APPENDIX B: ANALYSIS, RESPONSES AND PREFERRED APPROACH TO THE DESIGN, LANDSCAPE AND PUBLIC REALM, PLUS SUMMARIES OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

ISSUE: STRATEGIC PRIORITY – DELIVERING HIGH QUALITY PLACES

Total representations: 30	
Object: 8	Support: 22

OPTION NUMBER/OTHER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 60: Delivering High Quality Places This option is a strategic priority which underpins other more detailed design-related options.	• Strong support from most responses – seen as a vital policy; • Need to show the significance of city townscape; • Extra policy needed to require pre-application preparation and consultation on development briefs for all major developments (to be defined by housing number and or square metre development thresholds); • Policy needed to prevent demolition of buildings until development starts; • Site phasing policy needed so development starts with infrastructure and similar percentage of affordable housing at each stage; • Hard to define high quality design; • Developers need to respect the current 'style of the city' and not impact upon this with design that is not akin to it.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT
This option should have a positive effect on communities and well being issues in Cambridge as it aims to deliver high design quality helping to support the quality of life and amenity for residents and visitors. The support to continue Cambridge's tradition as a creative and innovative city is likely to have positive effects on the vitality of the City Centre and local economy. Positive effects may result on biodiversity and green infrastructure as the supporting option text indicates that the high quality design includes the buildings and spaces around them.

KEY EVIDENCE
• Urban Design Compendium (Volumes 1 and 2) • Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth (2008); • Cambridge City Council (2007). Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document; • DETR (2000). By Design. Urban design in the planning system: towards better practice

- Places Matter. The Economic Value of Urban Design (May 2007). A research report by AMION Consulting and Taylor Young for RENEW Northwest and the Northwest Regional Development Agency: www.placesmatter.co.uk
- Places Matter. The Economic Value of Urban Design (2009). A further research report by AMION Consulting and Taylor Young for RENEW Northwest and the Northwest Regional Development Agency: www.placesmatter.co.uk

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED
• Not applicable

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The current 'Designing Cambridge' policies of the 2006 Local Plan (3/4, 3/7 and 3/12) are amongst the most used policies in determining planning applications. These policies consider the development's interaction with its context, its overall quality and accessibility, sustainability and scale, and they have been tested at appeal on numerous occasions. Design quality continues to remain an important consideration in Cambridge with the continuing support of the Design and Conservation Panel and the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel. These panels, along with Council officers specialised in design and conservation, provide the Council with access to high quality advice and guidance on all matters related to design of the built environment. The Council also has experience in engaging with external design experts as part of the development of its own land. There is strong recognition of the benefits of engaging with external specialists in the fields of design and architecture in order to be as ambitious as possible.

One of the core planning principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 17) is that planning should "always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings". High quality design is a key aspect of sustainable development and should contribute positively to making places better for people. It should draw together the many strands of creating successful places, elements such as architectural design, landscape design and engineering, to create places that maintain and enhance the distinctive and historic character of the city. In addition, the design of buildings and places should take into account how they are to be used by residents and visitors to the city. As a strategic priority, Option 60 provides a high level aspiration for the quality and expectations of new development in Cambridge, in keeping with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. Overall, there was a high level of support for this strategic priority during the Issues and Options consultation. It was considered that the supporting text of the strategic objective should include a reference to the significance of the city's townscape, and this will be added to the wording of the supporting text.

High quality places and the design thereof is important because it has a fundamental impact on the quality of life in towns and cities. There have been numerous studies and reports from around the world identifying the economic, social and environmental benefits of good design and other studies identifying the economic, social and environmental costs of poor design. For example, the 2007 AMION and

Taylor Young study established that there are significant costs associated with poor design and a further study in 2009 demonstrated that good design is an important and viable option in a recession.

Consultation responses suggested the need for an extra policy that would require pre-application preparation and consultation on development briefs for all major developments (to be defined by housing number and or square metre development thresholds). The Council is committed to carrying out consultation on development proposals as part of the planning process in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework for planning to empower local people to shape their surroundings. Where development briefs are required for particularly large or complex sites, such as happened at Eastern Gate on Newmarket Road, then their preparation will be considered by the Council. However, not all major development sites will be of a sufficient scale and complexity to require the preparation of a Development Brief. Given the range of design issues covered by policy in the design section of the Local Plan, and the requirement for the submission on Design and Access Statements for all major developments, sufficient guidance is available to ensure the delivery of high quality schemes. As such its is considered that a specific policy requiring their preparation for all major developments is not appropriate. Instead, the need for the preparation of development briefs will be considered on a case by case basis.

With regards to pre-application discussions, in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework, local planning authorities cannot require that a developer engages with them prior to submitting a planning application, although the Framework does acknowledge the importance of such discussions. Pre-application discussions are already routinely undertaken between the Council and promoters of major developments, in advance of the submission of planning applications.

In respect of demolition, there are only restrictions on demolition in some areas e.g. Conservation Areas. As such, unless the demolition of a building requires prior permission, the Local Plan and the wider planning system cannot play a role in preventing demolition of buildings.

It is agreed that identifying 'high quality' and 'style' is not always straightforward. The appropriate means of doing so would be to set out what good design includes, for example responding to context and creating good interrelations between buildings and spaces with active building edges, and creating clearly distinct public and private spaces. These issues will be considered in appropriate policies within the design section of the new Local Plan. However, it should be noted that the National Planning Policy Framework specifically prohibits local planning authorities from imposing 'architectural style or particular tastes', nor should they stifle innovation, originality or initiative (paragraph 60). Future policies within the plan will provide a mechanism for creating high quality places and design without imposing architectural styles or taste. The Council will also continue to refer applications to the Design and Conservation Panel and Cambridgeshire Quality Panel.

One representation suggested that there was a need for a site phasing policy in the Local Plan to ensure that appropriate infrastructure was provided upfront. The provision of infrastructure is considered within chapter 12 of the Issues and Options Report, with Option 182 considering the timely provision of infrastructure, and Option 201 considering the provision of infrastructure and services and the funding of such requirements. Given that the Local Plan should be read as a whole, it is not considered necessary to include an additional policy within the design chapter.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH
The recommendation is to pursue Option 60 and develop a strategic priority related to the delivery of high quality places. Additional reference shall be added regarding the significance of the city's townscape within the supporting text to this strategic objective as follows: "An essential part of the character of the city stems from the interplay between its rich architecture and the spaces between buildings. Trees and high quality public realm play a significant role. The interface between the urban edge and the countryside is also an important component of how the city is appreciated in the landscape."

ISSUE: ENSURING THAT NEW DEVELOPMENT RESPONDS TO ITS CONTEXT

Total representations: 70	
Object: 25	Support: 45

OPTION NUMBER/OTHER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 61: Criteria based responding to context This option sets out the importance of all new developments responding to local character and distinctiveness, reflecting the identity of local surroundings, while not stifling innovation.	• Generally supportive of the policy; • Scale is critical; • Some of the terminology needs to be altered to make • The policy doesn't give enough scope for innovative development; • Ensure internal space requirements are adequate. • English Heritage requests specific reference to make it clear that applicants should set out clearly in their Design and Access Statement their examination of context
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT
This option will ensure the protection and enhancement of the historic environment through the appropriate design of new developments and sensitivity to existing landmark features. It should also help contribute to improving the quality and distinctiveness of the public realm helping address key issues regarding landscape, townscape and cultural heritage.

KEY EVIDENCE
• Urban Design Compendium (Volumes 1 and 2); • Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth (2008); • Cambridge City Council (2003) Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment (2003); • Cambridge City Council Conservation Area Appraisals (various dates); • Cambridge City Council (2006) Historic Core Area Appraisal; • Cambridge City Council Suburbs and Approaches Studies (various dates); • Cambridge City Council urban design briefs for specific locations (see the Urban Design guidance pages of our website)

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED
• Cambridge Local Plan Policy 3/4: Responding to context

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE
New development should be of a high quality of design in order to create places that are enduring, robust and complement and enhance the existing character of Cambridge. An essential part of achieving this aim is to ensure that the context of any proposal is considered as part of the design process. The Issues and Options consultation revealed that there is strong support for a criteria based policy to ensure that new development responds appropriately to its context. The National Planning Policy Framework is supportive of such an approach, noting that local plans should ensure that developments "respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discoursing appropriate innovation" (paragraph 60). However it does note that it is proper for planning policies to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. Some representations expressed concern that context-led development has the potential to stifle innovative forms of development and that 'context' is just one of a range of design issues. An understanding of and response to context is crucial to creating high quality development and that the analysis of context is key part of the design process. To proceed with a scheme ahead of a thorough analysis and understanding of the area around it, has the potential to create poorly integrated developments and undermine the quality of the built and natural environment of Cambridge. The best developments usually take the best of local elements and design approaches and integrate them into the design, the Stirling Prize winning Accordia scheme in Cambridge, for example, employs a buff brick which is typical to Cambridge and is predominantly low-rise, which is equally the predominant form in this context. As such, a policy requiring that development proposals understand the

surrounding context ensures that sensitive and high quality schemes come forward, helping to establish a benchmark to inform well designed schemes, while not stifling innovation or imposing architectural styles. Option 61 is considered to be in conformity with the requirements of paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

'Context' covers a wide range of issues including identifying and responding to existing features of natural, historic, or local character, as well as understanding how a place connects into and integrates with the immediate and wider locality. It is also a key component in understanding the prevailing character of an area and how proposals will 'fit in' in terms of materials and scale and massing. In an historic city such as Cambridge, it is therefore entirely reasonable to expect new development proposals to analyse and respond appropriately to these topics.

Context should not limit creativity but instead be used to inform the design process and accordingly developers should be prepared to justify their scheme as a response to the particular surrounding context. A development that responds positively to its context is one that will either enhance areas of existing high quality, or will seek to introduce a new and distinctive character to areas of weaker character. What should be clear, and contained within the submitted Design and Access Statement, is the clear rationale for the end development proposal.

Government guidance on the preparation of Design and Access Statements makes it explicit that assessment of the context is an essential part of such statements. Such statements are required for all "major development" and Government regulations are clear that an examination of context must be undertaken. A future policy on responding to context will carry the necessary weight to ensure this matter is addressed, however the supporting text to the policy could be more explicit in respect of requiring response to context to be covered in the Design and Access Statement.

Representations regarding adequate internal space standards are noted. The setting of space standards for all new development are discussed separately under Options 106 – 110 of the Issues and Options Report, and the Council's proposed approach to space standards will be subject to a further round of public consultation between January and February 2012, prior to their inclusion in the draft Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 61 and develop a criteria based policy to ensure that all new developments respond to local character and distinctiveness and reflect the identity of local surroundings, while not preventing appropriate innovation. The supporting text of the policy could make reference to the submission of Design and Access Statements, with an awareness of context forming a key part of such a document. These criteria could include:

- The need to identify and respond positively to existing features of natural, historic or local importance on and close to the proposed development site;

- The need to be well connected to and integrated with, the immediate locality and wider city; and

- The need to use the characteristics of the local area to help inform the siting, massing, building and landscape design and materials used in the proposed development.

ISSUE: THE ROLE OF GOOD DESIGN IN DELIVERING HIGH QUALITY PLACES

Total representations: 59	
Object: 20	Support: 39

OPTION NUMBER/OTHER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 62: Criteria based policy for delivering high quality places The aim of this option is to provide the more detailed requirements for the design and planning of new development	• Needs to be made clear at what scale of development these policies are aimed at – criteria not relevant to all schemes; • Cambridge should develop a 'local identity' in design; • 'Safe' walking and cycling routes with priority for the pedestrian over the car should be added to the criteria; • No need for a local plan policy addressing this issue, as it is a matter best dealt with through Supplementary Planning Documents; • Only include public art as an integral part of major new developments;
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT
Setting out comprehensive criteria for the quality of new developments including aspects such as designing out crime, enhancing public realm and considering those with disabilities is likely to have positive effects on key issues regarding communities and well being including helping protect and enhance community, leisure and open spaces and support the provision of affordable and intermediate housing. All areas in Cambridge are likely to benefit from the inclusion of criteria such as the integration of landscape design, inclusion of public art and proactive management and maintenance of development. Effects of this policy on the biodiversity, transport and climate change themes are uncertain when taking this option in isolation. However, other policies in the plan address criteria relating to these aspects, which could contribute positively to Delivering High Quality Places, for example sustainable design and construction options.

KEY EVIDENCE
• Urban Design Compendium (Volumes 1 and 2) • Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth (2008); • Cambridge City Council (2007). Sustainable Design and Construction

Supplementary Planning Document;
- Cambridge City Council, Public Art Supplementary Planning Document (2010);
- Cambridgeshire County Council (2007) Cambridgeshire Design Guide for Streets and the Public Realm

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Cambridge Local Plan Policy 3/7: Creating successful places

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Having addressed context, it is necessary to consider how to create a successful place. Place making is an essential component of high quality development and when done well will either create somewhere with a distinct identity or reinforce the identity of an existing place. Overall there was support for a criteria based policy to help in the creation of successful places particularly based on the content of Policy 3/7 of the existing Cambridge Local Plan (2006). Some concerns were raised about the content of such a policy with respondents asking whether further and more detailed elements could be included such as commercial premises signage. The issue of shopfronts and signage is being considered under a separate policy option (Option 71 of the Issues and Options Report), and as part of a visual pollution policy (Option 89), which seeks to minimise any adverse impacts from inappropriately placed signage, and as such there is no need for this to be replicated here.

Consultation revealed a concern that not all issues are relevant to all scales of development and that any policy should be clearly worded to clarify as to what scale of development it applies. However, it is considered that 'place making', that is the interaction of the building with the public realm or streets and open space, can be achieved at all scales of development. In the case of an individual dwelling, it can be as simple as ensuring that there is good surveillance of the street from a habitable room or making sure that there is a clear distinction between public and private space. At a more strategic level, place making involves understanding how the layers of movement and access, land use, density and open space all interact to achieve a framework for a place that functions well and can adapt over time. In summary, the level of 'detail' or 'focus' changes depending upon the scale of development, with the 'resolution' of elements varying dependent upon the complexity and scale of the site.

Further respondents highlighted the need for Cambridge to develop a 'local identity'. Successful places help to reinforce local distinctiveness and go beyond purely aesthetic considerations to help create places that are robust and enduring. Along with an analysis and understanding of a site's context, there is a need to make sure that all the various 'themes' that go into the creation of a place are considered and responded to appropriately. Whilst these will vary depending on the scale and complexity of a proposal, a series of 'criteria' will help to create development that forms an appropriate response to its setting and therefore create a successful place through creating, maintaining or reinforcing local identity.

Consultation suggested that 'safe' walking and cycling routes with priority for the

pedestrian over the car should be added to the criteria. Caution is needed to ensure that 'safe' does not result in the segregated and circuitous routes often created by rigid highway engineering. With a 'place making' approach, streets form an integral part of any development and are designed holistically with the buildings, land use and open space to encourage walking and cycling as well as creating an environment that feels safe and fosters social interaction. Accordingly the safety of pedestrians and cyclists is very important and the criteria will be amended to make this more explicit.

One respondent suggested that there is no need for such a policy within the Local Plan and that the matter could be best covered through a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The National Planning Policy Framework states that "local and neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area." It is considered that a robust and comprehensive policy setting out the quality of development that will be expected for an area is entirely consistent with requiring good design, and would be more effective than relying on a Supplementary Planning Document. Such a policy will provide certainty for developers as to the aspects that would need to be demonstrated in development proposals for them to be considered acceptable.

Some respondents expressed a view that public art requirements should only relate to major developments, as to require public art from smaller development would have an impact on viability. Cambridge City Council's Public Art Supplementary Planning Document (Chapter 7) currently provides clarity over how and when public art will be required:
"All major development will dedicate 1% of the construction cost of capital projects to public art. In the case of very large and complex sites and also Areas of Major Change… the contribution will be agreed by negotiation case by case subject to meeting the policy objectives."

Major developments are defined as residential developments of 10 or more dwellings or a site area of 0.5 hectares or more, or other developments where the gross floor area is 1,000 square metres or more, including both major new build and refurbishment where planning permission is required. Wording within any new policy could require the provision of public art as part of new major development. Developer contributions towards public art are considered as part of Option 201, provision of infrastructure and services. The insertion of the word 'major' into the relevant criterion for Option 62 would clarify what developments require public art contributions to be made.

Successful places are the product of many different factors and influences. The National Planning Policy Framework recognises that high quality design contributes positively to the creation of places that improve the quality of people's lives and experiences. Criteria based policy promoting successful place making is therefore entirely consistent with national planning policy requirements.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH
The recommendation is therefore to pursue Option 62 and develop a criteria based policy approach for delivering high quality places. This policy will be subject to the following amendments: Include wording to highlight 'safe' walking and cycling routes with priority for the pedestrian over the car and include 'major developments' in the public art criteria for clarity as to how and when the policy will be applied. Other criteria in the policy could include: • The interrelations and integrations between buildings, routes and spaces; • The development of a hierarchy of streets; • The creation of attractive built frontages; • The orientation of buildings to overlook public spaces and promote natural surveillance; • Activating edges onto public spaces by locating building entrances and windows of habitable rooms next to the street; • The provision of clearly distinct public and private spaces; • The integration of affordable and supported housing to minimise social exclusion; • Designing out crime; • The use of materials, finishes and street furniture suitable to location and context; • The integration of landscape design into the design of developments as a whole; • Measures for the improvement and enhancement of public realm close to the development; • Provision of adequate management and maintenance of the development; and • Consideration of the needs of those with disabilities.

ISSUE: HIGH QUALITY DESIGN OF BUILDINGS

Total representations: 61	
Object: 23	Support: 38

OPTION NUMBER/OTHER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 63: Criteria based policy for the design of buildings The aim of this option is to ensure	• Why is refurbishment covered here? Surely this should be covered in Option 66; • Matter could be dealt with by a Supplementary Planning Document; • Doesn't meet paragraph 58 in the National Planning Policy Framework.

that new buildings are designed to a high standard and meet key requirements in respect of form and function	• Many recent buildings not reached 'high quality' of design; • Contemporary and 'historical' designs can both be suitable for a new or old site if design is good.

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT
No additional options have been suggested.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT
This option should contribute positively to the maintaining the character and quality of the city's historic environment, through its specific reference to the need for new buildings to be of the highest architectural quality. Criteria requiring integrated design appropriate to the locality, which are convenient, safe and accessible should all contribute to addressing many of the community and wellbeing issues. The specification for buildings to be constructed in a sustainable manner and easily adaptable should help meet changing lifestyles/ownership and future climate change. This option is also likely to provide opportunities to reduce energy demand through increased deployment of energy efficiency technologies, for example. This is covered in more detail by proposed options in other sections of the plan. Economic benefits could result as a high level of architectural quality may attract people to Cambridge, therefore contributing to addressing the issue of continued vitality in the City Centre.

KEY EVIDENCE
• Urban Design Compendium (Volumes 1 and 2); • Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth (2008); • Cambridge City Council (2007). Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document; • Cambridgeshire County Council (2007) Cambridgeshire Design Guide for Streets and the Public Realm; • Cambridge City Council (2010) Cycle Parking Guide for new residential developments; • Cambridgeshire County Council (2012) RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED
• Cambridge Local Plan   Policy 3/12: The Design of New Buildings

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE
High quality building design is linked to context, in terms of appropriateness, and to place making in terms of how proposed development will be sited. Without imposing architectural tastes or styles, it is still important that proposed development is considered in terms of the site location, height, scale and form, along with materials and detailing with the latter linking directly to the quality and

durability of a proposal. The thrust of this policy option is about the design of new buildings and ensuring they are designed and delivered to a high quality. A separate option (Option 66) is more specific to building refurbishment, though it should be noted that planning policy does not generally deal with internal alterations to buildings other than in the case of Listed Buildings.

It was suggested that there was no need for a policy to cover design and that an Supplementary Planning Document would be more appropriate. Whilst the National Planning Policy Framework at Paragraph 60, states that "Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative", the development of robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for an area is entirely consistent with requiring good design.   Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework states 'Local and neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area.' Option 63 seeks to provide such a policy, alongside other design related options.

Cambridge has a strong track record of delivering high quality design with recent examples of such recognition including the two Stirling Prize winning schemes at Accordia and the Sainsbury Laboratory respectively. Additionally, the first Phase of Clay Farm (Great Kneighton) recently won a Government Housing Design Award 2012 (Project Winner). The projects have set a high benchmark for other schemes to follow. A future policy which sets out clearly what is expected in terms of building design is important to ensure future development also reaches these high standards.

It is agreed that both 'contemporary' and 'historical' design can be suitable. The approach to the design of new buildings needs to be driven by a thorough understanding of context, use and functional requirements. Regardless of whether a scheme is traditional or contemporary in approach, the key to achieving high quality is good design and execution. Good design incorporates tried and tested methods of elements such as employing robust materials, clear building entrances, good detailing, and clear "fronts" and "backs" amongst other devices. Any future policy should articulate these elements in a sufficient level of clarity and detail. Such a policy approach will provide certainty for developers, while at the same time allowing for innovative approaches to design.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is therefore to pursue Option 63 and develop a criteria based policy setting out the requirements for the design of new buildings.   These criteria could include:

- New buildings should be of the highest architectural quality. The design of buildings should have a positive contribution to their setting in terms of location on the site, height, scale and form, materials, detailing, wider townscape and landscape impacts and available views;

- Consideration of the relationship between the landscape design and the

character and function of the spaces and surrounding buildings;

- The need to demonstrate that buildings are convenient, safe and accessible for all users and visitors;

- The need for buildings to be constructed in a sustainable manner, easily adaptable for different uses and our changing climate, and which successfully integrates recycling and refuse facilities, cycle and car parking, plant and other services into the design; and

- Consideration of the potential to support biodiversity within the built environment.

ISSUE: DESIGN OF THE PUBLIC REALM, LANDSCAPE AND EXTERNAL SPACES

Total representations: 69	
Object: 20	Support: 49

OPTION NUMBER/OTHER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 64: The design of the public realm, landscape and other external spaces The aim of this option is to ensure a high quality of design in respect of external spaces as part of new development or improvements to the public realm	- Good support for the option in principle; - Shared space can cause issues between road users, cyclists and pedestrians; - Need to avoid street clutter too; - Need to upgrade the public realm in context with the city and its historic nature; - Open space needs to be provided, not commuted sums. - Some suggest working with the County Council to produce guidance on the public realm; - Others say no need for guidance, as highlighted in the National Planning Policy Framework; - Public realm improvements should be largely Section 106 funded; - Needs of elderly and disabled need to be considered.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT
This option is likely to result in positive effects across the majority of the sustainability topics. Criteria requiring high quality design of the public realm should help contribute to improving accessibility for all members of society and contribute to creating vibrant and inclusive communities and positive health outcomes. Measures to 'green' the city are likely to further this benefit, and also increase the provision of green infrastructure. Requirements to integrate surface water management proposals into the overall design should help address key issues relating to flood risk and climate change adaptation.

KEY EVIDENCE
• Urban Design Compendium (Volumes 1 and 2);
• Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth (2008);
• Cambridge City Council (2007). Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document;
• DETR (2000). By Design. Urban design in the planning system: towards better practice;
• Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy (2011);
• Cambridge City Council, Public Art Supplementary Planning Document (2010);
• Cambridgeshire County Council (2007) Cambridgeshire Design Guide for Streets and the Public Realm;
• BRE Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight. A guide to good practice. Second Edition (2011);
• Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment (2003);
• Manual for Streets (2007).

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED
• Policy 3/11: The Design of External Spaces

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE
Option 64 is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires planning policies to positively address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment. The advantage of such a policy approach is that it will enable the specific circumstances of each development proposal to be considered as part of the overall design process. As such, it will help to ensure high quality design not just of buildings themselves, but the spaces between buildings, and help enhance the local built and natural environment.

While there is a varied range of criteria required by this policy, this option is likely to have a range of positive implications for the wider public realm, landscape and townscape of the city, meeting the needs of the community. Requiring high quality design of public realm should bring about a whole range of economic, social and environmental benefits, and improve quality of life. Paragraphs 7.12 to 7.15 of the Issues and Options report sets out that the benefit of a high quality public realm is as fundamental as creating a high quality place to live. The majority of representations expressed their support of this policy approach and recognised the contribution that the public realm and landscaping makes to the character of the city.

This criteria based policy approach also enables the specific circumstances of each development proposal to be considered as part of the overall design process. As such, it will help to ensure high quality design not just of buildings themselves, but the spaces between buildings, and help enhance the local built and natural environment. Requirements to 'green' and integrate developments into their surroundings will enhance the function, character and amenity value of spaces, as well as increasing the provision of green infrastructure. Additionally, requirements to integrate surface water management into the overall design of development should also address key issues relating to flood risk and climate change adaptation. |

This option not only applies to the provision of new public realm, but also existing streets and spaces within the city to ensure the distinctive and special character of Cambridge is to be protected and enhanced. This is critical to ensuring the maintenance and enhancement of Cambridge's public realm, which acts as a setting for a wealth of historic buildings. The means by which public realm works are funded will vary and will include developer contributions.

In addressing concerns about the use of shared space within Cambridge, it should be noted that it can have a beneficial impact on the quality of the public realm, both from a functional and visual point of view. The key to a successful approach to shared space is ensuring it is used in the right context and that a full understanding of traffic volumes and modal split is gained in order to inform the future design. It is recognised that street clutter should be avoided where possible, this is very much the thrust of "Manual for Streets" and related local documents cited in the key evidence above.

The provision of open space in respect of how it is provided is addressed in Option 167 – On-site provision (in respect of new open space and recreation facilities). Option 64 deals with the design of the public realm and external spaces rather than with the principle of open space provision. Additionally, Option 89 on visual pollution addresses the issue of street clutter.

Option 81 of the Issues and Options Report suggested that Option 64 could incorporate reference to the enhancement of biodiversity, which would allow biodiversity enhancement to be addressed by all scales of development requiring planning permission, but would not require the provision of additional guidance. This would allow biodiversity to be considered in an integrated manner with public realm and landscaping issues. It is considered that this would ensure that options for biodiversity enhancement are explored by all developments without creating an overly onerous, costly and bureaucratic regime for all developments to follow. In order to maintain the use of the biodiversity checklist approach for major developments, it is suggested that the checklist is referenced within Option 64. Officers will then explore the best way of ensuring that the checklist is submitted as part of planning application, for example through the Local List. This would ensure the continued use of the biodiversity checklist and the associated inclusion of biodiversity enhancement measures in new major developments.

Cambridge City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council already work together on a number of projects pertaining to the public realm. Guidance in the form of the Cambridgeshire Design Guide, the County's Housing Estate Road Construction Specification (January 2011) and the national guidance "Manual for Streets" already exist and are used to guide the design of the public realm. There is a close level of co-operation between the County and City Councils and a number of highways improvements are promoted, designed, funded and delivered by Cambridge City Council but are subject to the approval of the County Council as highways authority. Some respondents noted points of detail e.g. avoiding clutter, catering for the disabled and elderly. Most of these detailed points are either addressed in this option or elsewhere in the Issues and Options Report. The need for a policy in this

regard is clear; the public realm and external environment is a crucial part of the image of any town or city.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH
The recommendation is to pursue Option 64, with amendments to the criteria. Such amended criteria could include the requirements to co-ordinate the provision of public realm/landscape/external spaces between adjacent sites and/or phases of large developments, provide high quality amenity space which receives adequate sunlight, in accordance with best practice guidance; and the need to assess the site's position in the ecological network and provide suitable protection and enhancement of important nature conservation features. In order to maintain the use of the biodiversity checklist approach for major developments, it is suggested that the checklist is referenced within Option 64. Officers will then explore the best way of ensuring that the checklist is submitted as part of planning application, for example through the Local List. This would ensure the continued use of the biodiversity checklist and the associated inclusion of biodiversity enhancement measures in new major developments.

ISSUE: DESIGN CODING

Total representations: 24	
Object: 9	Support: 15

OPTION NUMBER/OTHER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 65: Requirement for the production of design codes in respect of growth areas for all outline planning applications The aim of this option is to ensure there is a method (in this case a site-specific design code) to ensure the delivery of high quality development for growth sites	• Some concern that it could lead to another tier of design and access statements – this will cause delays and expense; • Only suitable for large scale development; • Would need greater public consultation and awareness; • Should encourage walking and cycling.

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT
No additional options have been suggested.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT
The requirement for proposals in growth areas to produce a design code could have a positive effect on several of the sustainability topics, especially if it results in planning applications being submitted in line with these design codes. This is due to the role of design codes in instructing and advising on the physical development of an area. For example, factors such as density and access, which can contribute to improve well-being and local amenity, or the design of open spaces which could benefit biodiversity in Cambridge. However, the full effect of this option at this stage as it is dependent on the actual implementation of the design codes, and not simply on the requirement of having one or not for all applications. This is the case for areas in North, South, East and West Cambridge where some of the growth areas are located.

KEY EVIDENCE
• Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth (2008); • Informal Guidance on Design Codes (Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council 2012).

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED
• Not applicable

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE
The National Planning Policy Framework encourages the use of design codes. As a footnote, the National Planning Policy Framework provides clear steer at paragraph 59 about the use of design codes to facilitate high quality development. It states that "local planning authorities should consider using design codes where they could help deliver high quality outcomes. However, design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally." Design codes are a set of illustrative design rules and requirements, which instruct and advise on the physical development of an area. They can be used to set requirements in relation to a range of design elements, such as the density and height of development, the hierarchy and design of streets and open spaces, best practice approaches to car parking, and the character of different parts of a development. Design codes are already in place for two of the growth sites on the Cambridge Southern Fringe, and further codes are in the process of being produced for the NIAB and North West Cambridge sites. Overall there was support for the use of design codes and a policy that would require them to be produced. Section 7.16 of the Issues and Options Report sets out the background, both generally and locally, to the use of design codes. The key point to note is that they are considered a potentially useful tool to help bridge the high level detail contained in an outline application and the much more detailed

information required in a reserved matters application.

An issue raised as part of the Issues and Options consultation was that a requirement for the production of design codes would introduce yet another tier of design and access statements, leading to unnecessary expense and delays in the preparation and submission of planning applications owing to the process of producing and agreeing a design code. It should be noted however, that a Design and Access Statement is not the same as a design code. The role of Design and Access Statements is to set out the process and rationale behind a development proposal. Design codes are a set of mandatory and discretionary rules to guide future development. A Design and Access Statement is submitted in support of a planning application whereas a design code is produced to facilitate future reserved matters development and as such is designed to speed up future applications by establishing agreed and more detailed rules and parameters. Good design codes do not stifle innovative design and as such it is important that the resolution or detail of the code is set at the right level, which is determined by the complexity and size of the development area.

Cambridge City Council has produced a clear and comprehensive guidance note on the production and implementation of design codes for Areas of Major Change. This was reviewed in May 2012, based on experience gained from the design codes produced for Clay Farm and Trumpington Meadows in the Southern Fringe. The guidance sets out clearly the role and purpose of a design code to bridge the gap between outline and reserved matters applications. Where sites are likely to be delivered over an extended period and there is the possibility that multiple developers will be operating in an area, it is imperative that there is a mechanism beyond the parameter plans associated with an outline planning application. Experience of delivering development within the Areas of Major Change has revealed that the outline, design code, reserved matters approach has not always been necessary and that full planning permissions for smaller growth sites (up to around 300 units) has proved to be the most expedient route.

Whilst the response to the Issues and Options report was in general supportive of the use of design codes for growth sites, a specific policy on design codes may not be necessary. Every growth area site is different, for example some are relatively small at only a few hundred houses and some are quite large at over a few thousand houses. How these sites are planned and phased and how many house builders are ultimately building on site has a bearing on whether a design code will actually benefit that particular site. For the smallest sites, for example, a design code could be redundant. Instead a clear, detailed Design and Access Statement accompanying a full planning application is likely to be sufficient, along with a set of detailed conditions of approval in respect of design details. For the largest sites ,however, where numerous house builders will build them out over long periods of time, there will likely be a benefit to producing and using a design code to help guide details of design from phase to phase and between parcels.

As there is no 'one size fits all' in respect of coding of growth sites, it may be more

appropriate to include the requirement of producing a design code for major development sites that are likely to be developed over the lifetime of the Plan by multiple developers, most notably the policies for the strategic sites identified in Chapter 4 of the Issues and Options Report, including Options 29 (Southern Fringe) and 31 (North West Cambridge)

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH
The recommendation is **not** to pursue Option 65, but instead to include references to the production of design codes within policies for strategic sites identified in Chapter 4 of the Issues and Options Report.

ISSUE: THE IMPORTANCE OF PUBLIC ART PROVISION AS PART OF NEW DEVELOPMENT

Total representations: 32	
Object: 10	Support: 21

OPTION NUMBER/OTHER	KEY ISSUES
Question 7.19: Is there a need for a policy addressing this issue (public art)	• Public art should be desirable but not essential on every development; • There should not be a detailed policy on public art, rather guidance should be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document; • Public art is only viable, and only has significant benefits, as part of major development proposals; • Questions need to be continually asked about the relevance of public art and development projects to ensure there is correlation between the two and that there is a clear link established to show that it is necessary and directly and reasonably related to the specific development project; • Preference would be for public art money to be channelled into functional design such as high quality street furniture, attractive street surfaces and trees; • Operate a percentage of any S106 agreement for art on site on a site by site basis, subject to local conditions and consultation at that time; • There is a clear need for a policy so that public art provision cannot be avoided; • People must support the concept of public art and not come to regard it as a waste of money. Public consultation is essential.
Question 7.20: How would you define public art?	• Objects, installations or interventions that are not integral to the functional design of a building or space; • Art in public spaces, other than museums – might include

	designated spaces for performance art;
	• Public art installations should be permanent and focussed on improving visual appearance of streets/places;
	• Public art needs a very broad definition – there needs to be recognition that the appropriate level of public access may be dependent on the art form itself;
	• The preference should be for good functional architecture which is art in itself;
	• Installations that stimulate the senses (visual, mobile, tactile), reflecting the natural habitat, culture and history of the area. Public art could also be educational and fun for children and adults;
	• Public art should be chosen with the full input and consideration of the community.

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

No new options arising.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Not subject to appraisal

KEY EVIDENCE

• Cambridge City Council, Public Art Supplementary Planning Document (2010);
• Cambridge City Council (2008). Public Art Survey

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

• Part of Policy 3/7: Creating successful places

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Public art has a key role to play in helping to provide social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits. It should enhance the fundamental principles of urban design and the creation of a high quality public realm. It can help to strengthen local distinctiveness and character and is important in the creation of a stimulating public realm, helping to integrate new and existing communities. Public art can be provided as a standalone project or it can be integrated into other infrastructure projects, for example through the provision of play areas or landscape design. The National Planning Policy Framework recognises the importance of planning positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes. Public art is an important element of high quality design.

While there was support from respondents to the principles of public art provision, there was concern expressed by some about the way in which public art is chosen. It was considered that there needed to be greater consultation with the community if public art is to be widely accepted. Some respondents felt that high quality architecture should be included within the definition of public art, and that money should be directed towards the provision of high quality public realm, including

street furniture and lighting. While the mechanisms by which public art proposals are approved is not a matter for the new Local Plan, it is acknowledged that public consultation on public art is an important matter.

It is important that public art is not considered as a standalone discipline; the key to its success is its integration within the design of new developments and its associated infrastructure, for example the provision of play, landscape, and public realm. As such, it is considered that it instead of a standalone public art policy, it would be more appropriate to include requirements for public art provision within the Local Plan options for creating high quality places (Option 62) and the design of the public realm, landscape and external spaces (Option 64). Public art provision would be determined on a site by site basis, taking into account the specifics of each development proposal and what would be an appropriate level of public art provision. Developer contributions towards public art are considered as part of Option 201, provision of infrastructure and services.   The insertion of the word 'major' into the relevant criterion for Option 62 would clarify what developments require public art contributions to be made.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH
The recommendation is to incorporate the provision of public art within Option 62 (Creating high quality places) and Option 64 (Design of the public realm, landscape and external spaces) to ensure that public art is properly integrated into the design of new developments. Reference to public art will also be retained in Option 201 (Provision of infrastructure and services) in order that developer contributions can be allocated for its provision.

ISSUE: EXTENDING AND ALTERING BUILDINGS

Total representations: 46	
Object: 10	Support: 36

OPTION NUMBER/OTHER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 66: Criteria based policy for alterations and extensions to existing buildings The purpose of this option is to ensure a high quality of design for the alteration and extension of existing buildings across the city	• Very strong support for this option; • Existing buildings need to respect their context; • Support for the idea of preparing guidance for alterations and extensions to residential property (possibly as a Supplementary Planning Document); • Would welcome criteria in respect of the impact from extensions on daylight levels to adjacent property and space between buildings; • The section should consider alterations for the purpose of improved sustainability / energy efficiency.

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT
No additional options have been suggested

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT
Implementing criteria for the extension and alteration of existing buildings should help ensure that alterations are sensitive to existing local character, particularly within the conservation areas. Criteria relating to the design of alterations should help maintain amenity of neighbouring residents. The requirement to ensure no adverse impact on gardens, trees or wildlife features should also help contribute positively to the key identified biodiversity issues. The effects of this option should benefit all areas in Cambridge. Other proposed options in the plan cover issues related to the delivery of extensions, such as Water efficiency, and Sustainable design and construction.

KEY EVIDENCE
• Cambridge City Council Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document (2007);   • Cambridge City Council Conservation Area Appraisals (various dates);   • Cambridge City Council (2006) Historic Core Area Appraisal.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED
• Policy 3/14: Extending Buildings

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE
The extension of buildings can help to make the most efficient use of land, and can prolong the life of buildings or find new uses for them. It can often provide the only way in which additional accommodation can be provided for householders or businesses. However, extensions and building alterations can have a negative impact on their surroundings if they are poorly designed. The purpose of Option 66 was to set out a criteria based approach to the design of alterations and extensions to existing buildings, both residential and non-residential. Such an approach would make it clear to applicants what they would need to demonstrate as part of their development proposals in order for them to be considered acceptable. The Issues and Options consultation revealed that there was considerable support for this option.   The context of any alteration or extension was identified as a key consideration by respondents to the Issues and Options consultation. Option 61 (Criteria based responding to context policy) would apply to all new development, whether major development or extensions and alterations to existing buildings. This option will ensure that a thorough analysis and understanding of context of any scale of development is taken into consideration. In addition to Option 61, the wording of Option 66 does reflect the need to consider context, for example making reference to the need for proposals including new or altered roof profiles to use materials that are sympathetic to the existing building and surround area, and the need for proposals to respect the space between buildings where this contributes to the

character of the area.

With regards to the inclusion of climate change and energy efficiency within Option 66, other options within the Issues and Options report already deal with sustainability and energy efficiency and relate to extensions and alterations as well as major new development. Specifically options contained in Chapter 6 (Sustainable development, climate change, water and flooding) such as Option 50 (Consequential improvements) consider the opportunities presented by householders proposing extensions to their homes for improving the energy efficient of the whole property. This option would provide greater control over the delivery of measures to combat climate change, albeit at a relatively small scale. Accordingly Option 66 does not need to cover these issues in detail, as it is more focused on design requirements.

The impact of extensions on day lighting to adjacent property and space between buildings is a typical consideration of any planning application. This is already noted in the second bullet of the option, which states that proposals should not unreasonably overlook, overshadow or visually dominate neighbouring properties.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 66 and develop a criteria based policy that would apply to alterations and extensions to existing buildings. This policy will set out a range of criteria against which proposals for the extension or alteration of buildings requiring planning permission would be assessed. The policy would apply to both residential and non-residential properties.

CHAPTER: 7 - Delivering High Quality Places   **7.1**

15525 Object
Summary:

If this paragraph is retained in the plan, we recommend that it should be amended to reflect the significance of the city's townscape. For instance: 'An essential part of the character of the city stems from the interplay between its rich architecture and the spaces between buildings. Trees and high quality public realm play a significant role. The interface between the urban edge and the countryside is also an important component of how the city is appreciated in the landscape.'

8293 Support
Summary:

We support this statement

10080 Support
Summary:

Agree strongly.
Tourists linger in our existing high quality outdoor places. We must make more such, and never allow the existing ones to be degraded by new constructions.

11305 Support
Summary:

strongly agree - and point to disasters (grafton centre) which have resulted in destruction of built heritage.

12358 Support
Summary:

It should be policy of the Council to make locations such as Christs Pieces (specifically as shown on the chapter cover) a pleasant place for residents and visitors to use at all times. The location in question is usually no-go for much of the day and certainly in the evening. So, high quality places must be accessible in practice.

12953 Support
Summary:

support.

CHAPTER: 7 - Delivering High Quality Places   **7.2**

10083 Object
Summary:

Disagree with one part of this para,: the second part of the second last sentence "Given ...the need in particular to accommodate new housing." You have not shown evidence for a need to provide new housing within Cambridge. Agree strongly with the rest of the paragraph.

17510 Object

Summary:

Development briefs - extra policy needed to require pre-application preparation and consultation on development briefs for all major developments, to be defined by housing number and or square metre development thresholds. Policy needed to prevent demolition of buildings until development starts, and not leave eyesore sites for 5+ years. Site phase policy needed so development starts with infrastructure & similar %s of affordable housing at each stage.

6915   Object
Summary:

Can you then explain Cambridge Leisure Park? Must do better. Why not more traditional public squares and symmetrical terraces?

10184 Object
Summary:

to maintain the city's quality of ambience

15533 Object
Summary:

High quality design is hard to define. A statement might be included, as follows: 'The Council will, in appropriate cases, refer applications for independent review of design quality to the Design and Conservation Panel, or other such bodies.'

15928 Object
Summary:

Plainly, not every new development can be Accordia, but there are important lessons to be learned from unmitigated disasters such as Orchard Park, which should never have been built so close to a four-lane A-road, is effectively isolated from the city by King's Hedges Road (which should instead have been rerouted to run next to the A14) and, several years after the first tranche of housing was erected, still lacks vital amenities such as local shops or a pub. This is just not the way to do it, and much of the evidence suggests that NIAB may well repeat these mistakes.

17764 Object
Summary:

Developers should respect the current style of the city and not apply for permission to construct high-rise buildings, they should be required to build environmentally sustainable dwellings, respect the limitations of the flood plain and water supplies/drainage and be required to use sympathetic building materials and designs.

7667   Support
Summary:

This has not always been the case --- we have some examples of very low level design (ie Leisure Centre)!

8296   Support
Summary:

We support this option

9056   Support
Summary:

Yes - this is a vital strategic option.

9464   Support
Summary:

Yes, but it needs teeth. I struggle to think of a recent development (apart from University and College buidings) which I would regard as meeting these objectives.

10086 Support
Summary:

Agree strongly. High quality places are places where people want to linger. We challenge you to achieve new outdoor places where families, students and tourists go to hang out sociably and constructively.

10638 Support
Summary:

Agreed. But must be more specific about spaces and include landscaping and trees. More emphasis on protecting and replacing trees and hedgerows.

10790 Support
Summary:

Vital

11013 Support
Summary:

I agree that high quality buildings are necessary. However, some of the recent buildings should be examined as models of what not to do - the Travel Lodge by the Leisure Park for instance. And the height of buildings should be carefully considered in relation to surrounding buildings. I think the Varsity Hotel in Thompson's Lane is at least one storey too high and has changed the skyline from Jesus Green for the worse.

11793 Support
Summary:

If Cambridge is to retain its current status as an attractive city to live and work in it is vital that buildings remain of the highest quality in both design and materials. There needs to be an improvement on that seen in some recent developments.

12189 Support

Summary:

I consider that Strategic priorities, option 60 (p. 136), option 67 (p. 150), option 121 (p. 218), option 163 (p. 260) and option 182 (p. 284) are the correct ones.

12415 Support

Summary:

Insist on the best. Pity that wasn't the case with cb1

12955 Support

Summary:

Support. mention or aspire to gardens as part of amenities for some homes.

13159 Support

Summary:

We support the strategic priority for delivering high quality places. In this regard, development proposals for Compass House will seek to address the aims of the aspiration to achieve high quality design which supports a high quality of life and amenity.

13348 Support

Summary:

Support

15186 Support

Summary:

Public art should generally be provided by the developer who should be encouraged to engage the public's interest at pre-application stage.

16732 Support

Summary:

Support - Development will be of the highest design quality for both buildings and the spaces around buildings.

16807 Support

Summary:

What I would like to see in future developments:
Good quality modern design
The imposition of transport infrastructure before development starts e.g. Guided bus and cycle paths to the South.
The total protection of every green space within the green corridors.
Sports fields near Grantchester Meadows and the West of Trumpington road should remain unspoilt.
Children should be able to walk or cycle to sports facilities
More weight should be given to aesthetics in designing new houses
Failure to be able to impose your aspiration for housing that enhances city life onto a developer concerns me.

11528 Object
Summary:

Whilst I acknowledge that the Accordia development has won awards, there are also other examples of poor quality new developments - ensuring high quality developments is a must for the future.

11530 Object
Summary:

In terms of the landscape - it is not all great e.g. Addenbrookes and the southern approach. New developments may positively impact these areas.

12127 Object
Summary:

This section is far too smug.
The lighting (since the candles are mentioned) in public places used by pedestrians and cyclists is so dim as to be very dangerous. Parkers Piece, Trinity Lane and the path by the University Library are all good examples of lighting that is either or both too dim and too sparse for safety from collision and for effect in "designing out crime".

Oh, and what happened to the windows on The Fountain (Regent St)?

16400 Object
Summary:

Public realm - cobbles may be 'quality material' but they are extremely uncomfortable for cyclists and pedestrians. Are they really necessary?

17100 Object
Summary:

I notice the continual whittling away of our tree canopy, and where trees are 'said' to be old or dangerous the replacement policy is not like for like.

We seem to build almost to the road side. We should be lining these pavements with maturing trees, setting back the building line. We should encourage architects to step-rise these developments so as to open the air corridors and clear pollution more quickly. We are just trapping and funnelling more particulates.

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

17124 Object
Summary:

Yes, close the Town Centre to traffic, reinvigorate the crummy Market Square, let's have a few Fountains. As we have had to bear with developers 'rubber stamping' their residential builds with appalling, unlovely and unloved urban 'sculptures' - instead ask them for water features, flower beds - its really not rocket science. And apparently we can do that!

10089 Support
Summary:

We agree particularly strongly with the importance of the key facts about the landscape. They describe the aspects of Cambridge that once destroyed by ill judgement will be lost to the City forever.

10639 Support
Summary:

Public realm: recent loss of railings in Panton Street and damage to cobbles in Saxon Street, both against wishes of local community and with permission from Planning Department indicates need for stronger policy not just to prevent loss but to force reinstatement.

10643 Support
Summary:

Landscape: recent loss of hedges and trees in North Newtown, both against wishes of local community and with permission from Planning Department indicates need for stronger policy not just to prevent loss but to force reinstatement.

11464 Object

Summary:

While I support the idea of public art, a lot of the recent works (for example, Fisher Square or Trumpington Park and Ride) seem to be arbitrary, unconnected to the realm in which they are found, disconnected and seen as irrelevant and ignored by onlookers. Good quality public art is very different - but examples such as the above will happen when a developer is mandated to produce public art on demand, with the artist having no link with the environment in which the art will be displayed.

10642 Support

Summary:

All much needed to prevent further degrading of community and quality of life in North Newtown

12141 Support

Summary:

Add to "design quality", terms that describe the quality of materials used and the quality of construction. There are too many modern buildings that look great on paper but suffer from extremely poor workmanship. I contend that design quality could be traded off for buildings which were well constructed (plumbing works, building does not subside etc).

12149 Support

Summary:

Very strongly support the statement (and policies that support the statement) concerning the Landscape. These (The Backs, the commons, the Green Corridors & the Cam Corridor) are truly defining, probably unique and if lost will not be regained. They must be protected as the highest priority.

12958 Support

Summary:

Support. But I do not think high quality of design that respects or enhances the surrounding landscape has always been successful. There Public realm in the centre of Cambridge is poor to disgraceful and neglected.

15536 Support

Summary:

bullet 7 - It is important to ensure that new art in historic locations is appropriate and does not detract from the buildings whose settings it seeks to enhance.

16688 Support

Summary:

I agree with the principles set out in this chapter.

17752 Support

Summary:

We welcome those options which seek to protect and enhance biodiversity, green infrastructure and landscape and aim to mitigate and provide adaption to climate change where possible. Policies should be in line with NPPF requirements and ensure development seeks to meet local targets and aspirations e.g. local BAP targets and the aims of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy.

CHAPTER: 7 - Delivering High Quality Places   **7.5**

15537 Object

Summary:

Design is more than the detail of how a building looks. High quality design means responding to the historic grain, scale, form and massing of the city in an appropriate manner.

12154 Support

Summary:

Not only design but also constructed with high quality materials and skill. Shoddy work should not be acceptable.

12960 Support

Summary:

Support. There should be a visual audit of examples good and bad so far.

11075 Object
Summary:

Paragraph 62 of the NPPF relates to design review panels not context. Whilst para 58 of the NPPF does include responding to context / sense of place, this is just one of several criteria. In addition, paragraph 60 advises LPAs not to impose specific architectural styles and paragraph 65 specifically warns against refusing sustainable development because of incompatibility with existing townscape. This paragraph needs to be more accurately drafted to reflect the balance within the NPPF.

13078 Object
Summary:

Paragraph 58 of the NPPF includes responding to context / sense of place as just one of several criteria. Paragraph 60 advises LPAs not to impose specific architectural styles and paragraph 65 specifically warns against refusing sustainable development because of incompatibility with existing townscape. Any such policy needs to be in line with the NPPF.

11017 Support
Summary:

Scale is vital. Current new buildings are much higher and larger than older ones - monumental slabs, while housing many people, are not the buildings which will enhance Cambridge.

11533 Support
Summary:

Scale is critical - new developments have often been out of proportion with surroundings (acknowledged in the tall buildings guidance as predominantly 2-storey in the suburbs). These may also act as a precedent for other tall buildings.

16402 Support
Summary:

Agree, but no high-rise buildings.

15542 Object
Summary:

The terms green and blue infrastructure are not as widely understood as green networks, open space and river corridors. Grey infrastructure when used to describe Cambridge's buildings takes this to another level of abstraction and potential misunderstanding. Grey infrastructure might be understood as roads and pipelines, but not normally Cambridge colleges or pleasant townscape. We suggest that the terminology in this section is reviewed.

9867   Object
Summary:

This is particularly relevant to preserve and enhance the character of Conservation Areas.

10187 Object
Summary:

very important - particularly in Conservation Areas

10415 Object
Summary:

Too many policies can overide common sense.

11079 Object
Summary:

Support the principle of a criteria-based policy if better weighted to allow for innovative / sustainable developments.

The Landscape Character Assessment is now rather old and would need to be updated to assist in the definition of context of certain areas of the city.

11537 Object
Summary:

I feel the language here could be tightened up to "not significantly influence" the characteristics of the local area?

13079 Object
Summary:

The principle of a criteria-based policy is supported but should be weighted to allow for innovative / sustainable developments thereby achieving other sustainable and carbon reduction policy objectives.

15546 Object
Summary:

The plan should make clear in its policies and text that applicants will be expected to set out clearly in the Design and Access Statement their examination of context, and how their design has evolved in response to it.

16693 Object
Summary:

The areas round the Station and University Press are unimaginative and far too cramped.

16907 Object
Summary:

 'Context' is just one of a range of design issues. The option does not give sufficient weight to encourage innovative development

10092 Support
Summary:

In bullet point 2,there is also a need for a development to be connected to close-by rural areas even it they are across roads or part of the green belt.

11306 Support
Summary:

Bit vague and open to interpretation, but in principle a good idea.

11605 Support
Summary:

An integrated plan for development is very welcome. We have seen examples in Cambridge where developments are done on an individual basis and are not properly integrated with the existing housing or other new developments made near by. Also transportation often seems to be overlooked.

12421 Support
Summary:

This should already be the case; it is basic common sense and decency for any architect or developer. Alas, as we have seen with Botanic House, some developers haven't a clue. Hopelessly out of scale for its setting and shamefully (and literally) overshadowing the War Memorial.

12669 Support
Summary:

strongly agree

13162 Support
Summary:

We support the objectives of option 61. With regard to the development of Compass House, regard will be given to the criteria set out to ensure the development responds to its context. This would be achieved through the Design and Access Statement.

15189 Support

Summary:

Setting criteria is difficult and sometimes contrast can be intriguing rather than jarring. Getting a good blend should be the aim without the need for a pastiche of existing styles or an unsympathetic contrast. Too often expensive design work is done ahead of engaging local people's interest in the proposals. Too often outline proposal ideas are not translated into actual buildings. this should be avoided if at all possible.

16404 Support

Summary:

Very necessary.

7171   Object
Summary:

As in the case of CB1, the potential for quality in design should have been put out to international competition, consistent with the civic need for an appropriate Gateway.

The reality that neither of the Councils have been capable of providing a Master Plan and have delegated it to the developers has lost the initiative and ceded the realisation or commissioning of civic benefits being achieved, concurrently, with a profit driven approach.

12069 Object
Summary:

There is no need for a Local Plan policy addressing this issue. This is a matter that is better dealt with as guidance in a Supplementary Planning Document.

13353 Object
Summary:

It is questionable if a specific policy on context is needed rather than reference to it as one of a series of design criteria in the policies promoted by Options 62-6

17398 Object
Summary:

Quality internal provision e.g. new housing - there has recently been insufficient focus on adequate internal space requirements proportionate to household design, including opportunities for spare rooms, adequate storage, etc. All homes designed for families should have adequate gardens, and safe, relaxed, child-friendly access.

7280   Support
Summary:

Excellent framework.

8298   Support
Summary:

need policy

8446   Support
Summary:

yes

9868   Support
Summary:

To ensure development respects the character of its context.

10093 Support
Summary:

We support the need for consultation on these criteria.

10109 Support
Summary:

yes

10190 Support
Summary:

To ensure development respects the character of its context.

10498 Support
Summary:

Yes. What is covered by the NPPF is insufficient to ensure that all parties involved in planning and development in Cambridge understand, or are committed to, high quality development.

10560 Support
Summary:

Yes

10644 Support
Summary:

yes

10791 Support
Summary:

Excellent idea

11538 Support
Summary:

Yes.

12961 Support
Summary:

yes

13045 Support
Summary:

Yes, there is a need for this policy

13513 Support
Summary:

Yes

13817 Support
Summary:

For reasons outlined in paras 7.6 and 7.7 of the Issues and Options report.

14081 Support
Summary:

Local character is important in determining appropriate development

14103 Support
Summary:

Remember the needs of people with autism and learning disability. Public spaces need to be safe spaces where they can't run off into traffic.

14958 Support
Summary:

Yes, support.

15528 Support
Summary:

We strongly support the inclusion of design policies.

15942 Support
Summary:

Definitely agree this should be the case. Will this now be a consideration in Petersfield - it certainly hasn't to date! See the following projects as examples:
Travelodge too high and big
Premier Inn - too high, big and not needed
Residential development on Newmarket Road - too high, big and overdeveloped
ARU medical faculty - not sympathetic to local surroundings and too high.
St Matthews Gardens

16406 Support
Summary:

Yes, emphatically there is a need for a policy

17853 Support
Summary:

Yes

18288 Support
Summary:

Yes. What is covered by the NPPF is insufficient to ensure that all parties involved in planning and development in Cambridge understand, or are committed to, high quality development.

9869   Object
Summary:

The density of development should be included, as well as siting, massing etc in third bullet point.

10193 Object
Summary:

The density of development should be included, as well as siting, massing etc in third bullet point.

10499 Object
Summary:

CCC often does a very sound job up to the point of planning approval. However, in implementation CCC:-
* does not adequately monitor and control developers seeking to avoid their planning commitments
* allows variations to approvals without taking them to planning committee
* does not keep local residents who had commented on the original planning application informed of what is happening, never mind being given an opportunity to comment

To achieve high quality places, not enough CCC resources are put in place for post-approval needs. For new growth areas, this resource requirement is greater than that in plan development.

11932 Object
Summary:

I just want to make the point that I regard the Accordia development as badly planned and resent the fact that it seems to have been acclaimed. Though fairly close to the railway station as the crow flies, it doesn't have any direct link to the guided busway which would provide a relatively traffic free walking and cycling route; and the nearest main road, Brooklands Avenue, is unserved by buses in the evenings, Sundays and Saturdays, and the buses that it does have don't serve the heart of the city. To solve this problem and others, the provision of a direct bus link to Trumpington via Brooklands Avenue should be a high priority goal when planning new development in the Trumpington area.

17399 Object
Summary:

Quality internal provision e.g. new housing - there has recently been insufficient focus on adequate internal space requirements proportionate to household design, including opportunities for spare rooms, adequate storage, etc. All homes designed for families should have adequate gardens, and safe, relaxed, child-friendly access

17854 Object
Summary:

The importance of delivering high quality places vis a vis
other policies could be more explicit, to help with
decision-making when there are conflicting priorities.

18289 Object
Summary:

Yes. From our neighbourhood experience at Accordia, CCC has done an exemplar
job up to the point of planning approval. However, in delivery and implementation
CCC:-
* had not monitored and controlled developers seeking to avoid their planning
commitments
* had allowed variations to approvals without taking them to planning committee
* had not sequenced amenities and infrastructure to be consistent with development growth
* has not held a bond sufficient to undertake swift adoption of landscape and highways

To achieve high quality places, it is clear that not enough CCC resources were put in place for post-approval needs. We would argue that for new growth areas, this resource requirement is greater than that in plan development.

9057   Support
Summary:

Greater weight should be given to the views of the Design and Conservation Panel. Although voluntary and advisory, its professional expertise should be recognised by requiring, as a matter of Local Plan policy, that an overall verdict of at least "amber" must be obtained before consent can be given.

10094 Support
Summary:

Create routes for pedestrians and cyclists to link in all directions regardless of the change of administration from City to County.

10561 Support
Summary:

Agree with this but the existing Local Plan must be very weak to allow developments in Cromwell Road which no-one could pretend reflect local character and are certainly not innovative either - just totally out of scale. Something must be very wrong with the existing Plan for this to happen.

10645 Support
Summary:

Important that individual applications are considered as part of the whole area and not as 'one-offs'; also should require full reinstatement of features damaged or removed during construction; e.g. the impact on an entire terrace by an application for part of it should be given greater consideration (see Lensfield Hotel) - something the current local plan has not prevented.

13842 Support
Summary:

When responding to context, need to consider how much open space (not just public, but semi-public e.g. pub/restaurant gardens) is in area, and thus its value as an amenity and what its loss would mean.

14096 Support
Summary:

The area where I feel this may not work well is on the issue of density where using a local context such as 'high density' leads to even higher density development leading to a cycle of increasing density which is detrimental to that locality but hard to oppose. Other policies are needed to counter this tendency and maybe some absolute limits or standards.

14254 Support
Summary:

I think new developments ought to be public spaces. I oppose the creation of private enclaves and gated communities as I think they create divides in the city. I think they result in people living more fearful and disconnected lives. I think there should be planning policies against developments such as the literally gated St Bartholomews Court, and other private if non-gated developments.

14959 Support
Summary:

Page 137 states 'the approaches to Cambridge play a particular role in how the city is perceived'. The biggest let-down for boaters visiting Cambridge is the approach to Jesus Lock. The riverbanks on both sides - owned and maintained by the City Council - are appalling. They are in urgent need of repair and re-design to permit full access for people with limited mobility. Many visiting boaters who travel great distances (from the Midlands and North) arrive in Cambridge and turn around within the same day because there is no decent mooring space for them. The Conservators would be willing to offer space on the lock island at Jesus Green for a public art installation, perhaps following the theme of the role of the river and navigation in the historical development of Cambridge (e.g. bronze statue of a hauling horse, sculpture of cargo etc.)

15531 Support
Summary:

The NPPF makes clear that design should take account of character and history. We note this link is made (for instance in para 7.5) and trust that this aspect will be strongly reflected in both the local plan design policies, and text.

CHAPTER:	7 - Delivering High Quality Places	Question 7.3

17401 Object
Summary:

Quality internal provision e.g. new housing - there has recently been insufficient focus on adequate internal space requirements proportionate to household design, including opportunities for spare rooms, adequate storage, etc. All homes designed for families should have adequate gardens, and safe, relaxed, child-friendly access.

18290 Object
Summary:

It is interesting to note that individuals, authorities and companies are vocal when
something goes right, but become anonymous when something fails, despite failures never being fully developer or local authority led. Rather than creating punitive measures to raise quality expectations, simply telling everyone that their name will be identified with all the proposals they are associated with. It would be interesting to see if a new policy framework could deliver this sort of commitment.

10096 Support
Summary:

Include the option not to develop immediately. Flexibility in the future requires that there is always an option to reject until the need is clearly evident. We have new towns and expanded villages that may be a better alternative for any proposal. We need to keep some development space in the City for the future beyond 2031.

CHAPTER:	7 - Delivering High Quality Places	7.8

7668   Support
Summary:

Urban design is fundamental -- I think we have plenty of examples of great design in the city, but also examples of what doesn't work (the Leisure Centre on Hills Road).

14074 Support
Summary:

This is essential. The Council rightly trumpets the success of Accordia but subsequent developments within the City have not lived up to its example.

7669   Object
Summary:

A criteria based policy is a form-ticking exercise whereby poor design can get around the objective.

10960 Object
Summary:

Bidwells considers that the inclusion of public art would only be viable and of significant benefit as part of major development proposals. Therefore, Bidwells suggest that the wording of bullet point 13 of Option 62 is amended to read: "The inclusion of public art as an integral part of major new developments".

11081 Object
Summary:

Whilst the need for such a criteria-based policy is acknowledged, policy 3/7 of the 2006 Local Plan was too often used against proposals for individual houses / very small developments. It needs to be made clear what scale of development this policy is aimed at - as some of the criteria are impossible to fulfil except on very large developments.

13080 Object
Summary:

The suggested policy to cover this issue has a long list of criteria which whilst important are not relevant to all schemes. A policy or policies should be clearly worded to clarify what scale of development it applies to.

15548 Object
Summary:

On commercial buildings that require signage, the position of signage should be an integral part of the design process and not something added as an after thought. A good example is the carved stonework sign of John Lewis on Downing Street.

10194 Support
Summary:

To maintain and improve the city's quality of ambience.

11607 Support
Summary:

Cambridge is a unique place with a unique character. We have to hold onto this.

11612 Support
Summary:

In general houses in Cambridge are small and often families have to move out of the city, since normal houses ~ 100m2 floor space are hardly available or very expensive. To keep families in Cambridge, it would be good to demand minimal floor space for a family house. Also bedrooms can be very small and resemble more a walk-in cupboard. Good bedrooms should have 10-12 m2.

12422 Support
Summary:

Again, this is obvious good practice.

12964 Support
Summary:

Support intentions of good design but there have been too many failures and erosion of heritage and grain of City centre street scapes and public realm.
Madgdelene street twee and does not mitigate monstrous bollards scheme. Need to get County Council to agree to a design code of street signage and clutter. Need to add to criteria to remove clutter before any new schemes.

13163 Support
Summary:

We would support a criteria based policy based on the 2006 Local Plan policy 3/7 which sets out guidance on delivering high quality places. This guidance would aid those preparing development proposals and will ensure quality development within Cambridge. In relation to the development of Compass House, any proposals which come forward will have regard to Policy 3/7 of the 2006 Local Plan as well as any emerging policies within the Local Plan Review which concern quality of place.

14291 Support
Summary:

I strongly support many of the proposed criteria including the orientation of buildings to overlook public spaces and promote natural surveillance and designing out crime. These are relatively vague aspirations though; I would like to see the city's planning policy address these areas in more detail, and think planners should actively seek out good practice from elsewhere especially where there is evidence suggesting aspects of design reduce crime, and ensure it is brought to Cambridge.

16410 Support

Summary:

Agree with all this. Strongly support it. Not sure how you design out crime though.

16702 Support

Summary:

What is needed is good non-box like housing that can be lived in comfortably. Green spaces should be included. Adequate facilities should be provided i.e. shops, community centres, surgeries in all areas of large housing. A mixture of affordable housing should be built. Green Belts should be preserved between the city and large areas of housing & villages.

16908 Support

Summary:

Support. Need to define clearly what scale of development this is aimed at.

18342 Support

Summary:

It is clear within Option 62 that designing out crime is a key element withing the new Cambridge Local Plan. The carbon cost of crime is considerable and should therefore be considered as an environmental issue. This is especially relevant where crime prevention measures have been considered. This should form part of the applicant's design and access statement.

12070 Object
Summary:

There is no need for a Local Plan policy addressing this issue. This is a matter that is better dealt with as guidance in a Supplementary Planning Document.

17402 Object
Summary:

Design should develop local identity in new development in Cambridge, as well as encourage radical innovative design where appropriate. There has been some good design but some very poor design in the last decade. Distinctive design features and a design code should be developed and applied to the detailing of all forms of Cambridge development so buildings are recognisable and interesting and suitable for context, and not 'could go any place development' which repeats standard and often poor design, repeated in new development across Britain

8269   Support
Summary:

The standard of design of the new houses on Aberdeen Avenue are great. Its good to have both private (large and small) and social housing mixed together, plus the trees, open spaces, and play areas for children makes it a really nice place to live.

8299   Support
Summary:

need policy

8447   Support
Summary:

yes

10078 Support
Summary:

These criteria would be better as guidelines.

10110 Support
Summary:

yes

10204 Support
Summary:

This option would allow for the development of a criteria based policy
setting out the quality of development that will be expected in Cambridge.

10403 Support
Summary:

Yes a policy on quality places is important in order to get all the elements of good design balanced. For example - designing out crime is very important but can potentially be in conflict with green infrastructure eg dense bushes which can be perceived as a risk to safety. All elements need to be considered together and tested with communities.

10646 Support
Summary:

yes

10846 Support
Summary:

Definitely yes. Criteria based assessment allows all involved in proposals to understand the benchmarks to good design. This will include embedding design reviews and assessments such as 'building for life', in the process.

13046 Support
Summary:

Yes, the city needs a Criteria based policy for delivering high quality places

13354 Support
Summary:

Supported in principle.

13856 Support
Summary:

Developments such as Accordia, which have pleasant, tree-lined, landscaped exteriors and corridors, provide high quality spaces for both residents and visitors. Contrast Accordia with the developments in Cromwell Road, which have none of these features.

14152 Support

Summary:

If disabled people who have high care needs (needing one or more carers around the clock) are to be able to be supported to live in terraced housing in established neighbourhoods with good facilities but little off street parking then planners should seek to make some provision for carers to park. If this isn't done then this group of disabled people will be excluded from living in eg Romsey.

14961 Support

Summary:

Yes, support.

15190 Support

Summary:

Yes and it should include a very strong presumption against 'gated' communities.

16413 Support

Summary:

Yes.

17855 Support

Summary:

Yes

18291 Support

Summary:

Definitely yes. Criteria based assessment allows all involved in proposals to understand the benchmarks to good design. This will include embedding design reviews and assessments such as 'building for life', in the process.

10206 Object
Summary:

Related to integration of landscape design into the design of developments as a whole, edible landscaping, or the use of edible and useful plants and trees should be encouraged. This provides access to local food options and promotes engagement with the community, as residents care about and interact with the landscape around them, rather than just observing it.

10649 Object
Summary:

Contains some gobbledegook - 'activating edges onto public spaces by locating building entrances etc.' seems unnecessary. No sense of which of these criteria has priority if in conflict - how will this be resolved?

10854 Object
Summary:

Yes. A greater emphasis could be made on achieving design quality through the quality of implementation. It could be a city architect or clerk of works, but something is needed. In the long run it is the cheaper option to sorting it out afterwards.

11933 Object
Summary:

I hope that "designing out crime" doesn't mean not providing short cuts for walkers and cyclists that also provide much more pleasant travel than car-infested roads. We need a policy of "filtered permeability" whereby walkers, cyclists and (where relevant) buses can use shorter and more convenient routes than motorists.

13355 Object
Summary:

Whilst the need for such a criteria-based policy is accepted it needs to be made clear what scale of development this policy refers to.

14736 Object
Summary:

Main concern: the bad design of the housing on the new Trumpington Meadows development (rows of tiny, ugly houses). Private developers must not be allowed to throw up instant slums on the edge of the city. Minimum standard of housing: the Poundbury development in Dorset (although Cambridge, hub of wealthy region, should be able to do better). Identify examples of attractive housing, traditional and contemporary, 19th and 20th century (town houses, detached dwellings, semis, courtyard developments, flats), and require developers to replicate them. If developers can't/won't, find someone who will.

17403 Object
Summary:

Design should develop local identity in new development in Cambridge, as well as encourage radical innovative design where appropriate. There has been some good design but some very poor design in the last decade. Distinctive design features and a design code should be developed and applied to the detailing of all forms of Cambridge development so buildings are recognisable and interesting and suitable for context, and not 'could go any place development' which repeats standard and often poor design, repeated in new development across Britain

18267 Object
Summary:

The neighbourhood of King Street contains mixed land uses. It comprises small, specialized retail and restaurant enterprises together with high density housing appended to the central shopping area. Together, these represent a creative mixture of uses. However in higher density areas of the city the relationships between different uses in terms of amenity and standards of control become critical. (This is in contrast to low-density suburban situations). Accordingly, the Local Plan should identify the particular standards and development control practices that are to be employed for the protection of the more sensitive uses.

18292 Object
Summary:

Yes. A greater emphasis could be made on achieving design quality through the
quality of implementation. It could be a city architect or clerk of works, but
something is needed. In the long run it is the cheaper option to sorting it out
afterwards.

18594 Object
Summary:

The impact of traffic on the quality of places could be more explicit, i.e. acknowledging that the quality of places is not just a function of design.

8448 Support
Summary:

Respect for the low-rise, intimate nature of the city; use of local or high quality materials. More care to protect what's good would be valuable. The Petty Cury of my childhood was full of strange delights; it's now no different from lots of UK cities. Some recent buildings jarr: The Travel Lodge, the tower of the Belvedere, the colour of the English Faculty on the Sidgwick site. By contrast, John Lewis and the new Grand Arcade with their fine stone seem to me to enhance the city.

8894   Support
Summary:

A point we would like to see included relates to the use of buildings in relation to their surroundings. In particular, ensuring that fast food outlets are not in close proximity to schools and services for young people so providing an environment that supports approaches to healthy eating and helps tackle obesity.

9058   Support
Summary:

Greater weight should be given to the views of the Design and Conservation Panel. Although voluntary and advisory, its professional expertise should be recognised by requiring, as a matter of Local Plan policy, that an overall verdict of at least "amber" must be obtained before consent can be given.

10404 Support
Summary:

Would like to see included 'safe' walking and cycling routes and priority for the pedestrian over the car.

13879 Support
Summary:

The importance of tree-lined/well landscaped corridors and open spaces which provide access and vistas to both residents and the surrounding community - compare Accordia (good) with Cromwell Road (bad)

14273 Support
Summary:

I think it is important new developments are quality places to live early on. They should not remain building sites for years on end. Street lighting and parking restrictions need to be installed and in operation as residents move in, and the streets need to be safe - free from dangerous holes and other hazards. To-date new developments around Cambridge have been failing on these scores.

16416 Support
Summary:

Perhaps stress the need for integrating with existing communities and sharing of amenities.

CHAPTER:	7 - Delivering High Quality Places	Question 7.6

7511   Object
Summary:

I object to a council policy on public art. Art imposed by edict is almost always of doubtful quality - good art must come from a genuine desire.

17404 Object
Summary:

Design should develop local identity in new development in Cambridge, as well as encourage radical innovative design where appropriate. There has been some good design but some very poor design in the last decade. Distinctive design features and a design code should be developed and applied to the detailing of all forms of Cambridge development so buildings are recognisable and interesting and suitable for context, and not 'could go any place development' which repeats standard and often poor design, repeated in new development across Britain

17856 Object
Summary:

See responses below to other chapter 7 questions, e.g.
the one on public art.

Public Art - RAON's view is that most of the recent
public art in Cambridge is gratuitous and does not
contribute to the attractiveness of Cambridge.

10850 Support
Summary:

no obvious alts (alternatives)

CHAPTER:	7 - Delivering High Quality Places	7.10

12161 Support
Summary:

Steps should be included in policy such that the blocking of pavements by bins and bikes should be reduced from its present, unacceptable level.

16423 Support
Summary:

Support but make design conform to local vernacular.

11089 Object
Summary:

The need for such a policy is supported though why is there reference to refurbishment here - that should be covered in Option 66. The phrase 'highest architectural quality' is not defined and is meaningless. The fourth bullet needs to acknowledge that it is 'appropriate' levels of car parking etc which are needed - there may be cases for zero parking.

11540 Object
Summary:

Perhaps "enhance" biodiversity instead?

7670   Support
Summary:

Very important!

10196 Support
Summary:

To maintain and even improve the quality of design in the city

10792 Support
Summary:

Excellent idea

11539 Support
Summary:

Yes, highest possible quality and in context with its surroundings.

13171 Support
Summary:

We would support a criteria based policy which sets out guidance on the design of buildings. The guidance would be relevant to Compass House should the proposal be for refurbishment of the existing building or construction of a new building. This guidance would aid those preparing development proposals and will ensure quality development within Cambridge. In relation to the development of Compass House, any proposals which come forward will have regard to this criteria based policy.

13358 Support
Summary:

Support

14075 Support
Summary:

support

14800 Support
Summary:

Cambridge is in danger of 'creeping high rise'. There are already insensitive developments (e.g. East Road) in Cambridge that are out of scale. This must not 'skew' considerations of future developments. Please consider the character of the area.

15191 Support
Summary:

Qualified support in the recognition that one wouldn't deliberately set out to design a rubbish building or amenity space. But it happens. Public engagement at an early stage is desirable.

16910 Support
Summary:

Support. Reference to refurbishment should be excluded and need acknowledgment that in some cases both a contemporary design and a contextual design could be appropriate.

12071 Object
Summary:

There is no need for a Local Plan policy addressing this issue. This is a matter that is better dealt with as guidance in a Supplementary Planning Document.

13222 Object
Summary:

Option 63 proposes the development of a criteria based policy setting out the requirements for new buildings and refurbishment of existing buildings. The Council should ensure that any forthcoming policy for the design of buildings should meet the paragraph 58 NPPF criteria.

Therefore our client considers that progressing Option 62 is unjustified and would negatively impact upon the soundness of the Core Strategy.

8301   Support
Summary:

need policy

8449   Support
Summary:

yes

10048 Support
Summary:

Yes but it would be extremely difficult to define what the criteria should be.

10111 Support
Summary:

yes - avoid clones

10650 Support
Summary:

yes

10793 Support
Summary:

Absolutely necessary

10857 Support
Summary:

definite need

13048 Support
Summary:

Yes, a Criteria based policy for the design of buildings should result in better new buildings.

13527 Support
Summary:

Yes

14962 Support
Summary:

Yes, support.

16426 Support
Summary:

Yes

17770 Support
Summary:

Developers should be required to use sympathetic building materials and designs.

17857 Support
Summary:

Yes

18293 Support
Summary:

Yes

CHAPTER: 7 - Delivering High Quality Places   **Question 7.8**

9060   Object
Summary:

Not entirely successful - eg Travelodge at Hills Road bridge

10051 Object
Summary:

Many buildings erected in the recent past have not achieved high quality design.   Too many are design statements regardless of the neighbouring buildings and with a lack of any "sense of place".

10651 Object
Summary:

not in Newtown North.

10868 Object
Summary:

A very mixed bag. Some very good examples but too many are poorly designed with uninteresting shapes and features and only middling quality materials.

The policies are OK but their application and enforcement leave much to be desired.

13050 Object
Summary:

Not always, as is shown by Botanic House - this is taller than surrounding buildings, glass-fronted, which gives an unsuitably "modern" feel to an important part of the city, with almost no windows at the back - very visible from Hills Road, giving the impression of the building turning its rear end rather insultingly to the people on the road.

On the other hand, the Accordia development on Brooklands Avenue fits in very sympathetically with its surroundings.

13370 Object
Summary:

Despite the previous local plan policies, there remains constant disagreement between officers / Design and Conservation Panel / members about what constitutes good design before, during and after construction.

16428 Object
Summary:

No, not so far.

17858 Object
Summary:

Often not. E.g. buildings that are unacceptable in scale or
in their impact on surrounding buildings have been
allowed if built from attractive materials.

8450   Support
Summary:

Respect for the low-rise, intimate nature of the city; use of local or high quality materials. More care to protect what's good would be valuable. The Petty Cury of my childhood was full of strange delights; it's now no different from lots of UK cities. Some recent buildings jarr: The Travel Lodge, the tower of the Belvedere, the colour of the English Faculty on the Sidgwick site. By contrast, John Lewis and the new Grand Arcade with their fine stone seem to me to enhance the city.I think the new building at Station Road corner by the Botanic Gardens is over large; Cripps building of Queen's destroyed a beautiful view and its concrete bears no relation to the brick of the rest of the college.

13655 Support
Summary:

I do not think the Local Plan has been successful in securing high quality design. While there are some notable exceptions, such as Accordia and the forthcoming Seven Acres development, many new developments are of very poor quality. Greater rigour in approving planning applications, in testing design codes and the appointment of design champions are needed.

18294 Support
Summary:

Yes, they are successful.

10652 Object
Summary:

Additions/alterations to existing buildings should be subject to same criteria as new builds; need to address densification and over-development issues.

10871 Object
Summary:

A greater emphasis could be made on achieving quality buildings through insisting on sufficient design resources to be put in place and the ability to quality control implementation.

13375 Object
Summary:

Refurbishment should be deleted from this policy as it is covered in Option 66.

18295 Object
Summary:

Yes. A greater emphasis could be made on achieving quality buildings
through insisting on sufficient design resources to be put in place and the ability to
quality control implementation.

8451   Support
Summary:

Relationship to its neighbours should be an explicit criterion of judgement of proposed new buildings.

9059   Support
Summary:

Greater weight should be given to the views of the Design and Conservation Panel. Although voluntary and advisory, its professional expertise should be recognised by requiring, as a matter of Local Plan policy, that an overall verdict of at least "amber" must be obtained before consent can be given.

13051 Support
Summary:

Some of the points about low-carbon building which were made in chapter 6 should also be included here (or at least one statement about the need to design buildings to be as energy-efficient as possible and use low-carbon building materials). This issue is too important to be confined to one part of the plan.

14964 Support
Summary:

Extend planning controls to residential boats.

6890 Object
Summary:

No - support good (visually pleasing and functional) design without insistence on contemporary design. Indeed in some places it may be much better to have designs that blend well with older buildings.

9061 Object
Summary:

Not actively promoting - we would get too many "current fad" designs.

10876 Object
Summary:

No, promote quality architecture with architects and designers of sufficient calibre. You can get poor quality contemporary 'bolt-on's' just like you can neo-Victorian. Being contemporary does not of itself make it OK. High quality must be paramount whatever the architectural style

11091 Object
Summary:

Too often the decision-maker / advisor is unable to acknowledge that both a well-designed 'contemporary' building or a well-detailed 'traditional' design can be equally appropriate to a site - and too often there is a difference of opinion between the officers and, for example the Design and Conservation Panel. More guidance on how these conflicts are resolved is needed.

13378 Object
Summary:

Too often the decision-maker / advisor rely on subjective judgements rather than reference back to any criteria by which 'high quality design' might be defined. A well-designed 'contemporary' building or a well-detailed 'traditional' design can both be appropriate - and if the City Council tries to promote one form of development over another in policy, it runs the risk of not complying with NPPF paragraph 60.

17859 Object
Summary:

Neither promoting nor stifling, but allowing good
contemporary design to replace older buildings if the
latter are mediocre.

18296 Object
Summary:

No. Promote quality architecture with architects and designers of sufficient calibre.
You can get poor quality contemporary 'bolt-ons' just like to can neo-Victorian, it
should not make it supportable.

8452 Support
Summary:

Yes. The contemporary can fit well with the historic; it's a question of the architect's sensitivity to place.

10654 Support
Summary:

Yes where appropriate but avoid following 'fashion', which will not stand the test of time. Innovative design is part and parcel of an architect's brief in responding to site, space and function so unlikely to be stifled.

13662 Support
Summary:

Yes, as long as it is appropriately respectful to local context. Just because a building may be innovative does not mean it is disrespectful to local context and basic principles of good design.

16431 Support
Summary:

So long as the innovative design is good, why should this option stifle it?

18297 Support
Summary:

Probably little, as Design and Build contracts dominate the process and planning
policy cannot dictate this.

12170 Support

Summary:

Additionally, new designs should seek to forcibly separate cyclists and pedestrians.
The mutual nuisance appears to be unrecognised throughout this plan. Both walking and cycling are safer and more pleasant if cyclists and pedestrians are kept apart.

12965 Support

Summary:

Heritage groups should be consulted before schemes instigated.
Cambridge City Centre a 'dogs dinner' in places.

15549 Object
Summary:

An additional bullet point on the need to avoid clutter would be appropriate.

16439 Object
Summary:

Agree, with reservations about the word 'palette' (see Orchard Park and parts of the Station Development where painting flats with bright colours has made them look cheap and nasty).

17101 Object
Summary:

I notice the continual whittling away of our tree canopy, and where trees are 'said' to be old or dangerous the replacement policy is not like for like.

We seem to build almost to the road side. We should be lining these pavements with maturing trees, setting back the building line. We should encourage architects to step-rise these developments so as to open the air corridors and clear pollution more quickly. We are just trapping and funnelling more particulates.

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

7671   Support
Summary:

Perhaps even more important than the building itself.

10102 Support
Summary:

But, bullet point 6 needs to be strengthened.
High-quality, robust, well-mannered street furniture we would like, coupled with a city-wide removal of unnecessary, ill-designed notices.

10197 Support
Summary:

to improve our living environment

10352 Support
Summary:

Agree with all the points, but provision of space for allotments or community gardens/growing spaces is not specified here.

10655 Support
Summary:

bullet point 4: consider use of movement activated lighting in side streets and walk ways

10794 Support
Summary:

Good idea

12425 Support
Summary:

Again, basic good practice.

12671 Support
Summary:

agree

13175 Support
Summary:

We would support a criteria based policy which sets out guidance on the design of the public realm, landscape and other external spaces. The guidance would be relevant to Compass House should the proposal be for refurbishment of the existing building or construction of a new building. In relation to the development of Compass House, any proposals which come forward will have regard to this criteria based policy. We support the policy as it will seek to ensure high quality design of buildings and spaces which will enhance the built environment of Cambridge.

13383 Support
Summary:

There is a need to tailor the policy to reflect the different scales of development (eg single building v major redevelopment area). Public realm improvements should be largely funded by S106. May be an opportunity to reduce consultancy costs by having direct Council employee to provide green space advice and planning.

13559 Support
Summary:

Trees, yes please. Biodiversity, yes please.

14802 Support
Summary:

Important to:
1) Avoid destruction of beautiful and historic streets (e.g. as in Bridge Street, spoiled by very inappropriate new build even if it does house the U3A).
2) Ensure trees are retained and planted.

14852 Support
Summary:

In general I support this but I think we need to consider very carefully where shared space is appropriate and where it would lead to road users or pedestrians feeling unsafe or intimidated.

15193 Support
Summary:

Public realm should be really useful spaces not bits left over after the builder has finished. scraps of land should not be counted as contributing to public open space requirements and in general developers should aim to make such provision in a single block as part of their overall design.
London's garden squares are still regarded as the most effective way of providing open space for residents of very high density developments.
In designing surfaces the needs of elderly and disabled people needs to be given full consideration.

16735 Support
Summary:

This should include recreational areas around the city

16897 Support
Summary:

We would welcome a policy which is directed at improving the quality of public spaces whether these are expansive (as in parks and large open spaces) or quite local intimate. There are opportunities to enhance the public space in even quite densely built up streets to enable residents to meet and relax, and enjoy a more varied streetscene. This might be particularly appropriate within for example a Conservation area.

17107 Support
Summary:

The four parishes of Barton, Coton, Grantchester and Madingley have submitted a vision document to the South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City Council, entitled "A Quarter to Six Quadrant". This sets out in detail how the QTSQ part of Cambridge could contribute to Cambridge's green infrastructure, ensuring that the total development of Cambridge and District is developed in a sustainable manner.

12072 Object

Summary:

There is no need for a Local Plan policy addressing this issue. This is a matter that is better dealt with as guidance in a Supplementary Planning Document.

13229 Object

Summary:

Option 64 of the issues and Options Report seeks to develop a criteria based policy of the design of the public realm, landscape and other external spaces. Our client considers that sufficient guidelines are provided in the Cambridegshire Design Guide for Streets and the Public Realm, Cambridgeshire County Council, 2007. This Design Guide sets out detailed principles for the design of the public realm, landscape and external spaces. The Council should ensure that its emerging policies comply with paragraph 21 of the NPPF.

Therefore our client considers that progressing Option 64 is unjustified and would negatively impact upon the soundness of the Core Strategy.

17405 Object

Summary:

The inadequate provision of open space in recent developments needs to be corrected, including twin requirements - to require on-site open space, not commuted sums as has been over-allowed for some of the most intensive sites - being even tougher in favour of open space in areas of the city with an open space deficit, including where recent development decisions have made it worse, and recognise in particular provision for children and the increased number of families living in flats due to excess local housing costs, and children living in over-developed parts of Cambridge.

7106 Support

Summary:

Yes, but any policy is likely to prove difficult to implement in practice. Developers have strange ideas as to how amenity and recreational open space is to be created, e.g the over regimented spaces emerging from the CB1 development.

7281 Support

Summary:

Very important to keep idea of public space alive.

7307 Support

Summary:

Tranquillity and relaxation should be the priority for a park. It should not become a busy noisy transport corridor; in particular running a bus across it should be avoided .

8002 Support

Summary:

Yes. Option 64 covers this well; the integration of surface water management into the wider landscape design is essential.

8303 Support

Summary:

need policy

8453 Support

Summary:

yes

8895 Support

Summary:

There seems to be considerable overlap with other proposed policies, e.g. on green space and sustainable development. We would suggest that the policies are integrated where possible to avoid confusion.

10098 Support

Summary:

There is clearly a need for a policy.

10112 Support

Summary:

yes

10562 Support

Summary:

Yes. Would add need for wider pavements. As buildings grow in height they cut out light and both dwarf and intimidate the pedestrian on narrow pavements with cars rushing by, e.g. outside Belvedere, but also in the city centre in Magdelene St or Regent St. Cambridge aspires to the European model of compact cities, but one of their attractions are often tree lined boulevards with wide pavements.

10657 Support

Summary:

yes

10795 Support

Summary:

Good idea

10880 Support

Summary:

yes

13664 Support

Summary:

Yes

14967 Support

Summary:

The River Cam should be a recognised feature of the landscape deserving protection of sightlines.

16454 Support

Summary:

Yes, definitely.

16808 Support

Summary:

Yes - support

17860 Support

Summary:

Yes

18298 Support

Summary:

Yes

18431 Support

Summary:

Support

10882 Object

Summary:

Yes, as above. A greater emphasis could be made on achieving quality public realm design through insisting on sufficient design resources to be put in place and the ability to quality control implementation.

16809 Object

Summary:

There is a need in Romsey and other conservation areas for planning policies to upgrade the public realm, in keeping with the history and heritage of the area. This means street lighting that is in keeping with the area, the replacement of slurry pavements with York stones or similar and the removal of unnecessary signage. A supplementary planning document should be drawn up to cover these issues and publicised appropriately, with funding through CIL.

17125 Object

Summary:

Yes, close the Town Centre to traffic, reinvigorate the crummy Market Square, let's have a few Fountains. As we have had to bear with developers 'rubber stamping' their residential builds with appalling, unlovely and unloved urban 'sculptures' - instead ask them for water features, flower beds - its really not rocket science. And apparently we can do that!

17406 Object

Summary:

The inadequate provision of open space in recent developments needs to be corrected, including twin requirements - to require on-site open space, not commuted sums as has been over-allowed for some of the most intensive sites - being even tougher in favour of open space in areas of the city with an open space deficit, including where recent development decisions have made it worse, and recognise in particular provision for children and the increased number of families living in flats due to excess local housing costs, and children living in over-developed parts of Cambridge

17861 Object

Summary:

You note the need for an integrated approach to the design and siting of street furniture, boundary treatments, public art and lighting. The approach to these things also needs to be integrated with transport policy and your vision of foot, bicycle and public transport being the norm. If you want elderly people to walk and take public transport more, lots of benches are needed, especially at bus stops.

18299 Object

Summary:

Yes. A greater emphasis could be made on achieving quality public realm
design through insisting on sufficient design resources to be put in place and the
ability to quality control implementation.

18432 Object

Summary:

The County Council as Highway Authority, Waste Authority and as Education Authority asks that further consideration be given to future maintenance and durability of materials in the light of further increases in population density within the City.

The general thrust of the options proposed within chapter 7 is to provide high quality places; however there is little or no consideration of future maintenance and the selection of materials and designs to provide places that can enhance the quality of life indefinitely in an environment of dwindling resources, both physical and financial.

7232 Support

Summary:

There is a need to stress distinctiveness and avoid the same palette of materials used all over the city in private or publicly managed green spaces; the opportunity should be taken to improve outlying parks (Arbury Town Park, Cherry Hinton Park, Trumpington/Foster Road/ King George VI Playing Fields etc), giving them higher ornamental value with interest throughout the year. Thus priorities for refurbishments of parks should be identified, supported by planning obligations and infrastructure levies. Parks with diverse interest need spreading throughout the City.

8454 Support

Summary:

Creation of small wild-liife corridors

10659 Support

Summary:

Add replacement/maintenance of trees/hedges/shrubs/gardens/grassy areas.

13672 Support

Summary:

I would like to suggest a unified, city-wide design code when it comes to designing the public realm. Rather than having different types of pavement in different developments (for example), we should be encouraging very similar types of paving throughout the city, with only a few notable exceptions. By unifying examples of public realm design, we tie together the different parts of the city, and avoid the 'gated community' feel of new developments.

14112 Support
Summary:

I should like to suggest support for community gardens and incorporating space for these within small and large scale developments as well as public spaces.

CHAPTER: 7 - Delivering High Quality Places   **Question 7.14**

10661 Object
Summary:

Guide was published in 2007 and has not been successful in preserving green areas in Newtown. It needs updating and strengthening? Does it apply with equal effectiveness to alterations to existing properties as to new developments?

10967 Object
Summary:

Paragraph 59 of the NPPF states "design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription", and paragraph 60 states that policies "should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles."

Therefore, Bidwells considers that there is no need for an additional Supplementary Planning Document in addition to the guidance in Policy 64, as this would become too prescriptive and potentially stifle innovation.

17408 Object
Summary:

The inadequate provision of open space in recent developments needs to be corrected, including twin requirements - to require on-site open space, not commuted sums as has been over-allowed for some of the most intensive sites - being even tougher in favour of open space in areas of the city with an open space deficit, including where recent development decisions have made it worse, and recognise in particular provision for children and the increased number of families living in flats due to excess local housing costs, and children living in over-developed parts of Cambridge

17862 Object
Summary:

Possibly. The current guidance has not resulted in contemporary lighting as beautiful as, for example, the 1930s lights in Trinity Street.

18300 Object
Summary:

Yes and training for Highways and Planning officers. A planning applicant should not comply with policy and then have CCC inter-department conflicts prevent progress.

7233   Support
Summary:

A joint design guidance should be agreed with the County Council for the urban, suburban and rural highway areas, and for heritage commons and green spaces where rights of way or cycle routes are proposed. Recent failures have included street lighting and colour co-ordination of pay & display machines within Conservation Areas.

9062   Support
Summary:

Work with County Council to reduce street clutter. Is there scope to have road signs fixed to lamp-posts rather than stand-alone poles? In centre and on main access routes, more lamps bracketed to buildings rather than in posts?

10883 Support
Summary:

Yes and training for Highways and Planning officers. A planning applicant should not comply with policy and then have CCC inter-department conflicts prevent progress.

13385 Support
Summary:

Further Supplementary Guidance might help clarify the point raised above.

13673 Support
Summary:

Yes

17409 Object
Summary:

The inadequate provision of open space in recent developments needs to be corrected, including twin requirements - to require on-site open space, not commuted sums as has been over-allowed for some of the most intensive sites - being even tougher in favour of open space in areas of the city with an open space deficit, including where recent development decisions have made it worse, and recognise in particular provision for children and the increased number of families living in flats due to excess local housing costs, and children living in over-developed parts of Cambridge

18301 Object
Summary:

Yes. CCC (or a Corporation entity) could become the strategic developer for
expansion areas around the city. The body could (if sufficiently resourced) deliver the necessary infrastructure and public realm, prior to offering parcels of land to
developers. It is also possible that this process could control the value of allocated
land and SIL early in the process.

15550 Object
Summary:

It would be prudent to undertake a review of the success of the design codes at the Southern Fringe before adopting them more widely.

10416 Object
Summary:

Too many policies can overide common sense.

13176 Object
Summary:

Although not relevant to Compass House, this policy would be of concern as it creates another tier of Design and Access Statements and may lead to unneccesarry expense and delays in the preparation and submission of planning applications owing to the process of producing and agreeing a Design Code. Flexibility in the implementation of this policy would be key, basing this on site specific requirements.

16911 Object
Summary:

Object. Sites need to be developed on an individual basis.

10198 Support
Summary:

To ensure a high quality of design.

11541 Support
Summary:

Yes, critical otherwise development piecemeal.

13393 Support
Summary:

This is a sensible provision but realistically can only be required for large scale development.

15195 Support
Summary:

Agree

10662 Object
Summary:

Yes - but why just to growth areas - why not throughout city?

9063   Support
Summary:

Yes - and SPDs/ADFs should be given greater weight. Adherence to masterplans should be enforceable.

11543 Support
Summary:

Agree

13676 Support
Summary:

Yes

14969 Support
Summary:

Yes, support.

15609 Support
Summary:

Yes, and it should include requirements that street and path layout and design should encourage walking and cycling and not car use. Also that cycle parking places should (in homes, shops, leisure sites and workplaces) be more easily accessible (to resident, visitor, customer and employee) than parked cars.
This principle is already recommended on p5 of the city's Cycle Parking Guide, quoting Manual for Streets. It should be applied to all development proposals, large and small.

16455 Support
Summary:

Yes, emphatically.

18302 Support
Summary:

Yes

10663 Object
Summary:

Where growth areas abutt conservation areas need to ensure design codes are compatible.

15401 Object
Summary:

Design Codes are strongly welcome, but must be subject to much greater public consultation and awareness.

18303 Object
Summary:

Yes, Design Codes are a vital tool. Designers, developers and other stakeholders
may change many times before construction starts. Codes, when written well, can
ensure continuity, consistency and promote quality over time. However, they are only a back stop. If a developer chooses to dumb down design quality, it would take a strong development control and implementation team to use a code effectively.

To answer the question, codes can be used for strategic and detail purposes but they favour the strategic.

9064   Support
Summary:

Yes - and SPDs/ADFs and masterplans should be given greater weight. Adherence to masterplans should be enforceable

13678 Support
Summary:

I strongly support the use of design codes, but would also strongly advise the appointment of design champions as well. All too often, new developments try to circumvent or loosely interpret the criteria laid out in design codes. A design champion can help mitigate this.

14557 Support
Summary:

Design codes for Option 65 (Detailed Level) should include a requirement that by default car parking is located at a distance from the residence and bicycle parking in the immediate vicinity of the residence. This allows for consolidated car parking solutions, which reduces overall space requirements

15611 Support
Summary:

See answer to 7.16

18304 Object
Summary:

Yes. Better resources within CCC to constantly steer developers not
wishing to comply with planning obligations.

14558 Support
Summary:

The city being a national leader in cycling, public art projects (stationary and performance based), should be commissioned which address this mode of transportation, its history, its joy and its importance.

15197 Support
Summary:

Public art is art visible to the public. What is provided is probably best left to individuals and I would back most developers against a local authority committee any day. If stuck, canvass local people for ideas, they could well surprise you by expressing a long-felt want that could be met by public art. I believe the replacement for Little Ben (long after its removal) at the station end of Victoria Street in London was the result of such an initiative.

9065   Object
Summary:

Public art is desirable but not essential in every development.

10888 Object
Summary:

For me, public art is at a lower importance level and lower strategic scale than the other elements in this chapter. Question the need for a policy. Avoid choosing 'by committee'.

10962 Object
Summary:

Bidwells considers that the inclusion of public art would only be viable and of significant benefit as part of major development proposals. Therefore, Bidwells suggest that the wording of bullet point 13 of Option 62 is amended to read: "The inclusion of public art as an integral part of major new developments".

11221 Object
Summary:

Questions need to be continually asked about the relevance of public art and development projects to ensure that there is a correlation between the two and that there is a clear link established in order the Council can show that it is necessary, and directly and reasonabaly related to the specific developmnent project.

12074 Object
Summary:

There is no need for a Local Plan policy addressing this issue. This is a matter that is better dealt with as guidance in a Supplementary Planning Document.

12078 Object
Summary:

There is no need for a separate Local Plan Policy defining public art.

17863 Object
Summary:

Perhaps, because RAON's view is that most of the recent public art in Cambridge is gratuitous and does not contribute to the attractiveness of Cambridge. Our
preference is that whatever time and money is available be channelled into functional design—such as high quality street furniture including benches, lighting and attractive street surfaces—and trees.

18305 Object
Summary:

Not when considering this strategic scale of urban growth. Yes, a percentage of any s106 agreement for art on a site by site basis, subject to local conditions and consultation at that time; however, not selected by committee.

8305   Support
Summary:

need policy

8455   Support
Summary:

yes

10564 Support
Summary:

Yes. It should include criteria that ensure developers cannot wriggle out of Public Art committments as at Christ's Lane. Looking at what went wrong there, and why the developers were not made to follow through with the scheme would give some clues to more forceful wording. It would also be welcome to see the use of more local artists, especially in neighbourhood schemes.Some public art contractors have no feel for Cambridge - sometimes good to have an outside view, but not always.

10664 Support
Summary:

yes

12178 Support
Summary:

Public art is important outside of the city centre as it helps enhance the sense of local identity and pride.

13398 Support
Summary:

A specific public art policy would be sensible.

13679 Support
Summary:

No

14970 Support
Summary:

Yes, support.

15761 Support
Summary:

Yes, primarily so it can't be avoided, and also to say what's expected.

16044 Support
Summary:

There is a need for public art, but of a kind that is acceptable to the public. My definition is art that belongs to the public and is intended to enhance the public domain. It should have wide appeal and acute pleasure and curiosity or even amazement.   Works of art that can only be understood by the artist can be baffling to the point of annoyance and therefore should not be condoned. People must support the concept of public art and not come to regard it as wasting money. Public consultation is essential.

10963 Object

Summary:

Bidwells considers that the inclusion of public art would only be viable and of significant benefit as part of major development proposals. Therefore, Bidwells suggest that the wording of bullet point 13 of Option 62 is amended to read: "The inclusion of public art as an integral part of major new developments".

17864 Object

Summary:

Objects, installations or interventions which are not integral to the functional design of a building or space.

18306 Object

Summary:

Public art across the city, selected by local authority committees, is generally the worst public art.

8456 Support

Summary:

Art in public spaces other than museums. A imaginative policy might include designated spaces for performance art.

9066 Support

Summary:

Public art should be permanent i.e. not like the CB1 "light shows". It should also be remembered that public art is about improving visual appearance of streets/places, not about encouraging artists.

10665 Support

Summary:

A feature that can be seen, enjoyed and used by the public - not as has happened in the past only by those who benefit from a development, i.e. truly publicly available.

13403 Support

Summary:

There needs to be acceptance that forms of art take many guises and therefore there needs to be a very broad definition of what constitutes art. Similarly there needs to be recognition that the appropriate level of public access may be dependent on the art form itself.

13682 Support

Summary:

While I support the idea of public art in principle, I believe the commissioning and execution of public art should not be left in the hands of developers or even the council. High quality examples of public art need to be commissioned by those who work or deal in art; organisations such as Kettle's Yard or Anglia Ruskin should be responsible for deciding the shape, form and nature of public art.

14400 Support

Summary:

I think it is critical that public art is intended to last as long as the development it is associated with. I think spending public art funds from developments on workshop sessions for example is not appropriate as the impact of these will be lost while the developments remain standing.

I would rather have good functional architecture which is "art" itself rather than make those looking for places to live pay even more for homes to fund add-on art.

14972 Support

Summary:

Public art is installations which stimulate the senses (visual, mobile, tactile), reflecting the natural habitat, culture and history of the area. They could also be educational and fun, for children and adults.

15762 Support

Summary:

My experience of public art provision is that someone in the council goes out and procures some. I think this is a great mistake. Public art should be chosen with the full input and consultation of the community, especially of the community in which it is to be placed and who will see it every day. It is not right to "impose" art. In some cases this may mean space for public art is reserved in a development, and developer funds ring-fenced, but only selected by the local community once the development is occupied.

16045 Support

Summary:

There is a need for public art, but of a kind that is acceptable to the public. My definition is art that belongs to the public and is intended to enhance the public domain. It should have wide appeal and acute pleasure and curiosity or even amazement.   Works of art that can only be understood by the artist can be baffling to the point of annoyance and therefore should not be condoned. People must support the concept of public art and not come to regard it as wasting money. Public consultation is essential.

11544 Object
Summary:

Consider height too?

7672 Support
Summary:

Existing buildings should be included as well.

8098 Support
Summary:

I think the criteria based policy should be applied for alterations and extensions

8306 Support
Summary:

we support option 66

9871 Support
Summary:

To ensure that there are relevant criteria for assessing such applications.

10205 Support
Summary:

To ensure that there are relevant criteria for assessing such applications.

10796 Support
Summary:

Good idea

11092 Support
Summary:

The need for such a policy and the scope are generally supported.

12198 Support
Summary:

Options 66 (p. 147), 70 (p. 158), 164 (p. 263), 178 (p. 277) and 200 (p. 301) are essential.

12426 Support
Summary:

Common sense.

12672 Support
Summary:

agree

13082 Support
Summary:

The need for such a policy and the scope are generally supported.

13178 Support
Summary:

We would support this policy as it seeks to provide clear guidance to applicants as to what is required as part of development proposals. It recognises the role that existing buildings play in the built form of Cambridge and seeks to ensure that alterations or extensions enhance both the building itself and the surrounding built form.

13329 Support
Summary:

I have concerns over large extensions and loft conversions that overshadow and overlook neighbouring properties. The size and placement of dormer windows are a serious issue with regard to this. The character and appearance of conservation areas should be protected.

15198 Support
Summary:

The areas covered appear very reasonable

16758 Support

Summary:

The criteria that are proposed for extensions seem to me to strike a good balance between permitting adaptation so that properties are developed to meet users' needs, and maintaining the character and improving the environmental sustainability of an area. I would propose also: (i) widespread and timely notification of local households within 50 yards, with opportunity to comment (ii) perhaps criteria placed on the process of building such extensions (eg timing, noise etc), perhaps to ensure that no-one is surrounded by extensions, that builders carry out work promptly , and that they do not work at inappropriate times or make unnecessary noise. These practices could be enforced through ad hoc site inspections.

16929 Support

Summary:

We would support a policy which provided more guidance to residents on alterations and extensions, particularly now that the area is included in a conservation area. The demand for such development is increasing locally as residents seek to adapt their homes to new family, work and leisure patterns, and a policy which addresses these needs and sets clear limits as to what might be acceptable could help reduce both abortive costs and the number of neighbour disputes.

9872   Object
Summary:

Because developments to existing buildings need to respect their context particularly as regards character and appearance of Conservation Areas.

12075 Object
Summary:

There is no need for a Local Plan policy addressing this issue. This is a matter that is better dealt with as guidance in a Supplementary Planning Document.

8075   Support
Summary:

Strongly support - the recent extensions on my street, which has just become a Conservation Area. Should boxes continue to stay on top of the Victorian terraces? Surely, something more in keeping could be more appropriate?

8307   Support
Summary:

need policy

10113 Support
Summary:

yes

10210 Support
Summary:

Because developments to existing buildings need to respect their context, particularly as regards character and appearance of Conservation Areas.

10570 Support
Summary:

Yes. Especially re roof extensions - often look like sheds sitting on top of the house, and dwarf neighbourhood, esp with small terraces. Would allowing the ridge to be raised be a way forward ?

10666 Support
Summary:

yes

10892 Support
Summary:

yes, policy needed. Existing buildings are a vital resource.

13053 Support
Summary:

Yes, a criteria based policy for alterations and extensions to existing buildings should help ensure high quality in these.

13406 Support
Summary:

The need for such a policy and the scope are generally supported.

13683 Support
Summary:

Yes

13986 Support
Summary:

There is a great pressure to extend existing Buildings, and Policies and criteria need to be reinforced to regulate the impact on public space and neighbours. I would like to also bring your attention to the fact this is related to consideration of density.

14173 Support
Summary:

A need for larger family houses in some areas where properties are small may mean that there should be a higher willingness to grant permission for extensions, restricting future use to family occupation and not as HMOs.

16456 Support
Summary:

Yes

17865 Support

Summary:

Yes. All the points you make are very important to the character of Cambridge.

18307 Support

Summary:

Yes

CHAPTER: 7 - Delivering High Quality   Question 7.22
Places

9067   Object

Summary:

Should not contrast, "successfully" or otherwise, with existing buildings, especially in conservation areas (cf 5 Shaftesbury Road).

10668 Object

Summary:

Add Buildings of Local Interest and Conservation Areas as deserving of specific protection; also emphasize that unless city planning enforcement is vastly improved at the time work is being done and retrospectively this whole policy counts for nothing.

11095 Object

Summary:

The section on dormers needs to be more carefully drafted - there may be instances where larger dormers are appropriate. This policy needs also to consider alterations made to improve sustainability / energy efficiency.

13409 Object

Summary:

The policy needs also to consider alterations made to improve sustainability / energy efficiency.

17866 Object

Summary:

One of your bullet points mentions the space between buildings but you do not explicitly talk about the subdivision of existing plots. A policy similar to the 2006
Local Plan's 3/10 'subdivision of existing plots' should be included in the new Local Plan.

18308 Object

Summary:

Yes. Existing buildings are a vital resource that should be assessed using 'renewable resource' and sustainability criteria.

13055 Support

Summary:

Some of the points about low-carbon building which were made in chapter 6 should also be included here (or at least one statement about the need to design buildings to be as energy-efficient as possible and use low-carbon building materials). This issue is too important to be confined to one part of the plan.

13685 Support

Summary:

I am concerned that there are several loopholes in the criteria for altering buildings in conservation areas. Poor quality roof extensions, if built before a conservation area has been designated, can be used as an acceptable precedent for another poor quality roof extension nearby. Such loopholes make a mockery of conservation area designations. Likewise, I am disappointed that there are not more Article 4 directions preventing the installation of poor quality PVC windows instead of sustainable sash windows.

14011 Support

Summary:

I should like to see included reference to impact on daylight levels and sunlight availability to main residential living rooms and some specific criteria in particular relating to the spaces between buildings (not only in relation to the character if an area but also in relation to amenity) and the issue of overshadowing and visual domination - presently this seems to be subjective so specific minimum standards or criteria/guidance about acceptable standards would be helpful.

14559 Support

Summary:

Conversion of front garden space to parking space should involve a permit process and include a fee.
Design should adhere to rain water run-off reduction targets, should be minimal, and make use of shared drive-ways if possible

A remedial policy should be in place and advertised which offers significant economical support for home-owners who want to reconvert front garden parking into green space

16457 Support

Summary:

Include the nuisance created by people building extensions that seriously affect their neighbours.

17616 Object

Summary

The Council should consider a more innovative approach to the extension/alteration of buildings. With the shortage of sizeable affordable family housing in Cambridge, there should be active encouragement/incentive for people to create additional space in their lofts (or basements). If homeowners were supported it might help ease the housing shortage in the City without actually building any more houses. The "help" would be in the form of easy-access advice packs, suggesting the most reputable contractors to choose from, and teaming up with a lender to offer advantageous loans/mortgages. If there were a welcoming policy with strict planning guidelines, then it could make things easier for people.

17616 Object