's public houses- There is no reference to the particular development pressures facing the city- Is this simply a response to community concern or is it an attempt to develop policy that prioritises the maintenance of public houses over other forms of development?	
Full Reference:	O - 6947 - 1870 - Scope and Purpose - None	
14689 Object	Respondent: British Beer & Pub Association (Dr Martin Rawlings) [2676]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	We object to the assertion that closed public houses may be more viable if managed under a different system or more immune to closure than tied pubs. There is no evidence to support this claim, on the contrary according to recent pub closure statistics freehold pubs are actually closing at a faster rate than tied pubs.	
Full Reference:	O - 14689 - 2676 - Scope and Purpose - None	
8781 Support	Respondent: Mr Trev Cooper [2187]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	We support the prevention of pub site redevelopment - enough is enough.	
Full Reference:	S - 8781 - 2187 - Scope and Purpose - None	
12776 Support	Respondent: Mr Matthew Day [2524]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	I agree that with supermarkets selling alcohol so cheaply and being so easy to buy from, pubs in the quantity Cambridge had didn't stand a chance. I am more sad about a pub building being knocked down for flats than I am to see it shut. I'd much rather the structure was kept and maintained and used for other uses for the community. Once they're flats, they can't be changed back into pubs again.	
Full Reference:	S - 12776 - 2524 - Scope and Purpose - None	
12784 Support	Respondent: Ms Sheila Jeffery [2514]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The change of use from public house to housing is often seen as a way of making a 'quick buck' by developers. The communities loose when this happens.	
Full Reference:	S - 12784 - 2514 - Scope and Purpose - None	

8086 Object**Respondent: Januarys (Mr Justin Bainton) [2124]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: -The Council needs to demonstrate that the adverse impacts of permitting the development of a PH site would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the development assessed against the NPPF policies "as a whole" (NPPF para 14).
 -The IPPG:
 fails to clarify what weight can be afforded to the emerging policy position in the context of the NPPF and the adopted Local Plan.
 fails to consider alternative uses for a PH site (vacant and where the business has failed), that otherwise complies with the Local Plan and NPPF, and has greater merit.
 -The IPPG lacks any sense of balance.

Full Reference: O - 8086 - 2124 - Status of the IPPG - None

8099 Object**Respondent: Januarys (Mr Justin Bainton) [2124]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: -The IPPG fails to clarify what weight can reasonably be given to the guidance, a major shortcoming of the document.
 -Not sound in a tightly constrained City to seek to impose a protective policy on a single issue basis without regard to the implications for other necessary development.
 -The IPPG conflicts with the provisions in the NPPF, which makes it clear that the document must be read as a whole, and that those development proposals that accord with the development plan must be approved without delay.
 -The IPPG should clarify the statutory power, which underpins the IPPG.

Full Reference: O - 8099 - 2124 - Status of the IPPG - None

8112 Object**Respondent: Januarys (Mr Justin Bainton) [2124]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: -The IPPG should state who is precisely concerned with the loss of public houses.
 -"local public concerns" needs to be clarified as to who this is apart from known pressure groups CPPF (Cambridge Past Present & Future) & CAMRA (Campaign for Real Ale).
 -The IPPG makes no reference to the dramatic increase in the number of Coffee Shops and alternative meeting places in the City, and the advent of social media, which has in part usurped the traditional "visit to the pub".
 -The IPPG is over simplistic.

Full Reference: O - 8112 - 2124 - Status of the IPPG - None

14690 Object**Respondent: British Beer & Pub Association (Dr Martin Rawlings) [2676]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We object to the development of an IPPG for this purpose which in our view goes against the spirit of the NPPF to reduce obstacles to growth and allow for businesses to change and adapt to a changing market.

Full Reference: O - 14690 - 2676 - Status of the IPPG - None

14698 Object**Respondent: Januarys Consultant Surveyors (Messrs N & D Cook & Brown) [2681]****Agent: Januarys Consultant Surveyors (Mr Colin Brown) [649]**

Summary: The status of the IPPG has not been clarified, and the weight to be attached to it is equally unclear. This needs to be corrected.

Full Reference: O - 14698 - 2681 - Status of the IPPG - None

14778 Object**Respondent: Ms Clare Blair [2699]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Concern regarding the weight officers and members are able to give to Informal Planning Policy Guidance until the new Local Plan is in place.
 It may be insufficient against pressures from developers.

Full Reference: O - 14778 - 2699 - Status of the IPPG - None

14855 Object**Respondent: Old Chesterton Residents' Association [2716]****Agent: Old Chesterton Residents' Association (Ms Clare Blair) [2719]**

Summary: Old Chesterton Residents Association (OCRA) welcomes the IPPG on pubs and the intent to incorporate strengthened protection for the retention of pubs into the forthcoming Local Plan. Concern remains that the weight officers and members are able to give to Informal Planning Policy Guidance until the new Local Plan is in place may be insufficient against pressures from developers however.

Full Reference: O - 14855 - 2716 - Status of the IPPG - None

6948 Support

Respondent: Daniel Durrant [1870]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This is a pressing issue and interim guidance is necessary and welcome.

Full Reference: S - 6948 - 1870 - Status of the IPPG - None

12801 Support

Respondent: Ms Sheila Jeffery [2514]

Agent: N/A

Summary: a clear policy on pubs needs to be incorporated into the local plan. It is good to take this opportunity to strengthen the protection of pubs under the local plan.

Full Reference: S - 12801 - 2514 - Status of the IPPG - None

CHAPTER: 2. Context

2. Context

11290 Object

Respondent: Miss Lynn Turner [2400]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I would like to see an amendment to planning policy to allow public consultation on whether the change of use of a pub to any other premises other than a pub with additional food facilities, eg. a restaurant attached would have to gain a proportion of the local area consent before any other use such as a shop or residential development was allowed. I strongly disagree with paragraphs 2.8 and 2.9, but support the previous and following paragraphs.

Full Reference: O - 11290 - 2400 - 2. Context - None

14811 Object

Respondent: Charles Wells Ltd [2710]

Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [1524]

Summary: We recognise local concern at the recent decline in the number of pubs within the City of Cambridge, a decline that reflects national trends. We anticipate that the number of traditional pubs will continue to decline with changing social circumstances and consumer spending patterns, and that the Council should accept this national situation. As supermarkets and other outlets come to dominate the mass market for beers and other alcoholic beverages, pubs must look increasingly to new business models that serve emerging niche markets where added value is critical to success, but this cannot apply in all circumstances.

Full Reference: O - 14811 - 2710 - 2. Context - None

11812 Support

Respondent: Metropolispd (Mr Nigel Bennett) [1164]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Representation submitted on behalf of Pace Investments Ltd, freehold owners of the land at Betjeman House/(new) Botanic House, Francis House, the Osbourne Arms and Flying Pig PHs, Hills Road, Cambridge.
Support for the general theme of the IPPG and the very important role community uses provide.
The consultation report:
-recognises the crucial role that pubs play in maintaining the vibrancy and vitality of local neighbourhoods and their place and contribution to the community;
-promotes a robust planning policy approach to provide protection in appropriate circumstances and to address a trend in falling numbers.

Full Reference: S - 11812 - 1164 - 2. Context - None

CHAPTER: 2. Context

Area covered by this IPPG

14688 Object

Respondent: British Beer & Pub Association (Dr Martin Rawlings) [2676]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Pubs are under severe pressure from tax and regulatory burdens.
Support pubs by alleviating the burdens affecting them, where possible.
The Council might consider looking at:
* Offering additional discretionary business rates relief to small businesses and those offering additional community services and value to the community.
* Taking a more positive approach to regulatory enforcement, particularly with regard to licensing as this can be one of the biggest burdens on business.
* Taking a positive and flexible attitude to planning and licensing to allow new pub businesses to start up and succeed if and where there is demand.

Full Reference: O - 14688 - 2676 - Area covered by this IPPG - None

- 8101 Object** **Respondent: Januarys (Mr Justin Bainton) [2124]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The IPPG is premature.
 Full Reference: O - 8101 - 2124 - Planning Policy Context - None
- 8122 Object** **Respondent: Januarys (Mr Justin Bainton) [2124]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: -Paragraph 2.3 overstates Cambridge's dependency on public houses to attract the students, academics, young workers and tourists that its economy and future growth depend upon. The statement is not based on verifiable evidence, and is symptomatic of the lack of balance within the document.
 -Paragraph 2.4 focuses on a very narrowly defined use of one part of the NPPF, and interprets and adapt sections in an equally brief and insubstantial way.
 -The blanket protection of PHs does not reflect the key requirement of the NPPF and therefore is not addressed properly by the IPPG.
 Full Reference: O - 8122 - 2124 - Planning Policy Context - None
- 13087 Object** **Respondent: Caldecotte Consultants (Mr Aaron Smith) [767]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Para 2.7 & 2.8 - The need to support business is made clear by these paragraphs, however, the requirements for a change of use is over burdensome, where supply and demand, and access to alternatives, is not fully considered.
 Full Reference: O - 13087 - 767 - Planning Policy Context - None
- 14687 Object** **Respondent: British Beer & Pub Association (Dr Martin Rawlings) [2676]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Further planning restrictions on change of use are counterproductive and go against the spirit of the NPPF that seeks to reduce red tape and delays around planning to allow business to more easily adapt to changing markets.
 The consultation quotes the LDF in stating that 'planning should readily adapt to changing circumstance' a sentiment expressed throughout the NPPF.
 The policy to 'resist the loss of Public Houses and other Drinking Establishments' is the opposite of this with pubs having to adapt to changing consumer habits away from pub going and planning restrictions supporting their viability and success in this situation.
 Full Reference: O - 14687 - 2676 - Planning Policy Context - None
- 14691 Object** **Respondent: British Beer & Pub Association (Dr Martin Rawlings) [2676]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Whilst we support the Council's comments about the value of pubs to the local economy and community, we do not believe that the proposals contained in this consultation are appropriate, and we question their legality.
 Full Reference: O - 14691 - 2676 - Planning Policy Context - None
- 14692 Object** **Respondent: British Beer & Pub Association (Dr Martin Rawlings) [2676]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: We object to the interpretation of the wording of the National Planning Policy Framework. In our view some of the quoted sections are taken out of context and used to justify the Council's restrictive planning policies in this document. The policy as a whole goes entirely against the spirits and intentions of the NPPF which sought to alleviate cost and burdens on business from the planning system.
 Full Reference: O - 14692 - 2676 - Planning Policy Context - None
- 14693 Object** **Respondent: British Beer & Pub Association (Dr Martin Rawlings) [2676]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: We object to the assertion that public houses will have enough flexibility simply to change between A Use Classes. Whilst this may be an option and clearly one that companies may look at, ultimately with a fast changing economic climate businesses are often under pressure to sell off unviable businesses. If there is no demand for businesses within the A Use Class then it may be the case that there is no option but to change to another use by applying for planning permission.
 Full Reference: O - 14693 - 2676 - Planning Policy Context - None
- 14779 Object** **Respondent: Ms Clare Blair [2699]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: There have been several significant appeal judgements (The Plough at Shepreth, The Unicorn, The Carpenters Arms) which need to be incorporated into the approved IPPG and any new Local Plan policy.
 Full Reference: O - 14779 - 2699 - Planning Policy Context - None

14856 Object**Respondent:** Old Chesterton Residents' Association [2716]**Agent:** Old Chesterton Residents' Association (Ms Clare Blair)
[2719]

Summary: Several significant appeal judgements must be addressed in the approved IPPG and any new Local Plan policy - namely the appeals at the Plough at Shepreth, The Unicorn and The Carpenters Arms.

Full Reference: O - 14856 - 2716 - Planning Policy Context - None

12807 Support**Respondent:** Ms Sheila Jeffery [2514]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: While the national planning framework is good for pubs, it is important to get this carried forward into the local plan

Full Reference: S - 12807 - 2514 - Planning Policy Context - None

6950 Object**Respondent: Miss Cassie Lynch [1871]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no longer a viable market for local pubs hence why so many are now closed. People can either not afford, or simply choose not to spend their money in pubs. There are plenty of pubs and bars in/around the city centre for people to go to if they wish. Local people would rather have more available housing, currently it is very difficult to find a house to buy in Cambridge because of the shortfall. Some local pubs have been a great source of concern to local residents because of noise and antisocial behaviour.

Full Reference: O - 6950 - 1871 - Need for the IPPG - None

7296 Object**Respondent: Mr Keith Hamilton [1940]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The IPPG is a scandalous waste of our money.

If pubs produce a reasonable profit they will probably stay open otherwise they will close.

The council cannot make a pub stay open if the brewery and /or owner decides otherwise.

What is better an eyesore of an empty building (and there are many disused pubs to illustrate this for example the Greyhound, Coldham's Lane) or a couple of houses/small block of flats.

Social life is changing. Pubs have always closed over the years. Get spending our money on something important in these hard times and not on things like this!

Full Reference: O - 7296 - 1940 - Need for the IPPG - None

14694 Object**Respondent: British Beer & Pub Association (Dr Martin Rawlings) [2676]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We do not believe that the Council are able to make generalisations about what model of pubs is most successful e.g. offering a wide range of real ales. It is impossible to speculate whether or not the pubs that have closed in Cambridge would have survived with a different offer or business model. It is beyond the remit of the Council to speculate in this manner or seek to prescribe what pubs should do in order to attract business and remain viable.

Full Reference: O - 14694 - 2676 - Need for the IPPG - None

14699 Object**Respondent: Januarys Consultant Surveyors (Messrs N & D Cook & Brown) [2681]****Agent: Januarys Consultant Surveyors (Mr Colin Brown) [649]**

Summary: There is not considered to be any justification for a current, single issue policy review outwith the Local Plan Review process. The IPPG is premature, not founded on a reasonable evidence base, and should not be progressed outwith the Local Plan Review.

Full Reference: O - 14699 - 2681 - Need for the IPPG - None

6880 Support**Respondent: Heather Coleman [1863]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I am relieved that the City Council finally realises there is a problem and is finally taking action. I generally support any measures taken to prevent more pub closures, especially with an increasing population, so that the remaining ones, especially the good ones, become so busy that it is difficult to reliably visit them with a group of friends as they are too crowded.

Full Reference: S - 6880 - 1863 - Need for the IPPG - None

7151 Support**Respondent: mr peter nanson [1914]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Clear requirement to preserve an appropriate number of pubs - several areas of cambridge are already very poorly served.

Full Reference: S - 7151 - 1914 - Need for the IPPG - None

10138 Support**Respondent: Mr Julius Baxter [2322]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I would like to express my support for, and agreement with the need for and goals of the IPPG.

Full Reference: S - 10138 - 2322 - Need for the IPPG - None

12833 Support

Respondent: Ms Sheila Jeffery [2514]

Agent: N/A

Summary: It has been too easy for pubs to change from pubs to restaurants, to failed restaurants, to redevelopments. This needs to be stopped as pubs can be the saviour of our high streets. The success of a pub in Cambridge is usually dependent on the landlord. Where there is the will to make a pub successful in Cambridge, it generally succeeds.

Full Reference: S - 12833 - 2514 - Need for the IPPG - None

14082 Support

Respondent: Tamsin Walker [2599]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Strongly support the need for this IPPG - pubs weren't in danger in the 2006 local plan, and thus not included, because of that reason, rather than because pubs were not valued. With the recent number of pub closures and applications for development, particularly in cambridge where development land is at a premium, this IPPG is both necessary and welcome.

Full Reference: S - 14082 - 2599 - Need for the IPPG - None

CHAPTER: 3. The Importance of the Public House 3. The Importance of the Public House

- 7034 Object** **Respondent: Friends of Midsummer Common (Dr Richard Baxter) [1262]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: It should be recognised that pubs are not just "culturally important institutions". Many are also "historically and architecturally important institutions". Redevelopment might destroy these attributes.
Full Reference: O - 7034 - 1262 - 3. The Importance of the Public House - None
- 7035 Object** **Respondent: Friends of Midsummer Common (Dr Richard Baxter) [1262]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: No mention is made of opening hours of individual pubs. Personal experience tells me which pubs are better for networking and meetings without having to remember their specific opening hours.
Full Reference: O - 7035 - 1262 - 3. The Importance of the Public House - None
- 7256 Object** **Respondent: Mrs Carol Johnson [1935]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: The document appears to list pros but no cons. This gives an unbalanced view as to the benefit of a pub to the community. For example, one of the reasons people stopped going to the Penny Ferry was the number of disturbances. Another reason, was for me, the deteriorating state of the grounds, overgrown trees which cut off any warm or light outside.
Another is the detrimental effect that alcohol has on certain individuals. Pubs are not designed as community centres. Places such as school,sports or church halls can make better meeting places.
Please list negatives in order to balance the discussion.
Full Reference: O - 7256 - 1935 - 3. The Importance of the Public House - None
- 13091 Object** **Respondent: Caldecotte Consultants (Mr Aaron Smith) [767]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: The importance of a public house is fully recognised but the statistics in this paragraph are unhelpful, unfounded, and unreliable. Further clarification is needed from a more impartial source.
Full Reference: O - 13091 - 767 - 3. The Importance of the Public House - None
- 14684 Object** **Respondent: British Beer & Pub Association (Dr Martin Rawlings) [2676]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Recognition of the value public houses provide including economic contribution, job provision, social function as community hubs and enhancing the diversity and character of areas.
Need to recognise that pubs are still businesses and must remain viable to survive.
Attempts to resist change of use or development of closed pubs will not prevent pubs failing if they are unviable, despite best efforts, some will inevitably still close.
It is crucial that pub businesses and individuals can re-position or dispose of the pubs to reinvest in other sites in the area.
Full Reference: O - 14684 - 2676 - 3. The Importance of the Public House - None
- 14700 Object** **Respondent: Januarys Consultant Surveyors (Messrs N & D Cook & Brown) [2681]** **Agent: Januarys Consultant Surveyors (Mr Colin Brown) [649]**
Summary: The IPPG presumes that all pubs (and former pubs) are valued facilities. The evidence base in the form of the GVA Grimley study provides no indication of community value.
Full Reference: O - 14700 - 2681 - 3. The Importance of the Public House - None
- 14813 Object** **Respondent: Charles Wells Ltd [2710]** **Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [1524]**
Summary: Although the NPPF classifies pubs as a community facility, it fails to recognise that this community function is dependent on the existence of a viable commercial enterprise.
Social networks, including families, have become looser and less geographically concentrated. New Internet based social networks are likely to promote these trends.
The days when pubs act as a focus for geographically defined local communities are largely over.
Pubs do not provide as many jobs as suggested, and are therefore not a significant part of the local economy. Demands of local groups are volatile.
Full Reference: O - 14813 - 2710 - 3. The Importance of the Public House - None

7019 Support	Respondent: mr martin salmon [1877]	Agent: N/A
Summary: As a resident of Romsey I feel it is important to save this building. I support it being opened as a Real Ale pub with inspired food menu. It could offer facilities for the community, rooms for a small music/comedy venue. Romsey is growing with vibrance, many new families are moving into the area. What we need is a focal point. This could be the first step to re-invigorating an historic area. The benefits would be many. This developer has already destroyed one pub house locally "The Jubilee", should not be given a second opportunity. Be brave CCC, think of the glorious alternatives.		
Full Reference: S - 7019 - 1877 - 3. The Importance of the Public House - None		
7149 Support	Respondent: Mr Kip Gresham [1912]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The Flying Pig is a cultural and social hub. It is a successful business. It has a critical role in the community. It offers an important sense of scale in the architecture of the area. It provides an essential service to a very diverse customer base.		
Full Reference: S - 7149 - 1912 - 3. The Importance of the Public House - None		
7195 Support	Respondent: Mrs Sheila von Rimscha [1932]	Agent: N/A
Summary: I agree with all of the points made in the document. I do not go to a pub that often, but they contribute to the atmosphere of an area, without which streets can become dreary housing estates. It is a valuable amenity in the city both for residents and visitors to have somewhere to go for a casual drink without having to go to a restaurant. Pubs are a very British institution and it would be a pity if they disappeared from everywhere except the historic centre.		
Full Reference: S - 7195 - 1932 - 3. The Importance of the Public House - None		
7302 Support	Respondent: Mr Dean Witziers [1943]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The Flying Pig has always been an excellent public house which supplies reasonably priced food. I've been a regular for many years and would miss its unique atmosphere if it was to be demolished. It's safe to say that should this public house be lost then it would be a sad day for this part of Cambridge. These types of establishments only develop over many years and once lost, it cannot be replaced. Please save the Flying Pig.		
Full Reference: S - 7302 - 1943 - 3. The Importance of the Public House - None		
9247 Support	Respondent: harry gray [2236]	Agent: N/A
Summary: I would like to add my support to the growing interest in retaining the 'Flying Pig' Public House as it is. There seems to be no merit in the destruction and then re- building of an existing community asset, indeed a great loss of amenity to this pocket of Cambridge would occur.		
Full Reference: S - 9247 - 2236 - 3. The Importance of the Public House - None		
12834 Support	Respondent: Ms Sheila Jeffery [2514]	Agent: N/A
Summary: I agreed with these statements.		
Full Reference: S - 12834 - 2514 - 3. The Importance of the Public House - None		
14278 Support	Respondent: English Heritage (East of England Region) (David Grech) [1787]	Agent: N/A
Summary: English Heritage agrees with the Council that the network of existing public houses make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the city and are important in promoting social cohesion and as venues for social recreation and leisure. We therefore welcome the draft IPPG as a tool to ensure viable public houses are retained in the use for which they were intended.		
Full Reference: S - 14278 - 1787 - 3. The Importance of the Public House - None		
15356 Support	Respondent: Ms Teresa Mulliken [2585]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Public houses make an important contribution to social life in Cambridge.		
Full Reference: S - 15356 - 2585 - 3. The Importance of the Public House - None		

CHAPTER: 4. Development Management Principles 4. Development Management Principles

- 7147 Object** **Respondent: Mr Neil Toolin [1911]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: There doesn't seem to be anything in the draft that addresses the case where an existing pub is to be demolished and replaced by a new pub as part of a wider redevelopment. The developer could argue that as the pub is not being 'lost' the IPPG is not relevant in this case. I would argue that the pub (eg Flying Pig) would be lost as the replacement pub would not have the same character etc. Could the council look into this and include this type of case in the IPPG and the resulting policy guidance applicable to it.
- Full Reference: O - 7147 - 1911 - 4. Development Management Principles - None
- 8663 Object** **Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: No reference to applications for entirely new Public Houses.
NPPF Paragraph 7 states that one of the NPPF's 'dimensions' is "a social role - supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities...with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being".
Add a paragraph in section 4 that:
-welcomes applications for new Public Houses in the City, particularly with outdoor areas, that promote these aims;
-any new development must demonstrate how they will meet 'community needs', and support the resident's 'social and cultural well-being', by the provision of an accessible Public House(s).
- Full Reference: O - 8663 - 178 - 4. Development Management Principles - None
- 10153 Object** **Respondent: Cambridge & District Branch of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) (Mr Paul Ainsworth) [2323]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Cambridge & District CAMRA very much welcomes this initiative and applauds the Council for recognising the need to preserve the city's remaining pubs for future generations. However, we wish to see the policies strengthened so that any conversion of a public house to another use (including other A class uses) will require planning permission.
- Full Reference: O - 10153 - 2323 - 4. Development Management Principles - None
- 14285 Object** **Respondent: English Heritage (East of England Region) (David Grech) [1787]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: With reference to the wording of the policy, it might be beneficial to consider adding a paragraph on deliberate neglect. Paragraph 130 of the NPPF considers the issue of deliberate neglect of heritage assets and that wording might be adapted for use respect of public house in the city. This might read:
- 'Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect or damage to a public house the deteriorated state of the public house will not be taken into account in any decision concerning its future use or demolition.'
- Full Reference: O - 14285 - 1787 - 4. Development Management Principles - None
- 14816 Object** **Respondent: Charles Wells Ltd [2710]** **Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [1524]**
- Summary: Protectionist development management policies could have perverse effects in encouraging the closure of commercially marginal or poorly located public houses. These policies need to be more flexible. Development management policies should be positively worded to support pub diversification including the provision of dining facilities, smoking shelters and accommodation rooms. Development management policies should encourage the provision of hospitality facilities, including pubs, restaurants, clubs and visitor accommodation within the city centre and edge of city clusters as identified in the Cambridge Public House Study.
- Full Reference: O - 14816 - 2710 - 4. Development Management Principles - None
- 14817 Object** **Respondent: Charles Wells Ltd [2710]** **Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [1524]**
- Summary: Public houses in the suburban estates are amongst the most marginal, the consequence of competition from off licence outlets, and with buildings and locations where it is difficult to adopt some of the successful niche business models. Without a viable commercial operation, these pubs cannot act as a community focus unless some substantial form of subsidy is available. Alternative criteria for marketing strategy need to be considered.
- Full Reference: O - 14817 - 2710 - 4. Development Management Principles - None
- 8805 Support** **Respondent: Mr Roger Crabtree [1384]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Principles cover the issues well
- Full Reference: S - 8805 - 1384 - 4. Development Management Principles - None

15898 Support

Respondent: Mr Luke Nashaat [2774]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support in general for the proposals

Full Reference: S - 15898 - 2774 - 4. Development Management Principles - None

CHAPTER: 4. Development Management Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house
Principles

- 8125 Object** **Respondent: Januarys (Mr Justin Bainton) [2124]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: -Marketing is not a way to test whether the facility is a 'valued' facility, which is a key consideration of the NPPF, or the benefits of alternative uses on the site. Its importance as a 'measure' of value is therefore very much overstated. The requirement for marketing should only be applicable if it is accepted that a public house is valued from the outset. It should not be the starting point to any assessment.
Full Reference: O - 8125 - 2124 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None
- 8130 Object** **Respondent: Januarys (Mr Justin Bainton) [2124]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: -We strongly query the assertion at paragraph 4.22 of the GVA report that pubs must be within 5 minute walking distance (400m) to serve local needs, and note that other local authorities, have adopted a wider catchment area threshold.
-Unclear about the requirement to provide one pub per 750 working age adults. No evidence to clarify whether this is the optimum ratio for Cambridge provided within the associated GVA Report, only a highly simplistic benchmarking exercise.
-No reference to the suitability of the public house use, and recognition that some have fundamental flaws or are more suitable for alternative uses.
Full Reference: O - 8130 - 2124 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None
- 8136 Object** **Respondent: Januarys (Mr Justin Bainton) [2124]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: -No reference is made to Local Centres, which in the current Local Plan are specifically designated to meet local day-to-day needs (para 6.24 of the Local Plan 2006), whereas outside such zones it would be reasonable to afford a lower degree of protection.
-Local Plans should recognise town centres as the heart of their communities and pursue policies to support their viability and vitality. This is in no way addressed within the IPPG.
Full Reference: O - 8136 - 2124 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None
- 8138 Object** **Respondent: Januarys (Mr Justin Bainton) [2124]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: -Criteria B and D goes well beyond the scope of the GVA pub study, in suggesting that viability should also be assessed in the context of alternative A Class and D1 uses. The IPPG has no remit to include policies which cut across the provisions of the Local Plan. No evidence base to support this approach.
-Requiring every criterion to be satisfied provides a blanket approach to resisting redevelopment, without retaining sensible flexibility in the emerging policy. Norwich policy framework is less onerous.
-Marketing may confirm a site's commercial interest, but when is an owner forced to sell a site?
Full Reference: O - 8138 - 2124 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None
- 8658 Object** **Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Point A: The specified 12 month period for marketing is inadequate. The Localism Act, under the 'Community Right to Bid', allows community organisations to nominate 'assets of community value' including Public Houses. If the owner of a listed asset then wants to sell then a six month moratorium period is triggered during which the asset cannot be sold. Any marketing period must start after the 6 month moratorium has elapsed. IPPG should clarify this.
Merton Council Local Plan Policy L15 states that the marketing period should be 2 years. The marketing period should be increased to a minimum 18 months.
Full Reference: O - 8658 - 178 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None
- 10156 Object** **Respondent: Cambridge & District Branch of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) (Mr Paul Ainsworth) [2323]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Of the 28 city pubs which have closed since 2002, 11 were converted to restaurants and these of course have considerably less of a community focus than the pubs they replaced. We feel, therefore, that the criteria, certainly so far as existing pubs are concerned, should seek to preserve pubs as pubs - the criteria as drafted appear to be relaxed about the prospect of them changing to other A class uses and D1 as well.
Full Reference: O - 10156 - 2323 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None

10159 Object	Respondent: Cambridge & District Branch of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) (Mr Paul Ainsworth) [2323]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Paragraph 4.5(a) We would prefer this to read "The pub has been marketed for a minimum of 12 months as a public house free of tie and restrictive covenant, at a price agreed with the Council following an independent professional valuation (paid for by the developer) and there has been no interest in either the free- or lease-hold as a public house". This would tie in more effectively with 4.6 and Annex A, where the marketing strategy is (rightly) primarily geared to selling for pub use.	
Full Reference:	O - 10159 - 2323 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None	
10160 Object	Respondent: Cambridge & District Branch of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) (Mr Paul Ainsworth) [2323]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Paragraph 4.5(b) For the same reason, we would prefer the wording to read ".....retain the building or site for its existing A4 class use." Again, the viability test at Annex B is oriented towards pub use so the nexus between criterion and annex would be stronger.	
Full Reference:	O - 10160 - 2323 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None	
10161 Object	Respondent: Cambridge & District Branch of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) (Mr Paul Ainsworth) [2323]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Paragraph 4.5(c) We applaud the ambitions of this criterion and the suggested 400 metres walking distance seems about right. We are not clear, however, how this ties in with the "one pub per 750 working age adults". Does this refer to the city as a whole, or the particular area of the city in which the pub is located? - and, if the latter, how is the area defined and the "pub per 750" figure calculated?	
Full Reference:	O - 10161 - 2323 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None	
10163 Object	Respondent: Cambridge & District Branch of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) (Mr Paul Ainsworth) [2323]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Paragraph 4.5(d) Again, we would suggest deletion of "any alternative A or D1 class use"	
Full Reference:	O - 10163 - 2323 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None	
13102 Object	Respondent: Caldecotte Consultants (Mr Aaron Smith) [767]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Para 4.5(a) If required, a 6 month marketing exercise is more proportionate. The proposed 12 month timeframe is unjustified and not compliant with the Government's own legislation allowing communities sufficient time to bid for community facilities. The Government recognises a total 6 month period will afford local community groups sufficient time to bid to take over registered 'assets of community value' which can include public houses. A more flexible and reasoned approach to the marketing period required may be a fairer reflection of economic circumstances, with six months an appropriate duration.	
Full Reference:	O - 13102 - 767 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None	
13103 Object	Respondent: Caldecotte Consultants (Mr Aaron Smith) [767]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Para 4.5(a) A more proportionate approach would require less onerous criteria for proposals, for a change of use to public houses in an urban area, where there is a minimum number of alternative pubs in reasonable walking distance.	
Full Reference:	O - 13103 - 767 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None	
13106 Object	Respondent: Caldecotte Consultants (Mr Aaron Smith) [767]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Para 4.5(b) The 'diversification options' of a pub needs to be further clarified, including guidance for the type of evidence required to demonstrate diversification options tried.	
Full Reference:	O - 13106 - 767 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None	

- 13126 Object** **Respondent: Caldecotte Consultants (Mr Aaron Smith) [767]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Para 4.5(c)
The requirement for alternative pubs to be within a 'reasonable walking distance' of 400m as per the Urban Design Compendium is not justified (to demonstrate a lower catchment for Cambridge) and is contrary to Government Policy which defines a reasonable walking distance at 800m, see Section 4.4 of the Manual for Streets (2007 as amended). The Manual for Streets guidance is more relevant as it refers to access to facilities as oppose to just open space, and is also more recent guidance. A 800m walking distance is 'reasonable' and justifiable, according to more recent and impartial research.
- Full Reference: O - 13126 - 767 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None
- 13161 Object** **Respondent: Caldecotte Consultants (Mr Aaron Smith) [767]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Consultation on the proposed marketing strategy and asking prices would be over burdensome. It is suggested that liaison with the local authority should be sufficient where, if the authority deem appropriate, may consider consulting the community in exceptional circumstances.
- Full Reference: O - 13161 - 767 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None
- 14685 Object** **Respondent: British Beer & Pub Association (Dr Martin Rawlings) [2676]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Attempts to restrict change of use will cut across the 'Community Right to Bid' provisions in the Localism Act which are due to come in later this year, which gives communities the power to protect community pubs that in rare cases may be under threat of closure. However, it also ensures that there is genuine community support behind a pub as without it, in the long run, the pub will still close. The Council should wait until the Localism Act provisions come in as these should be the mechanism if any to protect local pubs that genuinely have local support.
- Full Reference: O - 14685 - 2676 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None
- 14695 Object** **Respondent: British Beer & Pub Association (Dr Martin Rawlings) [2676]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: We are extremely concerned about the criteria that the Council is seeking to put into place before allowing development or change of use. We believe the proposals are unlawful as there is no legal basis upon which the Council might develop such criteria which are, in effect, obstacles to development. It is our view that the Council is exceeding it's powers under planning law as well as going against the spirit of the NPPF published only this year to free up business from unnecessary planning burdens and will be counterproductive in helping to keep pubs open.
- Full Reference: O - 14695 - 2676 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None
- 14696 Object** **Respondent: British Beer & Pub Association (Dr Martin Rawlings) [2676]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: This requirement is not something that that is within the Council's remit. It is unacceptable to require businesses to provide this information and an unacceptable intrusion into private business.
- Full Reference: O - 14696 - 2676 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None
- 14782 Object** **Respondent: Ms Clare Blair [2699]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Para 4.5 (a) and (b)
The approach taken in regard to acceptability of loss is almost solely a narrow market led viability approach favouring the applicants which is also contrary as well to the wider view on viability of recent appeals.
- Full Reference: O - 14782 - 2699 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None
- 14784 Object** **Respondent: Ms Clare Blair [2699]** **Agent: N/A**
- Summary: Para 4.5 (c)
Alternative provision is very weak. The argument used by the Council regarding the loss of the Penny Ferry/Pike and Eel listing the Green Dragon as alternative provision but not taking account of the wider loss in East Chesterton and that in fact loss of the Penny Ferry would mean the area was down to 1 pub for 7000 homes. Needs to be expanded to consider overall area provision and other pub losses (or gains) in the area over time (over the previous 10 year period) not just a tight circle round the pub itself.
- Full Reference: O - 14784 - 2699 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None

14785 Object	Respondent: Ms Clare Blair [2699]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Para 4.5(d) Development control principles need to address the emphasis often stressed by developers on the need for housing in Cambridge and give greater guidance on how to balance that against the potential loss of community facilities. The reality in Cambridge is that land constraints mean housing need can never be fully addressed and it will always remain a very high need, so any criteria based assessment of acceptability of loss needs to address this balance between housing and social amenity value explicitly. 4.5 (d) does not do this and could be strengthened.	
Full Reference:	O - 14785 - 2699 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None	
14857 Object	Respondent: Old Chesterton Residents' Association [2716]	Agent: Old Chesterton Residents' Association (Ms Clare Blair) [2719]
Summary:	Para 4.5 (a) and (b) The approach taken in regard to acceptability of loss is almost solely a narrow market led viability approach favouring the applicants which is also contrary as well to the wider view on viability of recent appeals.	
Full Reference:	O - 14857 - 2716 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None	
14858 Object	Respondent: Old Chesterton Residents' Association [2716]	Agent: Old Chesterton Residents' Association (Ms Clare Blair) [2719]
Summary:	Para 4.5 (c) The alternative provision is very weak. This option fails to take account of the wider loss in East Chesterton, for example. So it needs to be expanded to consider overall area provision and other pub losses (or gains) in the area over time (say over the previous 10 year period) not just a tight circle round the pub itself.	
Full Reference:	O - 14858 - 2716 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None	
14859 Object	Respondent: Old Chesterton Residents' Association [2716]	Agent: Old Chesterton Residents' Association (Ms Clare Blair) [2719]
Summary:	Para 4.5 (d) We consider also that the development management principles needs to address the emphasis often stressed by developers on the need for housing in Cambridge and give greater guidance on how to balance that against the potential loss of community facilities. The reality in Cambridge is that land constraints mean housing need can never be fully addressed and it will always remain a very high need, so any criteria based assessment of acceptability of loss needs to address this balance between housing and social amenity value explicitly. Para 4.5 (d) does not do this and could be strengthened.	
Full Reference:	O - 14859 - 2716 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None	
6878 Support	Respondent: Heather Coleman [1863]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Para 4.5a - I am pleased to see that the statement "free of tie or restrictive covenant" is included. Most pubs "fail" owing to onerous charges on behalf of the brewery that owns the freehold, or that the brewery imposes an incompetant landlord on the pub. The same pub, when free of tie, and run by a competent team, can often suddenly become a profitable success. One might interpret this as the brewery hoping the pub will fail, indeed setting the conditions so guaranteed to fail, so it can sell off the land for profitable housing.	
Full Reference:	S - 6878 - 1863 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None	
6944 Support	Respondent: Mr Ronald Clifton [1750]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There is a need to preserve existing pubs wherever possible. It is important that opinions as to continued viability are supported by truly independent evidence.	
Full Reference:	S - 6944 - 1750 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None	
7359 Support	Respondent: Mr John Meed [1956]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	I am very concerned about possible development on the site of our local pub, the Flying Pig, and hope this proposal will prevent such development taking place.	
Full Reference:	S - 7359 - 1956 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None	

8164 Support	Respondent: Holly Davies [2131]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Comprehensive; good detailing of how pubs benefit community and of how to check those benefits aren't being lost; good failsafes and checks to prevent inappropriate development of valued pubs.		
Full Reference: S - 8164 - 2131 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None		
8806 Support	Respondent: Mr Roger Crabtree [1384]	Agent: N/A
Summary: criteria seem reasonable		
Full Reference: S - 8806 - 1384 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None		
12866 Support	Respondent: Ms Sheila Jeffery [2514]	Agent: N/A
Summary: It is important that pubs be given a chance to revert to pubs if there is the demand by the local community for it,		
Full Reference: S - 12866 - 2514 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None		
14069 Support	Respondent: Tamsin Walker [2599]	Agent: N/A
Summary: I strongly support this proposal. When developers purchase pub sites, they do not do so with the aim of running a good pub in mind, and adopt the attitude that pubs are on the decline due to the smoking ban/ supermarket prices etc. It is clear, however, from walking into any well-run pub in cambridge, that pubs are extremely popular and important community meeting places when they are well-managed. This policy will protect against the developers' (naturally biased) arguments against pubs and allow sites to have a chance to be run as a pub again.		
Full Reference: S - 14069 - 2599 - Proposals affecting currently or last used as a Class A4 public house - None		

CHAPTER: 4. Development Management Principles Proposals affecting other Class A uses which were previously in a Class A4 pub use

- 6949 Object** **Respondent: Daniel Durrant [1870]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Would it be possible to have A4 as a default use class for public houses when a change of uses occurs. This may prevent situations like on Kings Street where a former public house was unable to reopen (albeit after some considerable time). It would also make it clear to local residents that a change of use back to A4 may occur in the future and that they should not assume the current use was permanent.
Full Reference: O - 6949 - 1870 - Proposals affecting other Class A uses which were previously in a Class A4 pub use - None
- 8165 Object** **Respondent: Holly Davies [2131]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: The other Class A uses seem to me to differ greatly from the functions pubs perform. I would think that a conversion in this category would still lead to the full effects of the loss of a valued pub, and think it would be better to use the same stringent criteria for proving redevelopment is appropriate here as elsewhere.
Full Reference: O - 8165 - 2131 - Proposals affecting other Class A uses which were previously in a Class A4 pub use - None
- 8660 Object** **Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: We would also ask that consideration be given to Public Houses left closed for longer than 18 months being re-opened through enforcement notices under the Local Plan, or be the subject of an Article 4 Direction(NPPF Para.200), to prevent the 'unnecessary loss' of a 'local amenity'.
Full Reference: O - 8660 - 178 - Proposals affecting other Class A uses which were previously in a Class A4 pub use - None
- 8661 Object** **Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: That 'development management principles' should be 'Development Management Principles' in order that it's clear it refers to the specific provisions in section 4.
Full Reference: O - 8661 - 178 - Proposals affecting other Class A uses which were previously in a Class A4 pub use - None
- 10165 Object** **Respondent: Cambridge & District Branch of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) (Mr Paul Ainsworth) [2323]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: We strongly support the proposal to bring former pubs within the ambit of the policy. We do not, however, agree that the flexibility allowed by the national permitted development rules is beneficial. Of the eleven pubs which have converted to restaurants since 2007, none have returned to pub use - it is very much one-way traffic. We accept that the proposals would make it easier to change from A1/2/3 back to A4 but we consider that such changes would be better prevented in the first place.
Full Reference: O - 10165 - 2323 - Proposals affecting other Class A uses which were previously in a Class A4 pub use - None
- 10177 Object** **Respondent: Cambridge & District Branch of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) (Mr Paul Ainsworth) [2323]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Use LPA powers to make Article 4 Directions to remove permitted development rights. Council could make a Direction which requires planning consent to be obtained for any change of use away from A4 (and, indeed, to demolish a pub not in a listed building or conservation area). Councils are reluctant to use Article 4 Directions because of the potential liability to pay compensation to owners affected by a Direction. The Town and Country Planning (Development)(England) Regulations allow LPAs to avoid compensation risks by giving 12 months notice of a Direction coming into force. -York and Manchester have made Directions.
Full Reference: O - 10177 - 2323 - Proposals affecting other Class A uses which were previously in a Class A4 pub use - None
- 14701 Object** **Respondent: Januarys Consultant Surveyors (Messrs N & D Cook & Brown) [2681]** **Agent: Januarys Consultant Surveyors (Mr Colin Brown) [649]**
Summary: It is inappropriate for the IPPG to equally seek to apply to former pubs, when these may not have been in pub use for a very considerable period of time.
Full Reference: O - 14701 - 2681 - Proposals affecting other Class A uses which were previously in a Class A4 pub use - None
- 14786 Object** **Respondent: Ms Clare Blair [2699]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Para 4.9 - 4.13. Recent greater relaxation of permitted development rights by central government mean that loss of buildings from A1/A2 class use for residential C3 purposes is easier. How can this be addressed though the development control guidance here?
Full Reference: O - 14786 - 2699 - Proposals affecting other Class A uses which were previously in a Class A4 pub use - None

14860 Object	Respondent: Old Chesterton Residents' Association [2716]	Agent: Old Chesterton Residents' Association (Ms Clare Blair) [2719]
	Summary: Para 4.9 - 4.13 Recent (confirmed in July as coming into force from Oct 12) relaxation of permitted development rights by central government mean that loss of buildings from A1/A2 class use for residential C3 purposes is easier. How can this be addressed though the development control guidance here?	
	Full Reference: O - 14860 - 2716 - Proposals affecting other Class A uses which were previously in a Class A4 pub use - None	
6879 Support	Respondent: Heather Coleman [1863]	Agent: N/A
	Summary: The ability to reinstate premises that were formerly pubs, which have been under some other use, as pubs, is essential. Under new management, what was formerly a failure, may be a success, and this should be encouraged.	
	Full Reference: S - 6879 - 1863 - Proposals affecting other Class A uses which were previously in a Class A4 pub use - None	
6945 Support	Respondent: Mr Ronald Clifton [1750]	Agent: N/A
	Summary: Flexibility to allow reversion to pub use is highly desirable, in the right economic conditions.	
	Full Reference: S - 6945 - 1750 - Proposals affecting other Class A uses which were previously in a Class A4 pub use - None	
8807 Support	Respondent: Mr Roger Crabtree [1384]	Agent: N/A
	Summary: agree proposals	
	Full Reference: S - 8807 - 1384 - Proposals affecting other Class A uses which were previously in a Class A4 pub use - None	
12871 Support	Respondent: Ms Sheila Jeffery [2514]	Agent: N/A
	Summary: Pubs need to be able to move into and out of restaurant use. However change to housing removes this option and this must be subject to strict planning requirements.	
	Full Reference: S - 12871 - 2514 - Proposals affecting other Class A uses which were previously in a Class A4 pub use - None	
14072 Support	Respondent: Tamsin Walker [2599]	Agent: N/A
	Summary: This appears to be a loophole in the planning law which developers exploit in order to get round the increasing amount of legislation to protect pubs, thus is a necessary policy.	
	Full Reference: S - 14072 - 2599 - Proposals affecting other Class A uses which were previously in a Class A4 pub use - None	

CHAPTER: 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites

- 6876 Object** **Respondent: Mr Richard Bagnall [1861]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: Is there nothing that can be done to save the Penny Ferry, formerly Pike and Eel?
 Full Reference: O - 6876 - 1861 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None
- 7033 Object** **Respondent: Ms Joanna Gordon Clark [1883]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: RE: THE GREYHOUND.
 A very bad idea for it to close despite having been cut off from some of its clientele, but there is nowhere near to the houses opposite for a very long way indeed.
 Suggest an overhead pedestrian crossing. Its a long trek to any other pub in the direction of Mill road.
 Local businesses will sometimes want to go to a pub.
 Greyhound designation should be moved into the same list as the Carpenters Arms.
 More community/co-operative work needed right now and it will, if it succeeds, help people in the very difficult times now and coming.
 Full Reference: O - 7033 - 1883 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None
- 7036 Object** **Respondent: Friends of Midsummer Common (Dr Richard Baxter) [1262]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The Zebra is in the list of current pubs but it is closed. Should it be in another table.
 Full Reference: O - 7036 - 1262 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None
- 7288 Object** **Respondent: Mr Peter Towers [1938]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: I note with regret that the Penny Ferry/former Pike and Eel is approved for demolition. This decision is wrong. Please reconsider. Please see online petition and read the reasons people have given:
<http://www.ipetitions.com/petition/save-the-penny-ferry-pub/>
 504 signatures (06/08/2012)
 Full Reference: O - 7288 - 1938 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None
- 8140 Object** **Respondent: Januarys (Mr Justin Bainton) [2124]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: -Concerned that the IPPG is fundamentally unbalanced and provides no flexibility as to the suitability of alternative uses on the site.
 -No adequate explanation is given within the IPPG as to what the "value" of the public house is, how is it determined and who is the beneficiary?
 -No considered assessment as to in what respect the pubs listed in Section 5 provide an important local facility.
 Full Reference: O - 8140 - 2124 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None
- 8665 Object** **Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The Penny Ferry is incorrectly classified.
 -The appeal was heard in January when the NPPF was not in force and the Pub was not in an approved Conservation Area. Since then the NPPF has been finalised with strong guidance with regard to pubs, as well as non-designated heritage assets, and further important historic information is coming to light of which the inspector would have been unaware.
 -The Pub should be classified as a 'riverside Pub providing an important economic and tourist function'.
 Full Reference: O - 8665 - 178 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None
- 8669 Object** **Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]** **Agent: N/A**
 Summary: The Rosemary Branch is incorrectly classified.
 -There are no other pubs in the vicinity and we would argue there is a significant enough and growing local catchment. However, in the event that Cambridge East is developed then there would be an enormous potential catchment and there is no specific pub provision included in Cambridge East Area Action Plan (2008).
 -The Pub should be reclassified as providing an 'Important Local Community Facility in a Suburban Area'.
 Full Reference: O - 8669 - 178 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None

8673 Object	Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	'The Dog & Pheasant' is incorrectly named 'The Golden Pheasant' in the list.	
Full Reference:	O - 8673 - 178 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None	
10203 Object	Respondent: Cambridge & District Branch of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) (Mr Paul Ainsworth) [2323]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	4 existing pubs (the Bird, Wrestlers, Clarendon Arms and Man on the Moon) omitted and need to be added in. Add Bird and Clarendon to 'Edge of City Cluster' list Wrestlers and Man on the Moon to 'Important Local Community Facility' list.	
Full Reference:	O - 10203 - 2323 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None	
10208 Object	Respondent: Cambridge & District Branch of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) (Mr Paul Ainsworth) [2323]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Penny Ferry appeal mentioned pre-dated the NPPF and a conservation area now covers the site. should be 'City Centre, Riverside ...' or 'Important Local Community Facility' category.	
Full Reference:	O - 10208 - 2323 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None	
10216 Object	Respondent: Cambridge & District Branch of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) (Mr Paul Ainsworth) [2323]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Include Fleur (de Lys) on 'Important Local Community Facility' list because the planning consent for residential use has not yet been implemented. If the plans fall through, we would like the possibility of it returning as a pub to be safeguarded.	
Full Reference:	O - 10216 - 2323 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None	
10222 Object	Respondent: Cambridge & District Branch of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) (Mr Paul Ainsworth) [2323]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Welcome pubs currently closed or turned into restaurants. Should include other former pubs converted to a restaurant: - Oak Bistro (former Oak/Lawyers) - La Mimosa (former Spade & Beckett) - Back Street Brasserie (former White Hart) - Former Locomotive (currently close as a restaurant) - Spice Merchant (former Volunteer, Trumpington) - Wok'n'Grill, Trumpington (former Coach & Horses) - former Durham Ox, Mill Road - former Globe, Newmarket Road - former Prince of Wales, Histon Road - former Little Rose, Trumpington Street - former Racehorse, Newmarket Road. If site developed, a pub should be included given the shortage of sites.	
Full Reference:	O - 10222 - 2323 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None	
11831 Object	Respondent: Metropolispd (Mr Nigel Bennett) [1164]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Planning permission (Ref:06/0552/FUL) was granted for redevelopment (August 2007) to provide mixed use scheme including the retention of the Flying Pig Public House(PH). Phase 1 (Botanic House) now complete.	
	Pubs excluded from protection are based on various reasons, including those circumstances where planning permission has been granted for redevelopment or redevelopment has already occurred. Both reasons apply to The Flying Pig and Osborne Arms PHs; they are included within an approved redevelopment scheme that has already begun. Both of these pubs should be removed from the protection list.	
Full Reference:	O - 11831 - 1164 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None	

- 11833 Object** **Respondent:** Metropolispd (Mr Nigel Bennett) [1164] **Agent:** N/A
- Summary: The Osborne Arms, in contrast to the Flying Pig, has never played an important community or indeed economic role by contributing to the vitality and vibrancy of the local area. The retention of the Flying Pig will achieve these objectives.
Retention of the Osborne Arms is not commercially viable, even as a free house, given its proximity to the Flying Pig.
Both pubs should be removed from the protection list.
A 'new' and improved Flying Pig is to be provided in the redevelopment scheme. The operation and management of this pub has been agreed in principle with the existing tenants.
- Full Reference: O - 11833 - 1164 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None
- 11952 Object** **Respondent:** Cambridge & District Branch of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) (Mr Paul Ainsworth) [2323] **Agent:** N/A
- Summary: The remaining former pubs where planning permissions have begun become a separate category of "Former pubs whose redevelopment prevents them ever returning as a pub". However, given the sadly large number of other former pubs which fall within this definition, there may not be any particular value in having such a list (but if it is to be included, then it needs to be comprehensive)
- Full Reference: O - 11952 - 2323 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None
- 11967 Object** **Respondent:** Cambridge & District Branch of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) (Mr Paul Ainsworth) [2323] **Agent:** N/A
- Summary: Rosemary Branch is the only pub in the northern part of Cherry Hinton and is, for many local residents, by far their closest pub. 'Important Local Community Facility' list.
- Full Reference: O - 11967 - 2323 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None
- 11968 Object** **Respondent:** Cambridge & District Branch of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) (Mr Paul Ainsworth) [2323] **Agent:** N/A
- Summary: Greyhound is the only one in its area and there are many properties in Coldhams Lane and adjoining streets for which this is the most accessible pub. Include on 'Important Local Community Facility' list.
- Full Reference: O - 11968 - 2323 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None
- 11973 Object** **Respondent:** Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178] **Agent:** N/A
- Summary: We would also concur with the supplied list of Pubs missing from the list, detailed by CAMRA in their submission.
4 existing pubs (the Bird, Wrestlers, Clarendon Arms and Man on the Moon) omitted and need to be added in.
Add Bird and Clarendon to 'Edge of City Cluster' list
Wrestlers and Man on the Moon to 'Important Local Community Facility' list.
- Full Reference: O - 11973 - 178 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None
- 11976 Object** **Respondent:** Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178] **Agent:** N/A
- Summary: We would also concur with the supplied list of Pubs missing from the list, detailed by CAMRA in their submission.
Penny Ferry appeal mentioned pre-dated the NPPF and a conservation area now covers the site. should be 'City Centre, Riverside ...' or 'Important Local Community Facility' category.
- Full Reference: O - 11976 - 178 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None
- 11978 Object** **Respondent:** Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178] **Agent:** N/A
- Summary: We would also concur with the supplied list of Pubs missing from the list, detailed by CAMRA in their submission.
Rosemary Branch is the only pub in the northern part of Cherry Hinton and is, for many local residents, by far their closest pub. 'Important Local Community Facility' list.
- Full Reference: O - 11978 - 178 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None
- 11980 Object** **Respondent:** Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178] **Agent:** N/A
- Summary: We would also concur with the supplied list of Pubs missing from the list, detailed by CAMRA in their submission.
Greyhound is the only one in its area and there are many properties in Coldhams Lane and adjoining streets for which this is the most accessible pub. Include on 'Important Local Community Facility' list.
- Full Reference: O - 11980 - 178 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None

11982 Object	Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	We would also concur with the supplied list of Pubs missing from the list, detailed by CAMRA in their submission. Include Fleur (de Lys) on 'Important Local Community Facility' list because the planning consent for residential use has not yet been implemented. If the plans fall through, we would like the possibility of it returning as a pub to be safeguarded.	
Full Reference:	O - 11982 - 178 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None	
11986 Object	Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Carolin Gohler) [178]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	We would also concur with the supplied list of Pubs missing from the list, detailed by CAMRA in their submission. Should include other former pubs converted to a restaurant: - Oak Bistro (former Oak/Lawyers) - La Mimosa (former Spade & Beckett) - Back Street Brasserie (former White Hart) - Former Locomotive (currently close as a restaurant) - Spice Merchant (former Volunteer, Trumpington) - Wok'n'Grill, Trumpington (former Coach & Horses) - former Durham Ox, Mill Road - former Globe, Newmarket Road - former Prince of Wales, Histon Road - former Little Rose, Trumpington Street - former Racehorse, Newmarket Road.	
Full Reference:	O - 11986 - 178 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None	
12916 Object	Respondent: Jonathan Handley [2342]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The Penny Ferry other Chesterton pubs should be protected from development. Spade & Beckett / La Mimosa needs protection	
Full Reference:	O - 12916 - 2342 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None	
13182 Object	Respondent: Caldecotte Consultants (Mr Aaron Smith) [767]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The list of safeguarded public house sites have been categorised under three separate categories yet the requirement for demonstrating their viability in all circumstances is the same. This approach ignores access to alternative public houses in the area. It is recommended that the criteria for change of use of a pub in an urban area be less strict for those pubs in a rural area, where access to alternatives is very different.	
Full Reference:	O - 13182 - 767 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None	
13187 Object	Respondent: Caldecotte Consultants (Mr Aaron Smith) [767]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The list of safeguarded public house sites have been categorised under three separate categories yet the requirement for demonstrating their viability in all circumstances is the same. This approach fails to recognise public houses operate under a single Use Class, in which regardless of a public house's location or facilities, in planning terms all are the same under Use Class A4 Drinking Establishments; with no planning controls existing on the way in which a public house business operating.	
Full Reference:	O - 13187 - 767 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None	
14787 Object	Respondent: Ms Clare Blair [2699]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The Penny Ferry/Pike and Eel pub should be listed as a "City centre, riverside or village pub and bar sites providing an important economic and tourist function" and also as a "Pub Sites within edge of city clusters providing an important city wide economic and local community function."	
Full Reference:	O - 14787 - 2699 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None	
14822 Object	Respondent: Charles Wells Ltd [2710]	Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [1524]
Summary:	In spite of the NPPF's statements on public houses as a local community resource, development management policies should recognise the reality that face many pubs in relatively isolated locations on suburban estates. Local initiatives could provide a future for some of these pubs as community pubs. However, it should be recognised that there are suburban pubs that are not commercially viable, are not respected or used by the local community, and whose closure and development for other uses would be regarded locally as beneficial. Development management policies should not seek to protect such pubs.	
Full Reference:	O - 14822 - 2710 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None	

14861 Object	Respondent: Old Chesterton Residents' Association [2716]	Agent: Old Chesterton Residents' Association (Ms Clare Blair) [2719]
Summary:	We believe that the Penny Ferry/Pike and Eel pub should be listed as a "City centre, riverside or village pub and bar sites providing an important economic and tourist function" and also as a "Pub Sites within edge of city clusters providing an important city wide economic and local community function."	
Full Reference:	O - 14861 - 2716 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None	
15902 Object	Respondent: Mr Luke Nashaat [2774]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Concern for, and confused about the fate of the Flying Pig. Public commentary (Cambridge evening news, 2008 onward and protection of public houses consultation 2012) suggest proposal is contrary to the literal and commonly understood meaning of the word 'retention'.	
	The Flying Pig is a successful egalitarian pub; the atmosphere is not simply a result of the broad spectrum of people who drink there. The fabric of the building and those who use it are intimately intertwined. Patently absurd to suggest that a similar relationship could be contrived in a redeveloped building. Why not value its authenticity and originality?	
Full Reference:	O - 15902 - 2774 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None	
7032 Support	Respondent: Ms Joanna Gordon Clark [1883]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Glad to see the Carpenters Arms on Victoria Road is listed in the second section. It is the only pub on Victoria Road in a good, accessible location.	
	Concerned that after its closure it would be developed.	
	It is a highly suitable and large building with open space to the rear for a community run pub and family restaurant.	
	Victoria Road is - community-wise - a desert right now, nowhere to stop and get a cup of tea or a pint, nowhere to chat however briefly with others.	
	Previous landlord supported the local community.	
Full Reference:	S - 7032 - 1883 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None	
7196 Support	Respondent: Mrs Sheila von Rimscha [1932]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Please ensure that pubs that have already closed are not demolished whilst this consultation is in progress. The owners are often selling them now quickly in order to make money while they can. For example the Bird in Hand has closed recently and whilst it may not be viable at the moment, it is right next to a major new development (Berkeley Homes) that will create a lot of additional potential customers once the flats are being lived in.	
Full Reference:	S - 7196 - 1932 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None	
10189 Support	Respondent: Cambridge & District Branch of the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) (Mr Paul Ainsworth) [2323]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	We fully support the concept of the list of safeguarded pubs.	
Full Reference:	S - 10189 - 2323 - 5. List of Safeguarded Existing and Former Pub Sites - None	

CHAPTER: Annex A - Marketing Strategies Annex A - Marketing Strategies

6946 Support

Respondent: Mr Ronald Clifton [1750]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is a need to preserve existing pubs wherever possible. It is important that opinions as to continued viability are supported by truly independent evidence.

Full Reference: S - 6946 - 1750 - Annex A - Marketing Strategies - None

7197 Support

Respondent: Mrs Sheila von Rimscha [1932]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Marketing must be overseen by an independent third party. There are many developers looking for sites who will pay over the odds. They have no interest in the local community just in a quick profit - also the motive of the breweries. Without safeguards, they will get round the rules. Free houses are a better bet than brewery ownership. The latter employ tenants with no incentive to give the pub character. It becomes part of a chain, with a standardised ambience including everything down to the hanging baskets. That it fails becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Full Reference: S - 7197 - 1932 - Annex A - Marketing Strategies - None

8163 Support

Respondent: Holly Davies [2131]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This is good; rigorous, and takes into account the problems of tied leaseholds and of pubs being deliberately run down very well indeed.

Full Reference: S - 8163 - 2131 - Annex A - Marketing Strategies - None

CHAPTER: Annex B - Viability Appraisals Annex B - Viability Appraisals

14780 Object

Respondent: Ms Clare Blair [2699]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Viability assessments might include the need for investment.
Location can be factored into considerations of viability.

Full Reference: O - 14780 - 2699 - Annex B - Viability Appraisals - None

CHAPTER: Annex C - Community Catchments and Consultation
Annex C - Community Catchments and Consultation

14789 Object

Respondent: Ms Clare Blair [2699]

Agent: N/A

Summary: It is unclear what criteria the Council will apply to determine the addition of any pubs (and what does 'certain pubs' mean?) to a Register of Community Assets. I believe the wording should read: The Council will maintain a Register of Community Assets and the Localism Act 2011 is clear that pubs can be nominated for inclusion on the Register. The Council will consider all such nominations through its agreed process.

Full Reference: O - 14789 - 2699 - Annex C - Community Catchments and Consultation - None

14862 Object

Respondent: Old Chesterton Residents' Association [2716]

Agent: Old Chesterton Residents' Association (Ms Clare Blair) [2719]

Summary: It is unclear what criteria the Council will apply to determine the addition of any pubs to a Register of Community Assets and what 'certain pubs' or 'significant community support' means. We consider that the wording should read: The Council will maintain a Register of Community Assets and the Localism Act 2011 is clear that pubs can be nominated for inclusion on the Register. The Council will consider all such nominations through its agreed process.

Full Reference: O - 14862 - 2716 - Annex C - Community Catchments and Consultation - None