

## APPENDIX C: ANALYSIS, RESPONSES AND PREFERRED APPROACH TO PROTECTING AND ENHANCING THE HISTORIC AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENT, PLUS SUMMARIES OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

ISSUE: PROTECTING AND ENHANCING THE HISTORIC AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

<b>Total representations: 37</b>	
<b>Object: 17</b>	<b>Support: 20</b>

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 67: Protecting and enhancing the historic and natural environment (Strategic priority)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The city should have a heritage policy and a discrete environment policy;</li> <li>• Reference should be made to minimising light pollution;</li> <li>• Hazards to heritage assets should be clearly defined so that aims become meaningful;</li> <li>• Concerns at the loss of green spaces and the need for more trees;</li> <li>• English Heritage has commented that the strategic priority needs to be stronger and suggested some wording changes;</li> <li>• Seeks specific inclusion of college playing fields as part of Cambridge's distinctive historic environment;</li> <li>• Victorian/Edwardian suburbs such as North Newtown should be given special consideration and mention in the Local Plan and their heritage assets protected;</li> <li>• Support the clear distinction between the historic setting of Cambridge and rural area beyond and suggest it is a good reason to retain the Green Belt.</li> </ul>
<b>NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b>	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT
<p>This option should ensure that new development contributes to the protection of the city's historic assets and improvements in its environmental quality. In doing so this option should help address key sustainability issues relating to landscape, townscape and also the impact on biodiversity. The option should benefit all areas in the city, particularly those wards where significant population growth is anticipated. Specific reference to improving air quality and increased tree cover should also help improve the health and well being of residents and contribute to mitigating and adapting to the effects of climate change.</p>

KEY EVIDENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge City Council (2006) Historic Core Area Appraisal;</li> <li>• Cambridge City Council, Conservation Area Appraisals (various dates);</li> </ul>

- Cambridge City Council (2006) Nature Conservation Strategy
- Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy (2011);
- Cambridge City Council's Local List of Heritage Assets;
- Cambridgeshire County Council. Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record;
- Cambridgeshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan;
- National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012).

#### **CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Not applicable.

#### **ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

Cambridge is a small city with a diverse and vibrant character. Some of the key distinctive qualities of the historic environment of the city include the richness of college and university architecture; the wealth of public and private historic open spaces; and the Victorian/Edwardian suburbs and post-war housing developments. Across the city, where areas and sites are considered to have special character and distinctiveness worthy of a heritage asset, the Council seeks to designate Conservation Areas; put forward buildings/structures for listing to English Heritage and include buildings on the Council's List of Buildings of Local Interest. The development of a number of policies on designated and undesignated heritage assets will support the protection and enhancement of these sites and areas. Using the existing policies in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and their successors will ensure that heritage assets are given due consideration in the planning process. The level of impact of development on a heritage asset will continue to be assessed on a case by case basis, due to the wide range of heritage assets within the city.

Two of the twelve principal objectives of planning set out in paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework are the conservation of heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance and the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment. Addressing both of these issues will not only protect and enhance the historic and natural environment itself, but will contribute actively to the quality of life of this generation and future generations. Local Plans should set out strategic policies to conserve and enhance the historic and natural environment of the area (paragraph 156 of National Planning Policy Framework). It is considered that Option 67 represents a starting point for the development of a strategic level policy on the protection and enhancement of the historic and natural environment. This approach will be supported by the development of more detailed policies on specific types of heritage asset and nature conservation sites and specific issues facing the historic and natural environment, such as climate change adaptation and the potential for strategic landscape-scale biodiversity enhancement.

As a statutory consultee, English Heritage has raised concerns surrounding the detail, in that the strategic priority needs to be stronger and has suggested amendment of the wording to read "tree canopy cover and positive enhancement of the city's heritage assets." Furthermore, English Heritage has suggested that the first objective pertaining to the historic and natural environment should read "To protect and enhance all heritage assets, including the wider landscape and the appreciation

of the historic city, its character and setting.” It is considered that these suggestions are reasonable and would strengthen the policy.

Other issues raised related to light pollution and concerns about loss of green spaces and the need for more trees. Cambridge’s historic and natural environment is subject to many pressures and challenges, including light pollution; the loss of green space and the need for more trees. Impacts from light pollution include disruption of natural habitats and wildlife and reductions in residential amenity and the overall quality of the wider environment. Option 88 seeks to address concerns about light pollution by setting out a criteria-based approach for considering planning applications with lighting impacts. Minimising the impacts of light pollution is also considered in paragraph 125 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that planning policies and decision should limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.

Green spaces and trees have a vital role to play in the sustainability of the city, improving quality of life, cooling the urban environment, contributing to biodiversity, and forming the setting of the city. College playing fields, other sports pitches, historic parks and gardens, allotments, amenity green space, commons and nature reserves all form part of the city’s open space provision and are designated as Protected Open Space and/or are located within the Cambridge Green Belt. Regarding the loss of green spaces as a whole and the need for more trees, Options 164 and 83 respectively address the need to protect open space and trees, whilst Options 165 – 167 deal with the need to provide open green space through new development and Option 49 and 64 refer to the planting of trees. In respect of the Cambridge Green Belt, it is noted that it plays a key role to maintain the setting of the city as well as the separation of the historic city and its suburbs from the surrounding rural villages. As noted elsewhere in Options 20 and 21, the landscape setting of the city remains vitally important.

#### **RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommendation is to pursue Option 67 with amendment of the wording to read “tree canopy cover and positive enhancement of the city’s heritage assets” within the final sentence. Furthermore, the first objective pertaining to the historic and natural environment will be amended to read “To protect and enhance all heritage assets, including the wider landscape and the appreciation of the historic city, its character and setting.” Additionally, in light of the duty to cooperate and English Heritage’s role as a statutory consultee, officers will undertake further discussions with them in order to ensure that this policy is sufficiently robust and that there is a positive strategy for the historic environment within the Local Plan.

**ISSUE: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF CAMBRIDGE'S HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT**

<b>Total representations: 87</b>	
<b>Object: 27</b>	<b>Support: 60</b>

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Option 68: Protection and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recent development of tall buildings has detracted from the skyline. High rise should not be a feature of Cambridge;</li> <li>• Historic buildings, rivers and green spaces are essential to the character of Cambridge;</li> <li>• Cambridge's historic environment is what makes it special, it is internationally important;</li> <li>• This section tries to cover too much ground and should be split up. Too many issues to be covered by one policy;</li> <li>• 'Views' which have been used extensively to argue against development in large areas of the city need to be carefully considered. There is no definition of 'local' or 'strategic' views;</li> <li>• Support the protection of the wider setting of the city;</li> <li>• There is also a need to maintain the usability of historic buildings, heating and insulation for example;</li> <li>• Buildings may not just have architectural merit but also may be important in terms of local history;</li> <li>• The 2006 Local Plan should be a template for any new policy;</li> <li>• The policy should not be unnecessarily prescriptive or restrictive and should support 'sustainable development';</li> <li>• A policy on Article 4 directions;</li> <li>• Enhance protection of conservation areas;</li> <li>• Protection and enhancement should include 'in line with ecological needs';</li> <li>• Protection of views should include views that are created;</li> <li>• The current policies on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas are fine and should be replicated together with a policy on archaeology;</li> <li>• There is a need to retrofit energy efficient improvements to Cambridge's historic stock;</li> <li>• There may be instances where 'wider public benefit' should be taken into account in relation to proposed works/development to historic buildings;</li> <li>• Enhancement must include stringent approval of materials;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A separate policy on the setting of designated heritage assets would be useful</li> <li>• There is a need to recognise that Buildings of Local Interest are undesignated heritage assets. Consequentially the wider public benefit required to outweigh their loss will be less than for designated heritage assets;</li> <li>• More important to protect the historic environment where it is damaged e.g. Newmarket Road.</li> <li>• English Heritage strongly support the coverage outlined in Option 68, with the caveat that the aspects to be covered are also identified within an overall strategy e.g. strategic option.</li> </ul>
--	---

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

No additional options have been suggested.

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

This option is likely to help protect or enhance the city’s heritage assets while also recognising the context of their setting helping address key sustainability issues identified within conservation areas, the landscape, townscape and cultural heritage topics. Recognition of the significance of the historic environment should give it added protection and may indirectly ensure new development is of appropriate design and scale. This option should have positive effects across all areas, in particular the Conservation Areas and the historic core.

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- Cambridge City Council (2006) Historic Core Area Appraisal;
- Cambridge City Council, Conservation Area Appraisals (various dates);
- Cambridgeshire County Council. Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record;
- Cambridge City Council’s Local List of Heritage Assets

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- 4/9 – Scheduled Ancient Monuments/Archaeological Areas
- 4/10 – Listed Buildings
- 4/11 – Conservation Areas
- 4/12 – Buildings of Local Interest

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

One of the twelve principal objectives of planning set out in paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework is the conservation of heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. In line with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, it is necessary to set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment of Cambridge and for the ongoing sustainable development of the city by articulating the issues that the Council considers important in the consideration of development affecting the historic environment. This option sets out the need to consider the protection and

enhancement of heritage assets, preservation of the wider setting of the city and the setting of specific heritage assets in Cambridge, an internationally renowned city for the quality of its historic built and natural environment. The Plan needs to take into account the following, which build upon the content of existing policies contained within the current Local Plan:

- The continued preservation and enhancement of existing, and, where appropriate, designation of new Conservation Areas. This would need to be supported by the ongoing production and review of Conservation Area Appraisals;
- The continued protection and enhancement of listed buildings, historic parks and gardens and scheduled monuments, buildings of local interest and other heritage assets;
- The identification and, where appropriate, protection of the city's archaeological heritage and assets of local importance;
- The protection of strategic and local views, the wider historic setting of the city and the setting of heritage assets, as well as, where applicable, their townscape value; and
- Addressing Heritage at Risk (including those assets on the Heritage at Risk Register) in a positive and proactive manner.

Any future policy could include the following elements:

- Development proposals affecting a heritage asset should preserve or enhance the significance of the asset, its setting and wider townscape value;
- Proposals should demonstrate a clear understanding of the wider context in which they sit as well as an understanding of the significance of assets;
- Impacts of proposed development on the special character of a heritage asset should be identified and assessed; and
- Where development is proposed that would lead to the harm of a heritage asset or its setting, clear justification for the works is required so that the harm could be weighed against the wider public benefits of the proposal.

Further detail will be considered as Option 68 is taken forward into the draft plan.

A number of detailed points have been made in relation to this policy, some of which will be addressed through the detailed wording of the policy and its supporting text. Some of the other issues, such as Buildings of Local Interest, climate change and the historic environment, and tall buildings and views are dealt with by other Options in the Issues and Options Report. A policy on Article 4 directions has been raised. The introduction of Article 4 directions would involve a separate legal process and would not form part of the Local Plan.

#### **RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommendation is to pursue Option 68 setting out a positive strategy for the historic environment, that builds on current policies, guidance in the National

planning Policy Framework and other relevant guidance. The policy will not be overly prescriptive. Where appropriate, further discussions will also be carried out with English Heritage.

**ISSUE: PROTECTION OF BUILDINGS OF LOCAL INTEREST AND DEVELOPMENT OF A LOCAL LIST**

<b>Total representations: 62</b>	
<b>Object: 13</b>	<b>Support: 49</b>

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES</b>
<p>Option 69: Protection of Buildings of Local Interest and Development of a Local List</p> <p>The aim of this option is to ensure the protection of Buildings of Local Interest as far as practically possible.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no requirements stated within the National Planning Policy Framework relating to locally listed buildings. A specific policy dealing with Buildings of Local Interest is out of step with the National Planning Policy Framework;</li> <li>• Colleges depend on being able to use and modify their buildings in order to achieve their educational purpose. Colleges are not simply curators of buildings which others decide should be on a local list and at the expense of their practical use;</li> <li>• There is no reason why, in a compact city such as Cambridge where over 1000 buildings are listed and almost ¼ of the city covered in Conservation Areas, Buildings of Local Interest should be considered so valuable to the city’s heritage that they should be given a higher level of protection than that contained within the National Planning Policy Framework;</li> <li>• The Council’s reason for designation of Buildings of Local Interest needs to be far more transparent and there should be a statement of what is significant about each Building of Local Interest.</li> <li>• English Heritage supports the inclusion of a policy for Buildings of Local Interest. They also note that consideration should also be given to the use of Article 4 Directions to afford additional protection to Buildings of Local Interest.</li> </ul>

<b>NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b>
No additional options have been suggested.

## **SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

By increasing the levels of protection afforded to Buildings of Local Interest, this option should help to protect the character and distinctiveness of the built environment in all areas of Cambridge. The retention of buildings could potentially impact the viability of some development schemes including much needed housing/office provision. Furthermore, the protected status of some buildings may reduce the opportunities to deploy energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies.

## **KEY EVIDENCE**

- Cambridge City Council's Local List of Heritage Assets

## **CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- 4/12 – Buildings of Local Interest

## **ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework sets out the need to take into account the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. Buildings of Local Interest are locally assessed by the Council and are considered to fall within the definition of heritage assets. Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework also states the requirement for Local Planning Authorities to have a "positive strategy" for the "conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment...", including maintaining a list of heritage assets. Furthermore, the definition of a heritage asset within the National Planning Policy Framework includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).

There are over 1,000 Buildings of Local Interest in Cambridge on the Council's Local List of Heritage Assets. These buildings have been locally designated because of their architectural merit and, in some cases, their historical associations. They may contribute to and help to define the character of the townscape of an area, or be significant in the historical and architectural development of the city. Many are 19th and 20th century buildings and some street furniture is also included. The inclusion of a building on the Local List of Heritage Assets does not preclude the effective re-use of buildings for a range of purposes. Retention and re-use of a Building of Local Interest will always be sought in the first instance, as approximately 15 Buildings of Local Interest have been demolished in the last 5-10 years. Such a policy approach would help to address the difficulties that the Council has faced in protecting Buildings of Local Interest, which add to the character and distinctiveness of the city. While there could be a concern from some that the retention of Buildings of Local Interest may have an impact on the viability of schemes, the adaptive reuse of buildings is almost always the most sustainable option.

When not located in a Conservation Area, planning permission for the demolition of



a Building of Local Interest is not required. When located in a Conservation Area, Conservation Area Consent is required for their demolition, and in Conservation Areas, Local Plan Policy 4/12 has been applied in such cases since 2006. In order to further safeguard Buildings of Local Interest outside Conservation Areas, English Heritage has suggested that consideration be given to the use of Article 4 directions to remove the permitted development rights for demolition of Buildings of Local Interest. This would mean that the demolition of a Building of Local Interest outside a Conservation Area would require planning permission for this process. The Council will consider the need for Article 4 directions for this purpose. However, it should be noted that the introduction of Article 4 directions would involve a separate legal process and cannot be carried out through the review of the Local Plan.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommendation is to pursue Option 69, linked to the ongoing development of a Local List of Heritage Assets in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**ISSUE: CLIMATE CHANGE AND HERITAGE ASSETS**

**Total representations: 32**

**Object: 7**

**Support: 25**

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Option 70: Works to a heritage asset to address climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are occasions when maintaining the existing use may require a more substantial loss of significance to a heritage asset than a new use;</li> <li>• It is not clear what the third bullet point (in the case of change of use; ensuring the sympathetic reuse of the heritage asset) brings to the consideration of climate change and heritage assets;</li> <li>• The option should be more weighted to protect the historic asset;</li> <li>• Conservation and renewal need to allow for embodied energy;</li> <li>• The age and importance of the building should not be used as an argument for no action or too little action to reduce carbon emissions of such buildings;</li> <li>• Adaptation to the works or the historic fabric should primarily use traditional materials;</li> <li>• Traditional methods/materials may not be the most appropriate or sustainable ways of enhancing the performance of historic buildings.</li> <li>• English Heritage have commented that it is reasonable to include a future policy on this matter; they also note that Supplementary Planning Guidance on this issue might be sufficient, and would be beneficial in providing more</li> </ul>

	detailed advice
<b>NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b>	
No additional options have been suggested.	

<b>SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT</b>
This option's hierarchical approach to carrying out works to heritage assets should ensure their protection and enhancement and help promote the character and distinctiveness of Conservation Areas and the wider city. The extent to which such works will help contribute to addressing climate change through improved energy performance is unclear, particularly given existing requirements to comply with Part L of the Building Regulations.

<b>KEY EVIDENCE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part L of the Building Regulations;</li> <li>• Adapted from CIBSE (2002) Guide to building services for historic buildings. Sustainable services for traditional buildings;</li> <li>• English Heritage (2011). Energy efficiency and historic buildings. Application of Part L of the Building Regulations to historic and traditionally constructed buildings;</li> <li>• Sustainable Traditional Buildings Alliance (2012). Responsible Retrofit of Traditional Buildings.</li> </ul>

<b>CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable.</li> </ul>

<b>ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE</b>
<p>Cambridge City Council is committed to tackling climate change and reducing the carbon emissions of Cambridge. The Council seeks to secure the highest possible standards of sustainability in all buildings, including the promotion of increased energy efficiency, renewable energy generation and climate change adaptation in the city's existing building stock.</p> <p>We are also committed to conserving the city's historic environment, preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of its Conservation Areas and the special historic and architectural interest of its Listed Buildings and Buildings of Local Interest. Well managed heritage assets improve the overall appearance of the built environment, enhancing people's quality of life by giving a sense of place and promoting civic pride. A balanced approach between enhancing environmental performance and the conservation of heritage assets is therefore required.</p> <p>All works to heritage assets will require a sensitive and sequential approach to design and specification. It is difficult to match the performance of traditional buildings with that of modern buildings, given the differences between vernacular and modern types of construction. However, that is not to say that historic buildings cannot be considered to be 'sustainable'. Vernacular design and traditional construction have evolved over centuries to meet local needs and deal with local</p>

conditions. The adaptive re-use of buildings also presents potentially significant carbon savings in terms of the embodied energy within the fabric of buildings. Instead, the focus should be on enhancing the performance of traditional buildings as much as practicable, without damaging the value and importance of those buildings and their setting.

Representations on this option raised no objection in principle towards pursuing a policy. The subject of works to a heritage asset to address climate change is a relatively new challenge, in some cases linked to owners of Listed Buildings being subject to the requirements of the Carbon Reduction Commitment, for example the University of Cambridge and its colleges. There is a growing body of research and literature to help guide those involved in both promoting and assessing works to such buildings. English Heritage, Historic Scotland and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings have recently published findings and guidance, for example on matters such as fabric improvements for energy efficiency, a key issue in relation to historic buildings.

As background to this subject in England, English Heritage has provided guidance on the application of Part L of the Building Regulations (Conservation of Fuel and Power) titled “Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings – Application of Part L of the Building Regulations to historic and traditionally constructed buildings”. It should be noted that the requirements in Part L do not apply to Grade I, Grade II\* or Grade II buildings, buildings in Conservation Areas, or to Scheduled Ancient Monuments. However in the event that works to improve energy efficiency are proposed to an historic building, there are key considerations that must be taken into account in terms of materials, technologies, building fabric, assessment and impact on building character. English Heritage’s guidance is a useful reference of best practice for undertaking such works. The purpose of such guidance is to help prevent conflicts between energy efficiency requirements and the conservation of historic and traditionally constructed buildings. Preventing such conflict lies at the heart of this option and any future policy that might be forthcoming.

The Council supports efforts to improve the energy performance of the building stock of the city and to better adapt buildings to our changing climate. However, care needs to be taken to ensure that works to heritage assets do not compromise their special character or significance. Owners of listed buildings should also ensure that there is minimal intervention in a historic building’s fabric and that the works are reversible and do not harm the building’s historic integrity.

Some representations felt that there was no need for a policy on this matter, and that the issue of climate change and the historic environment could be dealt with through a Supplementary Planning Document. However, the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that Local Planning Authorities should set out a “positive strategy” for conservation of the historic environment. A key part of such a strategy should be a clear planning policy on this subject. It is also considered that given the presence of a significant number of guidance notes from bodies such as English Heritage and Sustainable Traditional Buildings Alliance, further guidance in the form

of a Supplementary Planning Document would be unnecessary. The supporting text of the policy could provide references to some of these guidance notes.

The “weighting” of benefit or harm to a heritage asset in respect of works to address climate change is partly clarified by the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 132 states: “When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be”. In effect, this is a sliding scale of importance, and each individual case would be considered on its merits.

When carrying out works to a heritage asset to improve its environmental performance, it is important that the energy hierarchy is adopted. Prior to looking at alternative means of generating energy, it is important that all possible means of conserving energy are investigated and put into practice. Any works should be on the basis of a thorough understanding of how the building performs as a structure and how it is used. This analysis and understanding of the building must include both the conservation and sustainability constraints and opportunities as well as an understanding of baseline energy consumption. Works to historic fabric generally should use materials that either match the original building materials or are sympathetic to them. In the event that modern materials and methods are proposed, it is important to carefully assess how well they will fit with the existing materials and methods of construction in order to reach a balanced judgement of what method is more appropriate.

When considering the installation of renewable technologies, the viability of a range of technologies should be assessed in order to ensure that the correct technology is specified. Consideration must be given to the significance of the designated heritage asset, as this may rule out the use of certain technologies. In some cases, it may be possible to connect buildings to existing renewable or low carbon energy infrastructure, for example district heating networks. The specification of microgeneration technologies such as photovoltaic panels is also becoming increasingly popular. There are a number of key questions that must be asked when considering the installation of renewable energy technologies in the historic environment, including:

- Has the proposal been designed sensitively to fit with the appearance of the existing building?
- Will it harm the character or appearance of the building or conservation area?
- Will it be visible from the public realm?
- In the case of a listed building, will the proposed installation harm the historic fabric of the building and are the works reversible?

Given the need to balance the importance of protecting heritage assets and responding to the challenges of climate change, it is considered that a policy with specific criteria to act as a guide for proposals would assist the Council and applicants in getting that balance right.

### RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 70, and develop a policy setting out the hierarchical approach that should be taken to carrying out works to heritage assets to enhance their environmental performance. The approach could involve:

- Where at all possible, retaining the heritage asset and its existing/original use;
- Making every effort to preserve the historic fabric, using traditional methods of adaptation/construction;
- In the case of a change of use, ensuring the sympathetic re-use of the heritage asset;
- Seeking to improve the energy efficiency of the building in order to reduce carbon emissions; using sympathetic approaches, that respect the architectural and/or historic significance of the building;
- Specifying environmentally conscious materials suitable for the development. There should be a presumption in favour of traditional materials where possible.

### ISSUE: SHOPFRONTS AND SIGNAGE

**Total representations: 39**

**Object: 7**

**Support: 32**

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
<p>Option 71: Shopfronts and signage policy</p> <p>The purpose of this option is to ensure the protection of existing shopfronts when alterations are proposed and to ensure new signage is appropriate when proposed as part of a shopfront</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Shopfronts and signage should be required to be sympathetic and positive in relation to the character of the building;</li><li>• There still needs to be much work done with corporate brands like phone shops for example;</li><li>• Some shops require shutters or bollards to deter robbers;</li><li>• A policy allied to a review of the Shopfront Design Guide would be appropriate;</li><li>• There is no need for a Local Plan policy on shop fronts and guidance. Advice on these and other 'advertisement' issues could be provided in Supplementary Planning Document guidance;</li><li>• Commercial development in the historic city centre must be controlled in order to maintain a sense of place;</li><li>• Support aligned to a policy supporting small units and diversity of use types;</li><li>• Current policy seems to be sufficient;</li><li>• There should be a presumption against chains using their house style and an effort made to harmonise shop fronts in the City Centre (e.g. convenience stores or fast-food outlets);</li><li>• Remove shutters from premises that have them and don't permit new ones;</li><li>• The use of advertising billboards on busy pavements</li></ul>

	should be stopped.
--	--------------------

<b>NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b>
--

No additional options have been suggested.
--

<b>SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT</b>
---

This option should contribute to addressing key sustainability issues relating to the protection and enhancement of the built environment and maintaining and improving the quality of the city. This option may also result in economic benefits obtained through maintaining and enhancing the attractiveness of district and local centres as places to work and spend leisure time.
---

<b>KEY EVIDENCE</b>
---------------------

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cambridge City Council (2006) Historic Core Area Appraisal;</li><li>• Cambridge City Council, Conservation Area Appraisals (various dates);</li><li>• Cambridge City Council (1997), Cambridge Shopfront Design Guide.</li></ul> |
|--|

<b>CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED</b>
--------------------------------------

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 3/15 – Shopfronts and signage</li></ul> |
|---|

<b>ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE</b>
--

<p>Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. Additionally, paragraph 67 of the National Planning Policy Framework asserts that “Poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact on the appearance of the built and natural environment. Control over outdoor advertisements should be efficient, effective and simple in concept and operation. Only those advertisements which will clearly have an appreciable impact on a building or on their surroundings should be subject to the local planning authority’s detailed assessment. Advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.” Furthermore, the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 58 (second bullet) sets out the requirement for planning policies and decisions to “establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive...places to live, work and visit”, whilst the fourth bullet point of the same paragraph indicates that policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments “respond to local character and history...”.</p>
--

<p>Shopfronts and signage form a major part of the streetscape of Cambridge. They can contribute to the character and quality of the city and play an important part in defining distinct and attractive shopping areas. There is an expectation that shopfronts and signage in Cambridge will be of a high quality and will be in keeping with their context. When approval of new signage is required, the Council works closely with corporate brands to ensure a proposed sign (whether a fascia sign or otherwise on shopfront) is sympathetic to its location, and there are examples in and around the City Centre of such signage being customised to suit its particular</p>
---

location.

Some shops require shutters or bollards to deter theft, dependent on the type of merchandise sold in the shop. Usually the greater the value of the merchandise, the greater the likelihood of the owner using shutters or bollards. Applications for shutters and bollards will be considered on a case by case basis using this policy approach, which may incorporate some details from the Council's Shopfront Design Guide. Option 89 addresses visual pollution, which will include advertising billboards and 'A' Boards. The use of advertising billboards in busy areas must be considered on a case by case basis but a proliferation of these in the City Centre can be a concern.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommendation is to pursue Option 71 to ensure that works to shopfronts, including signage and security measures, promote high quality design that respects the local character of areas. Such a policy approach will have wider benefits in terms of maintaining a high quality environment, which will attract shoppers, visitors and investment into the city.

**ISSUE: TALL BUILDINGS AND THE SKYLINE**

<b>Total representations: xx</b>		
<b>Object:</b>		
<b>Option 72: 7</b>	<b>Option 73: 7</b>	<b>Option 74: 8</b>
<b>Support:</b>		
<b>Option 72: 22</b>	<b>Option 73: 10</b>	<b>Option 74: 34</b>

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES</b>
Option 72: Criteria based tall buildings policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need to emphasise the city's heritage and approve only mid-height buildings;</li> <li>• The historic core is particularly unsuitable for tall buildings;</li> <li>• This could be used in conjunction with Option 73 (identifying specific areas suitable for tall buildings) to create individual, iconic and slightly taller buildings in some areas and groups of significantly taller buildings away from the city's historic core;</li> <li>• Overall bulk of buildings must also be considered carefully;</li> <li>• Tall buildings do not fit with Cambridge and should only be allowed in exceptional cases;</li> <li>• The criteria must be much more demanding without being restrictive. High quality materials and craftsmanship should be included. Aesthetic values such as colour, texture, contrast, detail and massing need to be taken into account. Tall buildings should only be for</li> </ul>

	<p>extraordinary exceptions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the development of the policy supported by guidance setting out design and locational criteria in order to assess the suitability of development proposals on a case by case basis;</li> <li>• Tall buildings can work well in the right place if proper thought is given to design;</li> <li>• It would be better to have a policy that precludes tall buildings unless they can clearly demonstrate that they will not result in harm to the setting of historic buildings or the historic core, including more distant views of the city's skyline;</li> <li>• Need to know what the Council's definition of tall is.</li> </ul>
<p>Option 73: Policy identifying specific areas suitable for tall buildings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tall buildings can provide a positive contribution to the street scene, the Compass House site within the Eastern Gate would be an area suitable for tall buildings;</li> <li>• Specifying areas for tall buildings is unnecessary, development should respond to local character and distinctiveness.</li> </ul>
<p>Option 74: Limits on buildings heights</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specifying a maximum height for buildings is unnecessary. An upper limit might encourage developers to build to just below it;</li> <li>• A policy which limits building heights is needed;</li> <li>• Need a policy like this to protect the historic core;</li> <li>• The limit should be 5 storeys;</li> <li>• Needs to be one height restriction over the historic core and a less onerous but proportionate one over the rest of the city;</li> <li>• A policy like this would limit innovative design and would reduce the opportunity to make the most efficient use of land which in turn would impact on development viability;</li> <li>• A criteria based approach that deals with tall buildings on a case by case basis would be better;</li> <li>• Height should relate to function and purpose so a rigid limit is not appropriate;</li> <li>• One of the attractions of Cambridge is its human scale. The gradual encroachment of tall buildings negatively impact on this;</li> <li>• Area wide restrictions on building heights would be unnecessarily prescriptive;</li> <li>• Need to safeguard the historic skyline;</li> <li>• It is essential that building height and density is in keeping with neighbouring areas, particularly where domestic buildings are concerned;</li> <li>• There should be guidelines on the height of buildings</li> </ul>



	<p>permitted;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Height should be measured in absolute terms and not just by the number of storeys as residential and commercial buildings have different floor heights;</li> <li>• Missing comment about rooftop visual garbage (air conditioning, lifts, aerials) that can be detrimental to views;</li> <li>• Preservation of views of open space needs to include the River Cam corridor.</li> </ul>
--	--

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

No additional options have been suggested.

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

Options 72-74	<p>All aesthetic considerations involve some uncertainty. Despite this, the criteria based approach used in options 72 and 73 should offer good protection to the city’s townscape. Greater protection would be provided by a limit on the height of buildings. With all options there is an uncertain economic impact. Extensive protection may stifle innovative developments that could contribute positively economically. Alternately, a negative impact on the skyline could hinder economic development, for instance through lost tourism. Option 72 is likely to offer a balanced approach to skyline protection and development opportunity across all areas. Option 73 looks to allocate or protect specific areas, subject to the criteria set out in option 72. Option 74 may vary height limits by location. The details of how such decisions would be made are not provided and so localised effects cannot be effectively appraised.</p>
---------------	---

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- Cambridge City Council (2012). Guidance for the application of Policy 3/13 (Tall Buildings and the Skyline) of the Cambridge Local Plan, 2006)

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Policy 3/13 (Tall Buildings and the Skyline) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 59) is supportive of guiding the height of new developments in relation to neighbouring buildings and local areas and recommends that it should be addressed through local design policies. Consultation revealed that the majority of respondents supported Option 72: Criteria based policy for tall buildings. This option would result in a requirement to assess the suitability of tall building proposals on a case by case basis. Such an approach is consistent with the Cambridge Skyline Strategy (2012) produced by Cambridge City Council. Consultation raised a concern that Option 72 should also cover the ‘aesthetic values’

of tall buildings (including colour, texture contrast and detail). Whilst these issues are crucial to the design of any building, including this matter in the option relating to tall buildings will duplicate proposed policies covering the design of new buildings. The architectural quality of buildings is addressed in Option 63 'Criteria based Policy for the Design of Buildings'. The Plan should be read as a whole, and accordingly, there will be a number of policies that need to be read together when considering the design and appropriate scale of development proposals.

Of the three options presented relating to tall buildings, Option 73 received the most objections. Comments suggested that a location specific or 'zoning-based' policy would be unnecessary and that development should respond to local character and distinctiveness. Several representations suggested combining Options 72 and 73 to create a criteria based policy that supports the development of taller buildings in certain locations around the city. It is considered that due to the modest scale of the city, there is no need and indeed little opportunity to create zoned areas for tall buildings. Whilst some locations lend themselves to localised increases in scale, such as at local nodes (focal points of urban activity), key junctions and corners, at the ends of vistas, and at transport intersections, zoning would be a crude in application and would not be responsive to context or particular characteristics of different parts of Cambridge. It is considered that combining Options 72 and 73 should not be pursued for this reason.

Many of the representations received to Option 74 supported setting limits on building heights for both the historic core and the rest of the Cambridge. It is considered that a blanket height limit would be unsuitable given the modest scale of Cambridge and the sensitivity of important historic landmark buildings. Such an approach is unresponsive to changing circumstances around the city and could lead to unimaginative and inappropriate developments that could negatively impact on the skyline. A 'context led' approach for the development of tall buildings, as proposed within Option 72, is more appropriate as it reinforces the need to analyse context and character when considering tall buildings. It is considered that precluding tall buildings unless they can demonstrate that they will not result in harm to the setting of historic buildings and the historic core is a negative approach which is not in keeping with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. Whilst more positively worded, Option 72 would only applications for tall buildings to be granted where they can be justified against a series of assessment criteria.

In clarifying what constitutes a 'tall building', the definition adopted in the Council's guidance is taken from English Heritage and CABI 'Guidance on Tall Buildings' (2007): 'A tall building is any structure that breaks the existing skyline and/or is significantly taller than the surrounding built form' and reflects the need for a context led approach to the development of taller buildings in Cambridge.

Where comprehensive or large-scale development sites are identified, maximum building heights, along with other parameters have been established as part of the Outline Planning permission in line with DCLG Circular 01/2006. Given that commercial and residential floor heights are different, concern was raised during

consultation that heights should be measured in ‘absolute terms’ and not just by the number of storeys. The current Skyline Guidance uses an assumed height of 3.7m floor-to-ceiling heights (4m floor-to-floor) for commercial uses. Residential floors are assumed to have a 2.7m floor-to-ceiling height (3m floor-to-floor). Floor to floor heights assume a 300-400mm depth of construction for floors. Such a clarification would be needed within the supporting text associated with the option. Where the supporting text to Option 72 looks to identify specific storey heights, heights in metres, including the height of the rooftop plant should be provided. With regard to addressing roof top plant, lift overruns, aerials and air conditioning, these elements can often impact negatively on the quality of buildings from key views. Rooftop plant and other services should be integrated, well designed and discreetly located. The impact of roof plant should be fully evaluated in applications and shown on submissions. Policy Option 63 ‘Criteria based policy for the Design of Buildings’ (bullet point 4) references the requirement to integrate plant and other services into the design of new or refurbished buildings. In order to avoid duplication, it is considered that this is covered by Option 63.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommendation is to pursue Option 72 to develop a criteria-based policy supported by guidance setting out design and locational criteria in order to assess the suitability of development proposals for tall building on a case by case basis.

**ISSUE: CAMBRIDGE AIRPORT PUBLIC SAFETY ZONE AND SAFEGUARDING ZONES (OPTION 75) – THIS ISSUE WILL BE CONSIDERED AT JANUARY’S DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB COMMITTEE**

**ISSUE: HARD SURFACING OF FRONT GARDENS**

<b>Total representations: 50</b>	
<b>Object: 7</b>	<b>Support: 43</b>

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
<p>Option 76 – Paving over front gardens</p> <p>This option seeks to reduce flood risk, protect and enhance biodiversity and maintain visual amenity through a criteria-based approach to planning applications for hard surfacing on front gardens</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simply require paved over gardens to have adequate soakaways for their drainage systems;</li> <li>• Ideally soft paving should always be used;</li> <li>• This will continue to increase our capacity to reduce flood risk;</li> <li>• All developments, not just front gardens should increase porosity by use of adequate materials and soakaways;</li> <li>• Support clear guidance on the factors that need to be considered when contemplating paving over front gardens, including the impact of the character of the area and surface water runoff;</li> <li>• Support for a policy because of the negative visual impact of paving over front gardens;</li> <li>• The removal of walls in conservation areas to facilitate</li> </ul>

	<p>extra parking is something that should be resisted;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Silly to go for green roofs if we are concreting front gardens;</li> <li>• With stringent restrictions on parking in the city, there should not be any restrictions on people parking in front of their houses;</li> <li>• Given that this is often permitted development, the policy is unnecessary. If it is a concern in conservation areas, it should be flagged up in Conservation Area Management Plans;</li> <li>• There needs to be clear control on this and potentially rear gardens as well.</li> </ul>
--	--

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

No additional options have been suggested.

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

As planning permission is already required for non-permeable driveways it is unclear how this option will affect flood risk. The addition of visual amenity and biodiversity related criteria to the consideration of paving proposals is likely to have a positive effect. As this option only applies in a limited number of cases, it is not possible to determine area by area effects.

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012);
- Committee on Climate Change: Adaptation Sub-Committee, Progress Report 2012 – Is the UK preparing for flooding and water scarcity? (July 2012);
- The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, as amended;
- The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No. 2) (England) Order 2008.

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Not applicable

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

Surface water or pluvial flooding can cause considerable damage and disruption, with the potential for loss of life in the worst instances. Cumulatively, paving over front gardens can contribute to surface water flooding after heavy rains as the drainage system struggles to cope with considerable levels of run-off. Where possible, the Council is addressing the risk of surface water flooding by requiring new developments to limit discharge of surface water and designing in more effective rainwater management measures. Additionally, the Council is actively addressing surface water flooding by designing open spaces to accommodate surface water, where necessary. However, the collective impact of impermeable hard surfacing on front gardens should not be underestimated. The Government’s Committee on Climate Change – Adaptation Sub-Committee reported in July 2012 that indicators

show that in towns and cities the proportion of gardens that have been paved over increased from 28% of total garden area in 2001 to 48% in 2011.

Under permitted development legislation, specific limits apply for householders wishing to introduce hard surfacing on their front gardens. The same restrictions do not apply to back gardens. Planning permission is not required if the new or replacement driveway of any size uses permeable materials, such as gravel, which would allow water to drain through the surface, or where rainwater is directed into a lawn or border to drain. If the size of the area of hard surfacing exceeds five square metres and the surfacing to be used is impermeable and no provision is made for rainwater to soak away naturally, planning permission would be required. Although it is recognised that the creation of driveways may reduce impacts on on-street parking in some areas, it should be noted that the creation of vehicular crossovers reduce the amount of on-street parking possible and changes the character of the area.

Whilst it is recognised that there is a range of materials available to allow householders to use permeable materials for driveways, it is difficult to enforce this matter. Furthermore, the creation of hard surfaced areas for parking has a negative visual impact in itself and can also give rise to the loss of walls and other features, which may have contributed positively to the character and appearance of an area. In the interests of mitigating surface water flood risk across the city and in maintaining the character and appearance of the townscape, particularly in Conservation Areas, it is considered that this policy approach would require greater consideration and weight to be given to the potential impacts of and mitigation against this form of development. This matter can also be raised in Conservation Area Character Appraisals and Management Plans as an area of concern, but the policy would allow the Council greater opportunity to address the issues at hand.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommendation is to pursue Option 76. This would ensure that the Local Plan sets out criteria that would be applied to planning applications affecting the development of front gardens. Criteria could include:

- The impact of proposals on surface water run-off, particularly for those areas of the city with high levels of surface water flooding. The preference would be for the use of porous surfacing on all applications;
- The impact of proposals on the visual amenity of an area; and
- The impact of the proposals on biodiversity.

**ISSUE: PROTECTION OF SITES OF NATIONAL AND LOCAL NATURE CONSERVATION IMPORTANCE**

**Total representations: 77**

**Object: 58**

**Support: 19**

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 77:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were several general statements of support for</li> </ul>

<p>Protection of sites of nature conservation importance</p> <p>This includes protection of Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Local Nature Reserves, County and City Wildlife Sites.</p>	<p>this policy which is seen as important;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to the appropriate assessment of sites that are not covered by the Conservation Regulations 1994 (e.g. County or City Wildlife Sites). This requirement would be unnecessarily onerous and could impact on the viability of development;</li> <li>• Development proposals near such sites should not be ‘assessed’, they should be thrown out automatically. There should be no development on wildlife sites;</li> <li>• Policy/policies should ensure that development will only be supported where it can be adequately demonstrated that proposals will not have an adverse effect on biodiversity, where required suitable mitigation measures must be acceptable and deliverable;</li> <li>• The policy is needed and it needs to be enforced robustly;</li> <li>• Better protection is needed for green spaces and commons within the city;</li> <li>• Measures to enhance biodiversity should promote native species.</li> </ul>
--	--

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

No additional options have been suggested.

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

The use of a criteria based approach to the protection of sites of nature conservation importance will ensure that the conservation of biodiversity in Cambridge is effective and proportionate. Protection will contribute to the quality of the environment in terms of open and green space across the city. The conservation of biodiversity has potentially positive effects on health and wellbeing. Economically it could contribute positively through protecting ecosystem services, which can include improved water quality.

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006;
- The Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994, SI No. 2716;
- Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981;
- UK National Ecosystems Assessment (2011);
- Cambridge City Council Nature Conservation Strategy (2006);
- Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy (2011);
- Lawton, J (2010). Making Space for Nature: A review of England’s Wildlife Sites and Ecological Networks.

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Policy 4/6 Protection of Sites of Local Nature Conservation Importance

## **ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

Within Cambridge, there are a number of nationally and locally recognised nature conservation sites, which form an important element of the character and setting of the city. These sites include two Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), which are designated for their national biodiversity or geodiversity value. SSSIs are statutorily protected by their designation under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. The Council has declared twelve Local Nature Reserves on land that it owns and manages, including a number of the city's commons. Local Nature Reserves are statutorily designated under Section 21 of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 by local authorities. County Wildlife Sites and City Wildlife Sites include a number of the city's commons. They do not have statutory protection. They have been selected as sites of substantive nature conservation interest, against published criteria, as a result of surveys undertaken initially by the local Wildlife Trust for the Council and maintained by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Environmental Records Centre (CPERC). Other undesignated green spaces also make up the ecological network of sites across the city and would be subject to this policy, if they are identified as meeting the criteria for City or County Wildlife Site status. A large number of green spaces are also designated as Protected Open Space and would be protected as a result of existing policy coverage under Policy 4/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and its proposed successor policy in the Cambridge Local Plan Towards 2031.

Development within or affecting SSSIs, Local Nature Reserves, County Wildlife Sites and City Wildlife Sites is dealt with in paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Given the lack of detail on assessment of the potential impact of development upon sites of local and national nature conservation importance and the need to mitigate the impact of that development, it is considered appropriate to bring forward a policy covering these issues. There is strong support for this option to be pursued in order to protect the hierarchy of locally and nationally significant sites of nature conservation importance.

The policy will ensure that development would only be supported where it can be adequately demonstrated that proposals will not have an adverse effect on biodiversity or geodiversity; and that, where required, suitable mitigation measures must be acceptable and deliverable. In addition, the potential for the enhancement of the site and adjacent habitats should also be explored. Proposals on or adjacent to a site of national or local conservation importance should not be refused without proper consideration of the potential to enhance the site's biodiversity or geodiversity through enhanced management, habitat creation or the formation of new linkages with adjacent habitat areas. Whilst measures to enhance biodiversity on sites of nature conservation importance will need to promote the use of native species of local provenance, where possible, it is also recognised that this issue should be addressed in relation to policies on landscaping of new developments. This will be reflected in the relevant policy options taken forward in Chapter 7 Delivering High Quality Places.

It is noted that the use of the term 'appropriate assessment' in bullet point 1 of the

policy option has given rise to some confusion. This occurred as the term is usually used in relation to sites of European nature conservation importance. The National Planning Policy Framework states in paragraph 113 that protection should be commensurate with a site's status and give weight to their importance and the contribution that they make to wider ecological networks. The policy option will be reworded to indicate that development within, adjacent to, or affecting locally and nationally significant sites of nature conservation importance will require the submission of appropriate ecological screening information on the potential impacts of development and proposals for protection, mitigation and enhancement measures prior to decision.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

Given strong local support for this option and the need to protect and enhance sites of national and local nature conservation importance, the recommendation is to pursue Option 77. This would ensure that the Local Plan requires proportional ecological information to determine any application on, adjacent to or affecting a designated nature conservation site. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework's requirements, the policy should include a requirement for development to incorporate biodiversity/geodiversity enhancement, as well as protection.

**ISSUE: PROTECTION OF PRIORITY SPECIES AND HABITATS**

<b>Total representations: 37</b>	
<b>Object: 6</b>	<b>Support: 31</b>

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
<p>Option 78: Protection of priority species and habitats</p> <p>This would not permit development which would have a direct or indirect impact on rare or vulnerable habitats and species.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several statements of support in favour of a policy for the protection of priority species and habitats;</li> <li>• When a case is made for protection of a species that is not on the Section 41 list, it must also be considered;</li> <li>• No need for a Local Plan policy, detailed guidance should be provided in Supplementary Planning Document guidance on Nature Conservation issues.</li> </ul>

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

No additional options have been suggested.



### **SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

By preventing or mitigating the effects of developments that will directly or indirectly impact upon rare or vulnerable species or habitats, this option should help to conserve threatened biodiversity. This is likely to contribute to the quality of green and open space citywide, along with wider potential benefits from ecosystem service provision.

### **KEY EVIDENCE**

- Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006;
- UK Biodiversity Action Plan;
- Cambridge City Council Nature Conservation Strategy (2006);
- Cambridgeshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan;
- Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 - Habitats and Species of Principal Importance in England List, available at <http://ukbars.defra.gov.uk/archive/news/details.asp?X=45> under Lists of Habitats and Species – August and November 2010

### **CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Policy 4/8 Local Biodiversity Action Plans

### **ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

This approach would assist the Council in continuing to comply with its duty to conserve biodiversity under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. Furthermore, the National Planning Policy Framework promotes the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets (Paragraph 117). This policy option was strongly supported, reflecting the need for this approach to continue protecting priority habitat and species across the city. Vulnerable habitats and species will continue to be identified on the Section 41 list or in the Cambridgeshire Biodiversity Action Plan.

One representation suggested that protection of priority species and habitats could be dealt with by way of a Supplementary Planning Document. However, the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that Supplementary Planning Documents should not be used to add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development.

Protection of non-priority species does not lie within the scope of this policy option. Where ecological surveys identify locally important species populations and habitats, the management of these species and their protection will need to be addressed through the policy approach to new development and biodiversity.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommendation is to pursue Option 78 to ensure that the Local Plan requires that development will only be supported where it can be adequately demonstrated that proposals will not have an adverse effect on priority habitats and species; and, where required, suitable mitigation measures and proposed enhancement measures are both acceptable and deliverable.

**ISSUE: NEW DEVELOPMENT AND BIODIVERSITY**

<b>Total representations: 96</b>					
<b>Object: 19</b>			<b>Support: 77</b>		
<b>Option 79:</b>	<b>Option 80:</b>	<b>Option 81:</b>	<b>Option 79:</b>	<b>Option 80:</b>	<b>Option 81:</b>
5	8	6	31	21	25

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Option 79: Enhancement of biodiversity as part of all development proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It should be amended to allow pooling of biodiversity gain in adjacent sites, nearby green spaces and adjacent corridors;</li> <li>• The requirement to minimise the impacts of development on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity is included in the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not necessary to repeat the policy in the Local Plan, it should be incorporated into Option 64 (Design) and the wording should reflect the wording in the National Planning Policy Framework;</li> <li>• Guidance in this regard including opportunities to reduce costs through identifying and replicating successful approaches should be developed.</li> </ul>
Option 80: Enhancement of biodiversity as part of major developments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less desirable than Option 79 as it does not apply to all developments.</li> </ul>
Option 81: Include reference to biodiversity within Option 64 (the design of the public realm, landscape and other external spaces)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less desirable than Option 79 as it does not apply to all developments;</li> <li>• It would be better if Option 79 was added to Option 64;</li> <li>• The requirement to minimise the impacts of development on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity is included in the National Planning Policy Framework. It is not necessary to repeat the policy in the Local Plan, it should be incorporated into Option 64 (Design) and the wording should reflect the wording in the National Planning Policy Framework;</li> <li>• So long as ‘public realm’ includes developments of less than 10 houses, a unified approach is welcome;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several statements of support for a policy of this nature;</li> <li>• Some sites have not been designated despite their wildlife value e.g. Chesterton Sidings;</li> <li>• No need for a policy but detailed guidance should be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document on Nature Conservation issues;</li> <li>• Support the inclusion of a biodiversity enhancement programme but suggest it should be wider than the options presented;</li> <li>• Worth noting the value of allotments.</li> </ul>
--	---

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

No additional options have been suggested.

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

Option 79, 80 and 81 may all result in higher quality green spaces across the City and so could potentially help contribute to providing wider ecosystem services. The extent to which the options contribute to the enhancement of biodiversity varies, with Option 79 likely to provide the greatest gains due to its strength as a standalone policy and its recognition of the opportunities for enhancement at all scales of development.

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- UK Biodiversity Action Plan;
- Cambridge City Council Nature Conservation Strategy (2006);
- Cambridgeshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Not applicable

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The National Planning Policy Framework states that planning policies should promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and protection and recovery of priority species (paragraph 117) and that opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged; (paragraph 118). The three policy options outlined above could give rise to net gains in biodiversity, which would support the Government’s commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity (paragraph 109). None of these options seek to designate specific sites for nature conservation purposes, but all options were strongly supported by respondents. None of the options would seek to pool biodiversity gain on adjacent sites as a matter of course. This is in part because changes to planning obligations from 2014 onwards would prohibit the pooling of five or more obligations, but is also based on the need to enhance biodiversity on sites themselves in order to widen ecological networks.

Whilst it is recognised that Option 79 is the most ambitious in requiring the enhancement of biodiversity as part of all development proposals, it has a number of

disadvantages, in relation to implementation of the policy. It could also be very onerous for smaller scale householder applications and could impact on the viability of development, due to the assessment required and the measures to be put in place through the development.

Option 80 would require assessment of the site's position in the ecological network and the provision of suitable protection and enhancement of important nature conservation features for applications for major developments only. This approach would not allow the Council to take opportunities to enhance biodiversity on smaller sites, which could lead to continuing gaps in the city's ecological network. Option 80 would be less desirable than both Options 79 and 81 in relation its lack of coverage of smaller sites within the city. Currently, major developments are assessed for their capacity to enhance biodiversity as required by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Biodiversity Checklist. The completion of this checklist for major developments is required by the Council's Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document, which is currently tied to Policy 3/1 in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

Option 81 on the inclusion of reference to the enhancement of biodiversity within Option 64 (The design of the public realm, landscape and other external spaces) 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 should also be highlighted that biodiversity enhancement will be addressed in Option 42 which will form a general sustainable development policy and in the option to be taken forward on infill development in rear gardens.

It is considered that Option 81 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.

#### **RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommendation is to pursue Option 81, which would involve increasing the breadth of Option 64 to make reference to the need to enhance biodiversity through new development. Additionally, the need to complete a biodiversity checklist for all major development should be included in the text of the criteria based policy on public realm, landscape and other external spaces.

## ISSUE: LANDSCAPE SCALE ENHANCEMENT OF BIODIVERSITY

<b>Total representations: 32</b>	
<b>Object: 7</b>	<b>Support: 25</b>

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Option 82: Support for strategic biodiversity enhancement proposals  This would consist of large scale projects to join up existing habitats and improve ecological quality of the wider farmed and urban environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This option is essential to support the creation of a viable and functioning ecological network across the city to deliver the Green Infrastructure Objectives;</li><li>• Large sites need to have this assessment;</li><li>• The 2011 Green Infrastructure Strategy will provide a useful starting point for the identification of proposals.</li></ul>
<b>NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b>	
No additional options have been suggested.	

### **SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

This option is likely to improve habitat connectivity within Cambridge, helping create a stronger ecological network and contribute to a positive effect on biodiversity as a result. As strategic biodiversity proposals are capable of having a landscape scale influence, a positive effect on green and open spaces could occur across all areas of the city.

### **KEY EVIDENCE**

- Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy (2011 – 2020);
- Cambridge City Council Nature Conservation Strategy (2006);
- Lawton, J (2010). Making Space for Nature: A review of England's Wildlife Sites and Ecological Networks

### **CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Not applicable

### ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The delivery of large scale strategic biodiversity enhancement projects at a landscape scale would support the delivery of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy's objectives and would be in keeping with paragraph 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This would ensure that proposals with the primary objective of biodiversity enhancement would be given appropriate support through the planning process.

With regards to the mapping of strategic biodiversity enhancement projects, this process has already taken place as part of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy, which forms a background document to the Local Plan Review. The Council will continue to work with partners including the Wildlife Trust, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council to implement projects identified in this study as appropriate.

Although this option is likely to improve habitat connectivity within Cambridge, helping create a stronger ecological network and contribute to a positive effect on biodiversity, it is considered that these benefits could also be achieved by including specific reference to the delivery of large scale strategic biodiversity enhancement projects at a landscape scale in the policy option on the setting of the city (Option 21). This option already makes reference to landscape improvement proposals that enhance biodiversity and continues the policy approach taken by Policy 3/2 Setting of the City in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

### RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is **not** to pursue option 82, but to include support for the delivery of large scale strategic biodiversity enhancement projects at a landscape scale in Option 21 Setting of the City. Option 21 will be discussed at a forthcoming meeting of Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee.

### ISSUE TITLE: THE PROTECTION OF TREES

**Total representations: 90**

**Object: 9**

**Support: 81**

OPTION NUMBER/OTHER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
<p><b>Option 83: Trees</b></p> <p>This option would allow for the development of a policy to protect existing trees affected by development proposals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several statements in support of this policy option;</li> <li>• A replacement policy would be more sensible than preventing trees from being harmed;</li> <li>• The 'wherever possible' element could allow developers to wriggle out of their responsibility;</li> <li>• In favour of the retention of hedges and veteran trees;</li> <li>• A flexible approach should be promoted;</li> <li>• The criteria for judging whether a tree should be felled needs to be stronger;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy should recognise the role of trees in the setting and character of the city and its neighbourhoods, and in providing visual amenity, environmental and social benefits;</li> <li>• When a large tree is removed a greater number of smaller trees should be planted, to ensure similar levels of habitat;</li> <li>• The Council’s proposed policy should incorporate the flexibility provided in the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 118) where the loss of veteran trees might be outweighed by the benefits of new development;</li> <li>• Policy needs to account for the felling of trees in anticipation of development;</li> <li>• There should be ongoing maintenance of trees provided as part of large developments.</li> </ul>
--	---

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

No additional options have been suggested.

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

The protection of existing trees is likely to contribute positively to maintaining biodiversity, especially in the case of ancient trees and hedgerows, which provide important habitat and ecological connectivity. Given that the presence of trees also contributes positively to visual amenity, this option should also help enhance both the setting of the city and its townscape, as it seeks to protect trees with significant amenity value to the public realm. The retention and enhancement of hedges and trees, is likely to have positive effects on community and wellbeing, as green and open space is protected. In addition, air quality in and around Cambridge City Centre has been identified as a key issue, and this option is likely to contribute to improved air quality. Positive effects may also result with respect to flood risk, as protecting trees will contribute to enhancing natural flood risk management infrastructure.

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- National Urban Forestry Unit (2005). Trees for cities.
- Town and Country Planning Act 1947
- Cambridgeshire’s Green Infrastructure Strategy 2011-2020
- Conservation Area Appraisals
- 2003 Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Policy 4/4 (Trees)

## **ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

The majority of representations support the proposed policy for the protection of existing trees and hedges. This policy option recognises the valued contribution trees make to the built and natural environment. This policy approach for the protection and enhancement of trees and hedges is likely to have a wide range of environmental and social benefits including: improving air quality, reducing noise, cooling the urban environment, aiding sustainable drainage, and adding economic value to areas. It is also likely to contribute positively to maintaining biodiversity, especially in the case of ancient trees and hedgerows, which provide important habitats and ecological connectivity. These positive benefits were reflected in the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal.

Policy Option 83 is also likely to have positive implications for the protection of trees and hedges that contribute to the visual amenity and character of Cambridge at a community, neighbourhood or city level. In accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1947, policy option 83 will ensure the protection of an excess of 500 Tree Preservation Orders and thousands of trees in the Conservation Areas across the city which play an important role in the character and setting of the city, as well as promoting the planting of new trees as part of new development proposals to help enhance the canopy cover of the city.

Some representations raised the issue of the felling of trees and replacement planting. Where felling is required, replacement planting must be appropriate to both the development and the surrounding area. It is not therefore considered appropriate to require or specify that multiple trees to be planted to replace one large tree. It is however noted that the wording 'wherever possible' should be excluded from the policy to avoid the responsibility of developers being lost.

With regards to the ongoing maintenance of trees to ensure that they establish and flourish to maturity, this is already a consideration in new developments, and will continue to be important in the future. At present, the City Council maintains all new trees provided within the Highway and on open spaces within new developments that are adopted by the Council.

The proposed policy will be in keeping with the National Planning Policy Framework, notably paragraph 118 which states that planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats unless the need for, and the benefits of, the development outweigh the loss. While the policy will be flexible in this regard, the preference should be for veteran trees to be incorporated into new developments wherever possible, and the consideration of veteran trees should take place from the early stages of the development and design process to ensure successful integration.

## **RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommendation is to pursue option 83 with some amendments to the criteria as follows:

- A presumption in favour of the retention and enhancement of irreplaceable



habitats, including aged and veteran trees, hedges, trees and other landscape features of amenity and biodiversity value, unless the need for, and the benefits of, the development clearly and demonstrably outweigh any loss;

- Protection of trees that have significant amenity value as perceived from the public realm; and
- Where felling is accepted, appropriate replacement planting will be required within the vicinity.

**ISSUE: POLLUTION AND PROTECTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (OPTIONS 84 – 88) – THIS ISSUE WILL BE CONSIDERED AT JANUARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB COMMITTEE**

**ISSUE: VISUAL POLLUTION**

<b>Total representations: 27</b>	
<b>Object: 5</b>	<b>Support: 22</b>

<b>OPTION NUMBER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>
Option 89 - Detailed Visual Pollution Policy  This policy option seeks to address the impact of visual pollution on amenity and public safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Street clutter is a persistent problem;</li> <li>• No need for a separate policy, other policies in the plan allow these matters to be addressed;</li> <li>• The design of buildings can involve visual pollution;</li> <li>• Require commercial premises use lower lighting when shut;</li> <li>• Include mobile phone masts in the third bullet point.</li> </ul>

<b>NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b>
No additional options have been suggested.

<b>SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT</b>
This option has the potential to contribute positively to maintaining and improving the quality of the City Centre as a place to live, work and spend leisure time. This option should also help maintain Cambridge as an attractive tourist destination and contribute to promoting an attractive public realm. This option should also help contribute to maintaining the attractiveness of Cambridge’s townscape, particularly in Conservation Areas by promoting their individual character and distinctiveness. This option may contribute positively to helping improve the quality of public realm in various areas of the city, including North Cambridge.

<b>KEY EVIDENCE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)</li> </ul>

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Not applicable

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

This option was strongly supported by respondents, who recognised that street clutter is a persistent issue within the townscape. This policy approach brings together a range of issues such as advertising signage and hoardings, unnecessary street furniture, and satellite dishes, which are not dealt with in detail in other parts of the Local Plan. The National Planning Policy Framework recognises the importance of streetscapes in creating attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit. It also recognises that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact on the appearance of the built and natural environment. Given the international importance of Cambridge's historic environment, it is considered that a policy approach that seeks to reduce the impact of street clutter is appropriate for the new Local Plan.

With regards to the inclusion of mobile telephone masts in the policy wording, it should be recognised that many telecommunications development do not require planning permission. Where planning permission is required, the Council will consider the impact of the proposed development upon visual amenity. The National Planning Policy Framework provides support for high quality communications infrastructure and notes that the aim should be to keep numbers of radio and telecommunications masts to a minimum, with a preference for the use existing masts, buildings and other structures, unless the need for a new site has been justified. Where new sites are required, equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate. Development of new telecommunications infrastructure will be subject to a separate Local Plan policy, along the lines of Option 199 of the Issues and Options Report, which proposes a criteria based policy approach for telecommunications development. This will include consideration of the visual impact of proposals. As such, it is not considered necessary to include reference to telephone masts within the visual pollution policy.

It is recognised that the lighting of commercial premises can cause visual pollution and it is considered that this issue will be addressed through the policy approach on light pollution. It should be noted however, that the planning process can only deal with lighting proposals for new commercial premises or enforcement of existing planning permissions. The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 brought light nuisance under the statutory nuisance provisions of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. It is under these provisions that existing light causing a nuisance can be regulated.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommendation is to pursue Option 89 and develop a criteria based policy setting out the approach to minimise visual pollution. This policy will cover issues such as advertising hoardings and signs, satellite dishes and street furniture and give the Council and other parties responsible for the street scene a focus for enforcement.

---

**CHAPTER: 8 - Conserving and  
Enhancing the Historic &**

**8.1**

---

**16458 Object**

Summary:

These aims are incompatible.

**18435 Object**

Summary:

The County Council also wishes to add that in relation to paragraph 8.1, we consider it important to recognise the contribution of the historic environment to heritage tourism and the economic value of this to the City. Corrections are needed for some bullet points within the Key Facts.

**10103 Support**

Summary:

We endorse this chapter.

**11307 Support**

Summary:

This whole chapter outlines ideas and policies that are vital to the quality of life in Cambridge.

**17753 Support**

Summary:

This chapter includes a comprehensive overview of the City's biodiversity/geodiversity importance, including reference to nationally locally designated wildlife sites, habitats and species. We are pleased that this section makes reference to the important role that biodiversity plays in helping to deliver sustainable development and in enhancing the capacity of our natural environment to provide ecosystem services such as clean water, regulation of the urban heat island effect, and crop pollination, as well as providing habitats for wildlife.

We welcome recognition of the potential effects of air pollution and light pollution on ecology, and wider biodiversity addresses the policy options in relation to the protection of the historic environment, protection and enhancement of biodiversity and sites of nature conservation importance, and the need to protect the environmental quality of the city from pollution.

### **6916 Object**

Summary:

Development should follow "constructive conservation" as advised by EH, enabling sensitive change and development. Not all city sites are suitable for enhanced tree cover. These are separate issues and the City should have a heritage policy and a discrete environment policy.

### **9873 Object**

Summary:

Agree the wider landscape setting of the city is of utmost importance. reference should also be made to the goal of minimising light pollution

### **10215 Object**

Summary:

Agree the wider landscape setting of the city is of utmost importance. However reference should also be made to the goal of reducing/minimising light pollution and noise pollution

### **10501 Object**

Summary:

A strategic priority should be stated with conviction. We see very little enhancing in this chapter. Why do so many of the options apply only to (new) developments? Protection should also be defined. Protection from what? The hazards to Heritage Assets should be clearly defined so that aims become meaningful. As it stands this chapter is woolly and over-generalised.

Insert: To recognise that historic heritage assets are a non-renewable resource.

Alter wording to strengthen "To ensure that new development proposals protect and enhance....."

Alter wording to strengthen "Development proposals should contribute to a net gain in biodiversity...."

### **13915 Object**

Summary:

Object to the words 'and the wider landscape setting of the City'. This should be defined and transparent - for example the 'Defining Character' identified in the Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment 2003. Otherwise the protection and enhancement of the wider landscape setting of the City could block development.

### **13918 Object**

Summary:

The Consortium wish to object to the wording 'and the wider landscape setting of the City' in Option 67 because there is no explanation of what this actually means and because the location of the wider landscape setting of the City is not specified or defined. The option, as worded, aims to protect and enhance the wider landscape setting of the City but in reality this will simply seek to restrict development.

### **15552 Object**

Summary:

We recommend that the last sentence should read '....tree canopy cover and positive enhancement of the city's heritage assets'. Option 67 as it stands would not, in our view, be adequate in terms of the strategic historic environment policy content for the Cambridge Local Plan. The NPPF requirement for strategic policies should be expressed in terms that are both general, and specific to the locality. Given the importance of the city's architectural heritage, we would like to discuss with you how this can be reflected in the strategic policy content of the plan. The strategic policies clearly also have a role in guiding neighbourhood plans and this is another aspect that should be taken into account.

### **16822 Object**

Summary:

I am concerned development may destroy a way of life that allows everyone to enjoy playing fields and green spaces near the centre of town without having to use a car to get to them. and that Cambridge's crown jewels feature (colleges aside) which is the melding of the countryside with the town will be destroyed.

### **17102 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.

### **9216 Support**

Summary:

For reasons given

### **10351 Support**

Summary:

Plainly desirable.

## **10567 Support**

Summary:

The Wildlife Trust supports inclusion of such a strategic this over-arching policy proposal

## **10797 Support**

Summary:

Absolutely essential to preserve the special character of the city

## **12184 Support**

Summary:

Obviously crucial to the character of this lovely city.

## **12190 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

## **12428 Support**

Summary:

Self-evidently sensible

## **13415 Support**

Summary:

Support in principle

## **13874 Support**

Summary:

historic and natural environment should be protected.

## **14080 Support**

Summary:

This is critical if Cambridge is not lose its unique special character

## **15223 Support**

Summary:

Agree

## **16459 Support**

Summary:

I support this, if it is attainable.

## **16737 Support**

Summary:

Support - Particularly this should include care for flora and fauna and open spaces

## **16850 Support**

Summary:

Tall high density building trap air thereby reducing (already very poor) air quality. Cambridge badly lacks trees and this is one thing that would have an effect in reducing the amount of pollution/allergies in the air.

## **17108 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. QTSQ also makes recommendations on the reduction of pollution in the City and District: noise (in particular from roads), air, and light.

## **18433 Support**

Summary:

In the absence of specific questions for Option 67, the County Council wishes to record its specific SUPPORT for this as a Strategic Priority.

### **9874 Object**

Summary:

There is no specific mention in this section of the historic pattern of green spaces constituted by college playing fields still within the city, particularly those forming a network between the backs and the urban edge to the west. Natural green spaces referred to in the section on Biodiversity. These are not natural green spaces as such but should be considered as part of the historic fabric/ setting of city and stated to be such to give them additional protection

### **10218 Object**

Summary:

Support reference to importance of historic environment However there is no specific mention in this section of the historic pattern of green spaces constituted by college playing fields still within the city, particularly those forming a network between the backs and the urban edge to the west. Natural green spaces referred to in the section on Biodiversity. These are not natural green spaces as such but should be considered as part of the historic fabric/ setting of city and stated to be such to give them additional protection

### **11545 Object**

Summary:

Is Addenbrookes really a key feature of the skyline to protect, or does this refer to 'enhance'?

### **11546 Object**

Summary:

Tall building section needs to refer to tall building guidance.

### **18434 Object**

Summary:

There is a correction to the 2nd bullet point within the Key Facts - There are currently 5 Scheduled Monuments and 12 designated Parks and Gardens within the City Council's administrative area. We also consider that the paragraph relating to the archaeological heritage of the City (7th bullet point) understates the significance and contribution of archaeological assets within the City's boundaries.

### **15553 Object**

Summary:

Since setting applies to an asset or, as in the case of the historic city, a collection of assets with nested settings, the first objective might be amended as follows: 'To protect and enhance all heritage assets, including the wider townscape and the appreciation of the historic city, its character and setting'.

### **16689 Support**

Summary:

I agree with the principles set out in this chapter and believe that these principles should carry significant weight in planning decisions.

### **9877 Object**

Summary:

not sure about inclusion of post war housing/employment developments. Not evident from text what is referred to here. Do Very strongly support the reference to key quality of private and public historic open space but seek specific inclusion of college playing fields within the city as part of Cambridge's key distinctive historic environment

### **10220 Object**

Summary:

not sure about inclusion of post war housing/employment developments. Not evident from text what is referred to here. Do Very strongly support the reference to key quality of private and public historic open space but seek specific inclusion of college playing fields within the city as part of Cambridge's key distinctive historic environment

### **10504 Object**

Summary:

An example of Victorian/Edwardian suburbs is North Newtown. It is in a Conservation Area - is currently being destroyed by a lack of adequate planning and enforcement. The Hills Road development will bring more traffic into historic Newtown making it more of a rat-run - endangering the lives of thousands of school children who come into Newtown. Areas such as Newtown should be given special consideration AND mention in the Local Plan. Consultation with local groups/conservation bodies should support the vital heritage of these special areas. Heritage assets and sites of historic interest must be preserved in these areas.

### **15952 Object**

Summary:

What is special about Cambridge and should be preserved? Sadly, Cambridge has managed to mislay much of its particular, perhaps unduly austere charm in

recent years, and I say this having known the city all my life (I'm fifty-nine) and lived here in Castle since the mid-1980s. The once blissfully still, historic centre has long since been abandoned to the exigencies of rampant consumerism. The older university buildings in the city centre remain as imposing and astonishing as ever, but only the marketplace serves as a reminder of the city's kinder, less hurried past.

### **12464 Support**

Summary:

The city should be protected from motor traffic by building a driverless, automated, fully underground metro system. It should link all the Park-and-Ride sites to the city centre, and there should be policy development to ensure that tourist coaches use the metro system. The efficiency, comfort and punctuality of such a system would lead people voluntarily to leave their cars outside the city. The cost of such a system is higher than the £500 million previously promised, but not greatly so.

### **10506 Object**

Summary:

Unless more effective enforcement of planning policies and decisions is in place, these documents are meaningless. The Local Plan and national guidelines must be used rigorously especially for the historic core and surrounding historic areas such as Newtown. These documents should be used in conjunction with consultation of local and conservation groups defining buildings and other features of historic interest to ensure that conservation areas are preserved over and above the commercial demands of developers.

### **10507 Object**

Summary:

The words 'respects' and 'understands' are insubstantial. Although growth and development is necessary for a living city, the heritage, buildings and features of local interest should always take priority. This is especially so for the centre of historic Cambridge and the surrounding historic areas such as Newtown, Newnham etc. (8.5 acknowledges the international importance of Cambridge). These historic buildings and features of local interest should be determined by heritage experts, local council and local residents prior to development and be part of local documentation to determine any further developments.

### **11547 Object**

Summary:

Currently the Green Belt I would argue does not "enhance" the local environment, but it could if appropriately redeveloped as public greenspace.

### **15554 Object**

Summary:

In terms of the NPPF guidance, we would wish to see the protection of the historic environment pursued jointly and simultaneously with other objectives to achieve the most sustainable solutions.

### **9218 Support**

Summary:

This is a reason for retaining the green belt and not allowing further intrusion into protected areas.

### **9878 Support**

Summary:

Because this is what makes Cambridge special.

Very good that historic environment is given a wide definition The Council needs to continue to maintain the key feature it identifies in the historic setting and the clear distinction with the rural area beyond by directing any policies for growth away from those areas of the Green Belt which could threaten that key feature.

### **10223 Support**

Summary:

Because this is what makes Cambridge special. Very good that historic environment is given a wide definition The Council needs to continue to maintain the key features it identifies in the historic setting and the clear distinction with the rural area beyond by directing any policies for growth away from those areas of the Green Belt which could threaten that key feature.

### **16461 Support**

Summary:

Support this, but suggest that this is a good reason for retaining the Green Belt (what is left of it) and not allowing further intrusion into protected areas.

### **9220 Support**

Summary:

We agree



### **11096 Object**

Summary:

The need for policies rather than a single policy protecting the historic environment is supported. However as it stands, this section is trying to cover far too much ground and will be hugely muddled if not split.

### **11550 Object**

Summary:

Somewhat concerned about the 'views' section, which whilst important, has been used extensively elsewhere to argue against development over large areas of the city. This need to be carefully considered - who is the view benefiting? Can the view really be taken in without walking to an elevated position elsewhere?

### **13635 Object**

Summary:

There is a need to more fully assess the impacts of extending conservation areas.

### **13924 Object**

Summary:

The fourth bullet point of the Option seeks to protect strategic and local views. However, the Option is not transparent or clear because there is no definition of either strategic views or local views.

The fourth bullet point also seeks to protect the 'wider historic setting of the City'. This is essentially the protection afforded by the Green Belt and there is no need or justification for another policy to achieve the same objective.

### **14854 Object**

Summary:

Whilst I want to see historic buildings and environment protected, conservation areas tend to mean more unnecessary bureaucracy for householders who have to ask whether they can change window frames or prune a tree.

### **15224 Object**

Summary:

Agree but it is important to also maintain the usability of such buildings by accepting the need for them to be properly heated and insulated even if this offends the historical purists.

### **15555 Object**

Summary:

We strongly support the coverage outlined in options 67 and 68. It would however, be helpful to ensure that the areas covered are identified within a positive overall strategy for the historic environment. This applies to the other historic environment policies. The aspects to be covered in the strategic policy and development management policy also needs careful consideration.

### **16912 Object**

Summary:

Need a range of policies rather than a single policy. The policy is covering too much ground and there is no requirement to mention the 'heritage at risk'

### **7673 Support**

Summary:

This is fundamental to promoting the city's unique character and it's liveability.

### **8945 Support**

Summary:

The recent developments with tall buildings have detracted from the beauty of Cambridge's skyline. Kings College Chapel needs protection from development.

### **9223 Support**

Summary:

The combination of the historic buildings, river and green spaces is essential to the particular character of Cambridge.

### **9879 Support**

Summary:

because its historic character is what makes Cambridge special

### **10225 Support**

Summary:

Because Cambridge's historic environment is what makes Cambridge special. Support this provided the term heritage assets is given a broad interpretation

## **10798 Support**

Summary:

Essential

## **11309 Support**

Summary:

These objectives are vital.

## **12429 Support**

Summary:

Common sense; particularly glad to see recognition of the need to protect the wider setting and distant views of the city.

## **13754 Support**

Summary:

The principle of developing policies aimed at preserving and enhancing the historic environment is supported.

## **14089 Support**

Summary:

support need for policy.

The Council has downgraded the expertise within the planning dept to look after needs of the historic environment and this should be rectified.

## **15707 Support**

Summary:

We support Option 68 and agree with the need for effective protection of buildings of local interest and strongly support the sort of measures proposed in Option 69. It should be recognised that such buildings may not be of high architectural merit, but frequently are important in terms of local history, and can be part of the fabric of local people. East Chesterton has lost too many such buildings recently to development. The current list of BLIs should be revisited.

## **16460 Support**

Summary:

Strongly support all these aims.

### **12079 Object**

Summary:

There is a need for a policy addressing this issue - but the policy should not be unnecessarily restrictive or prescriptive. The policy should encourage and enable development within the historic environment, including changes of use, which support the Government's 'sustainable development' agenda - provided that it does not 'harm' historic assets.

### **13418 Object**

Summary:

There are far too many issues here for this to be covered in a single policy.

### **16880 Object**

Summary:

It is essential that the Local Plan provides policies to protect and enhance the historic environment. The city's historic environment is of international importance and is a key feature that defines Cambridge and contributes to the quality of life in Cambridge.

### **6990 Support**

Summary:

Yes, there is a need for a policy on protecting the historic environment. Sadly, history shows that this is absolutely necessary. I support the policy entitled Option 68.

### **7107 Support**

Summary:

Undoubtedly. The greatest vandals are the highway engineers and those of like ilk! It is ironic that mention is made in the draft of the Richardson Candles, soon to be replaced. I may have missed it but is a policy on street clutter proposed? There are far too many road signs of various types.

### **7282 Support**

Summary:

Very glad to see this being put forward so robustly.

### **8457 Support**

Summary:

yes

### **9225 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **9575 Support**

Summary:

Yes, there is a clear need for a policy. Option 68 seems to consider most potential problems.

### **9668 Support**

Summary:

High rise should not be a feature of Cambridge.  
Heritage views are critical, new developments must blend in.  
Natural landscape on south west must remain to enhance city.

### **9880 Support**

Summary:

yes because this is what makes cambridge special

### **10114 Support**

Summary:

yes

### **10227 Support**

Summary:

Because Cambridge's historic environment is what makes Cambridge special. Support this provided the term heritage assets is given a broad interpretation

### **10509 Support**

Summary:

Yes

## 10799 Support

Summary:

Absolutely

## 11021 Support

Summary:

Yes, this must be key to ensuring that future Cambridge remains true to its origins.

## 11224 Support

Summary:

Existing policies within the existing 2006 Local Plan should be a template for any new policy or policies.

## 11343 Support

Summary:

an absolute must. The historic and natural environments are key factors in making Cambridge a special place.

## 12969 Support

Summary:

Essential. Should be core funding towards conservation of City Heritage.

## 13063 Support

Summary:

Yes, a good policy (or policies) aimed at preserving and enhancing the historic environment would help ensure a good outcome.

## 13598 Support

Summary:

Yes

Section 7 pages 49-58 of the Quarter-to-Six Quadrant Visioning Document is in effect the representation contained in this response. "Our vision is for the QTSQ to be enhanced and preserved as a very significant part of Cambridge's 'rural lungs', dedicated to public rural enjoyment by the people of Cambridge and visitors to the area. The four parish councils will work together, and with all those already involved in the area, to develop this vision over the coming years."

## 13687 Support

Summary:

Yes

## 13756 Support

Summary:

The principle of developing policies aimed at preserving and enhancing the historic environment is supported.

## 13934 Support

Summary:

Yes

## 14973 Support

Summary:

Yes, support.

## 15891 Support

Summary:

The projected demand for new homes and jobs within Cambridge is a reflection of Cambridge's success at securing inward investment, and its emergence as a major centre of growth. The Local Plan will need to ensure that future growth is carefully balanced with the objective of preserving the special historic character and setting of the city, whilst protecting the Greenbelt. Land at Coldham's Lane, Cherry Hinton, comprises a major brownfield development opportunity within the existing urban area of Cambridge. The proposed residential development and the provision of new Strategic Open Space will reduce pressure on the Green Belt, whilst enhancing the special historic character and setting of the city by delivering local area regeneration.

## 16462 Support

Summary:

Yes.

## 16851 Support

Summary:

Yes there is a need for a policy addressing the protection and enhancement of Cambridge's Historic Environment. Particularly note the enhancement of the existing.

## **17410 Support**

Summary:

Historic environment - it is even more important to protect remaining historic environment in damaged environments like Newmarket Road, and in areas of the city which people assume have less history, but in reality have plenty still to protect. More local buildings and smaller features should be protected e.g. historic signs, working with site owners

## **17867 Support**

Summary:

Yes, Cambridge is a wonderful historic City & requires strict policies to ensure the heritage is retained & future development is challenged thoroughly

## **18101 Support**

Summary:

Yes

## **18436 Support**

Summary:

In this context the County Council would emphasise the important role and contribution of the Cambridgeshire Collection at the Central Library - the major, comprehensive collection of printed and photographic material on the history and life of the City and County - and Cambridgeshire Archives, based at Shire Hall Cambridge, the public repository for original archival documents relating to the city.

We support the policy proposal for protecting and enhancing Cambridge's historical environment (Option 68).

### **7048 Object**

Summary:

A policy on Article 4 Directions - or similar - is needed to counter this 'Green Deal' threat.

### **9881 Object**

Summary:

Support policy. But enhance the protection of Conservation Areas and the status of the Conservation appraisals. Policy should protect Conservation Area as in Policy 4/11 in 2006 Local Plan. Include reference to college playing fields as part of the historic setting of the city. Make the definition of heritage assets as wide as possible - could not see an express definition. Important no important part of the historic character is left out - hence reference to college playing fields being included or at the very least it made clear that list not definitive of heritage assets

### **10231 Object**

Summary:

Support policy.

But enhance the protection of Conservation Areas and the status of the Conservation appraisals. Policy should protect Conservation Area as in Policy 4/11 in 2006 Local Plan. Include reference to college playing fields as part of the historic setting of the city. Make the definition of heritage assets as wide as possible - could not see an express definition. Important no important part of the historic character is left out - hence reference to college playing fields being included or at the very least it made clear that list not definitive of heritage assets

### **10511 Object**

Summary:

Bullet 1 & 2 should read rigorous preservation/protection and enhancement, 'continued' preservation is not good enough.

Preservation and enhancement should include 'in line with ecological needs'.

Bullet 4 'protection of view' should include new views that are created

Bullet 5 should include the adding of new items to the Heritage at Risk Register as it becomes necessary,

Impacts of proposed development should not be only on its special character but also on its physical structure to include such things as vibration, traffic and footfall density, air quality, etc.

Policies need to refer specifically to Conservation areas.

### **11098 Object**

Summary:

The current separate policies covering Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas work fine and should be largely replicated together with a policy covering archaeology. They would need to be redrafted to better reflect the NPPF and its balance of public benefits needing to outweigh substantial and less than substantial harm.

In line with the recent Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Bill 2012, there should be a policy supporting Heritage Partnership Agreements. These are especially pertinent in Cambridge where Colleges and the University often need to apply repeatedly for Listed Building Consent for similar or identical works to their buildings.

### **13421 Object**

Summary:

The current separate policies covering Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas work fine and should be largely replicated together with policy covering archaeology and the setting of heritage assets. There is a clear need to differentiate between 'designated' and 'undesignated' heritage assets and consideration of the balance to be struck between heritage significance and public benefit outlined in the NPPF.

### **6917 Support**

Summary:

Please see "constructive conservation" EH policy in line with PPS5.

### **13169 Support**

Summary:

Retrofit of energy efficiency improvements to Cambridge's extensive, world-class historic buildings must be enabled, while still preserving them.

Many old buildings are notoriously difficult to heat efficiently.

Low-visibility, reversible energy-efficiency measures should not be blocked in deference to historical purity.

Policy on the historic environment needs to cover these difficult issues and enable appropriate retrofit for comfortable use of old buildings with minimum energy bills and greenhouse gas emissions.

### **13758 Support**

Summary:

It is important to recognise that there may be instances where it is entirely appropriate to take into account 'wider public benefit' which can allow the alteration, loss or total demolition of historic buildings.

### **13884 Support**

Summary:

Ensure wider notification to local community for any development affecting these, including BLIs

## **15713 Support**

Summary:

One of the key facts noted on page 151 in relation to nature conservation is that the areas to the north of the city are deficient in natural green space. Policy should be directed towards ensuring that existing green space north of the river, or areas which could be developed to provide additional green space, are not eroded by development for housing or employment purposes.

## **16853 Support**

Summary:

If already not made so Jesus Green and Alexandra Gardens should have special preservation protection status

## **16881 Support**

Summary:

The Colleges and University are the owners and stewards of many historic buildings in the city. However, there is no recognition of this positive building stewardship in the consultation document. Land is a finite resource in Cambridge and as such particular challenges arise. The historic environment should not therefore be seen as a constraint, but as an opportunity for innovative and respectful development within this context.

## **17411 Support**

Summary:

Historic environment - it is even more important to protect remaining historic environment in damaged environments like Newmarket Road, and in areas of the city which people assume have less history, but in reality have plenty still to protect. More local buildings and smaller features should be protected e.g. historic signs, working with site owners

## **17868 Support**

Summary:

The policy should remain as is but better steps taken to enforce this policy.

## **18102 Support**

Summary:

- 1) there should be adequate protection of all historic light fittings throughout Cambridge, and not just the Richardson candles that are listed.
  - 2) enhancement must include appropriate materials to the site context such as more stringent approval of material samples, and choice and type of mortar eg developments that attempt to follow a traditional format must use high quality better matching bricks ( to either soft reds or Cambridge white stocks) and a lime mortar.
- Roof coverings should also be approved, and where a slate appearance is proposed then it should be a real slate and not an artificial one.

### **18103 Object**

Summary:

No

### **10512 Support**

Summary:

All bullet points are not of equal value, some should be complied with unequivocally.

The last four bullet points should be included in the option. The last bullet point in option 68 considers that the development proposal that harms a heritage site should be weighed against the benefit to the public. However, nowhere is it categorically stated that all development proposals should benefit the public. This should be the number one condition for every single proposal, regardless of whether it is going to harm anything. Then one can assess the justifications about harming a heritage site etc

### **11099 Support**

Summary:

A separate policy on the setting of designated heritage assets would be useful. References to Buildings of Local Interest should be removed from this policy as should references to views which is covered by the Tall Buildings guidance.

### **13425 Support**

Summary:

A separate policy on the setting of designated heritage assets would be useful. References to Buildings of Local Interest should be removed from this policy as should references to views which would otherwise be covered by the Tall Buildings guidance. In line with the recent Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Bill 2012, there should be policy supporting Heritage Partnership Agreements. These could potentially save a good deal of wasted resources where Colleges and the University often need to apply individually for Listed Building Consent for similar or identical works to their buildings.

### **13761 Support**

Summary:

In line with the NPPF there is a need to recognise that BLIs are 'undesigned heritage assets' and therefore by implication are of less heritage significance than 'designated' ones. Consequently the 'wider public benefit' required to outweigh their loss will be less than for designated heritage assets.

### **17412 Support**

Summary:

Historic environment - it is even more important to protect remaining historic environment in damaged environments like Newmarket Road, and in areas of the city which people assume have less history, but in reality have plenty still to protect. More local buildings and smaller features should be protected e.g. historic signs, working with site owners

---

**CHAPTER: 8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment** **8.6**

---

### **11101 Object**

Summary:

The last sentence is misleading. Whilst Buildings of Local Interest are mentioned in the NPPF they are 'undesigned' heritage assets - not mentioning this distinction implies that they are of equal heritage significance to designated assets.

---

**CHAPTER: 8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment** **8.7**

---

### **11102 Object**

Summary:

Given that the NPPF requires the loss of significance of heritage assets to be weighed against the wider public benefits, it cannot be assumed that the demolition of the buildings mentioned would have been prevented by a differently worded Local Plan Policy.

---

**CHAPTER: 8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment** **8.8**

---

### **11104 Object**

Summary:

The list of BLIs as it stands lacks rigour in terms of the selection criteria, the lack of suitable descriptions and any meaningful assessment of what is considered to be 'significant' about many of the buildings. The list needs to be revised to reflect English Heritage's recent guidance on Local Lists (Good Practice Guide for Local Heritage Listing; English Heritage, May 2012).

The suggestion that BLIs should be given a 'higher degree of protection' is entirely out of step with the NPPF. They should be afforded a suitable degree of protection commensurate with their heritage significance.

### **9227 Support**

Summary:

In many areas of Cambridge there are felicitous combinations of domestic and small scale buildings, not individually of great historical or architectural significance, which merit preservation or sympathetic development only.



## 9228 Support

Summary:

We agree

### **11105 Object**

Summary:

There are no 'requirements' stated within the NPPF relating to local lists.  
It is not true to say that the 'adaptive reuse of buildings is almost always the most sustainable option'.

### **13428 Object**

Summary:

There are no 'requirements' stated within the NPPF for LPAs to produce local lists. Operators of buildings - eg Colleges - would be restricted from making reasonable changes to buildings. Colleges depend on being able to use and modify their buildings in order to achieve their educational purpose, and we are not here simply as curators of buildings decided by others to be of Local Interest at the expense of practicality. That said, we do not wish to spoil the look of our environment, and so our approach is always likely to be sympathetic.

### **13762 Object**

Summary:

A specific policy dealing with BLIs is unnecessary. This is out of step with the NPPF.

### **16913 Object**

Summary:

Option 68 refers to Buildings of Local Interest. No reflection of the NPPF balance between heritage significance and wider public benefit. The present list needs to be reassessed against best practice guidance

### **7674 Support**

Summary:

Very important.

### **9882 Support**

Summary:

To protect what is of architectural/historic merit

### **10134 Support**

Summary:

We support option 69.

### **10233 Support**

Summary:

To protect what is of architectural/historic merit

### **10800 Support**

Summary:

Important

### **11552 Support**

Summary:

Agreed

### **12434 Support**

Summary:

Vital to have this; many unlisted buildings have considerable value to one's sense of belonging and continuity. All the more necessary when redevelopment is continually happening and some are put up and knocked down within barely a generation.

### **13344 Support**

Summary:

I support enhancing the level of protection of buildings of local interest.

### **13972 Support**

Summary:

As a specific example of such protection our local community would like to see the Penny Ferry pub retained. Though this matter might be resolved before the new plan comes into force it might be a material consideration that such a policy is in development.

### **15226 Support**

Summary:

Agree with general thrust of this proposal. Such buildings should be automatically included in the statutory Community Asset Register for the contribution they make to the local townscape. This should give a degree of protection against rogue demolition over a Bank Holiday week-end, this is presuming that anything on the Register will require consent for demolition.

## **15557 Support**

Summary:

We support the inclusion of a policy. Consideration should be given to the use of Article 4 directions to afford additional protection to buildings on the local list through targeted removal of p.d. rights

## **16468 Support**

Summary:

Broadly support this.

Bullet point 1: yes, so long as the steps taken are reasonable;

Bullet point 3: This seems to be a let-out clause.

(Michaelhouse is a shining example of an imaginative re-use of a redundant building. More like this please).

## **16762 Support**

Summary:

I approve the criteria. We have the recent experience of proposals to transform the Royal Standard on Mill Rd. In addition, one might propose that one add that as far as possible, the types of use of buildings of local interest be maintained. It would be unfortunate if this pub/restaurant were allowed to be transformed into housing. As the population around Mill Rd increases, the viability of the RS as a pub/restaurant can only improve.

### **11106 Object**

Summary:

The NPPF provides clear guidance on the weighting to be used when assessing the potential demolition of undesignated heritage assets. There is no reason why, in a compact town such as Cambridge where over 1000 buildings are listed and almost ¼ of the City covered by Conservation Areas, why Buildings of Local Interest are considered to be so vital to the City's heritage that they should be given a higher level of protection than that contained within the NPPF.

### **12081 Object**

Summary:

There is no need for a greater level of protection of Buildings of Local Interest.

### **13433 Object**

Summary:

The NPPF provides clear guidance on the weighting to be used when assessing the potential demolition of undesignated heritage assets. There is no evidence to suggest that BLIs are more important to local character in Cambridge than elsewhere and hence why there is a need to provide a policy which seeks to exceed NPPF paragraph 135.

### **13769 Object**

Summary:

No. The NPPF (section 12) clearly sets out that in the determination of applications LPAs should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected with the level of detail 'proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance'.

### **6991 Support**

Summary:

There is a need for a policy protecting historic buildings, which are one of Cambridge's assets, and I support the policy entitled Option 69.

### **8100 Support**

Summary:

I support the idea of a local list.

### **8458 Support**

Summary:

yes

### **9229 Support**

Summary:

yes, as under paragraph 8.8. In many areas of Cambridge there are felicitous combinations of domestic and small scale buildings, not individually of great historical or architectural significance, which merit preservation or sympathetic development only.

### **9883 Support**

Summary:

to protect what is of historic/architectural merit

### **10115 Support**

Summary:

aesthetics should be as important a consideration of development as economic gain

### **10235 Support**

Summary:

To protect what is of architectural/historic merit

### **10513 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **10574 Support**

Summary:

Support

### **10801 Support**

Summary:

Yes

## **11349 Support**

Summary:

a policy covering this might be difficult to draw up but it would be a very positive move to have a policy in this area which would afford some protection of important local buildings

## **13068 Support**

Summary:

Yes, there is definitely a need for this as there have been too many unsuccessful attempts to protect buildings in the past.

## **13352 Support**

Summary:

Yes there is a need for a policy addressing this issue, especially in light of the rejected development of the Royal Standard site.

## **13600 Support**

Summary:

Yes

Section 7 pages 49-58 of the Quarter-to-Six Quadrant Visioning Document is in effect the representation contained in this response. "Our vision is for the QTSQ to be enhanced and preserved as a very significant part of Cambridge's 'rural lungs', dedicated to public rural enjoyment by the people of Cambridge and visitors to the area. The four parish councils will work together, and with all those already involved in the area, to develop this vision over the coming years."

## **13889 Support**

Summary:

BLIs are of disproportionate importance in areas with few historic buildings - current local plan has little specific protection thus this policy is needed

## **13941 Support**

Summary:

Yes

## **14071 Support**

Summary:

Modest buildings can nonetheless be important locally as part of the history of an area or its visual identity. Cambridge has such a wealth of magnificent historic buildings that I feel it is important to recognise and protect the less obvious buildings in local communities across the city and to retain and reuse them if possible

## **14974 Support**

Summary:

Yes, support.

## **16469 Support**

Summary:

Yes

## **16811 Support**

Summary:

Yes - support

## **16855 Support**

Summary:

Yes there is a need for a policy addressing the protection of Buildings of Local Interest. Policy 8.13 is endorsed re protecting and enhancing shop front signage.

## **17869 Support**

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

## **18104 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **17870 Object**

Summary:

No

### **8459 Support**

Summary:

The need to protect the surroundings of buildings of local interest so that they don't become misfits and end up looking like cinderellas surrounded by swish giants of buildings.

### **9167 Support**

Summary:

Schools in particular are difficult to re-use. It is often better to expand a school by rebuilding on a new site, and demolishing the old buildings to release land for housing. The same may apply to other public-purpose buildings, including former cinemas and the like.

### **10514 Support**

Summary:

Bullets 2 and 3 should be mandatory before being able to consider bullet 1. Otherwise the provision is too weak.

### **11353 Support**

Summary:

It will be important to recognise that some buildings of local interest which fall out of use may be very difficult to retain as there may not be a viable alternative use.

schools, cinemas could for example fall into this category. Therefore any policy on this matter needs to acknowledge that economic success is an important element in any bid to retain buildings of local interest. Building more (affordable) houses might be a better option in a number of cases

### **13436 Support**

Summary:

There is no evidence to support the statement that the 'adaptive reuse of buildings is almost always the most sustainable option'.

### **13771 Support**

Summary:

The process by which Cambridge City Council designates BLIs is not clear and the published list does not set out any justification for designation. The reasons for designation need to be far more transparent and there should be a statement of what is considered to be significant about each BLI.

### **16470 Support**

Summary:

Why does this apply only to buildings requiring planning permission, or in conservation areas?

### **16812 Support**

Summary:

Buildings of local interest need to be protected. Similarly, historic shop fronts need to be protected and enhanced. There should also be a policy to remove steel shutters along Mill Road.

### **18105 Support**

Summary:

No

### **18106 Object**

Summary:

Yes, all developments should be appraised to meet a high standards of design by a conservation and design officer. New developments, of any kind, must be of a higher standard, such as those proposed in conservation areas, and should be scrutinised by the Design and Conservation Panel.

### **10135 Support**

Summary:

PSRA has produced a list of assets for its area which is an example of the kind of list every local area would wish to defend.

### **10517 Support**

Summary:

This option should also refer to the context of individual buildings. Individual buildings may remain intact but are degraded by local overdevelopment, or inappropriate use e.g. overcrowding - houses of multiple occupancy, densification of school occupancy, garden grabbing, hedge loss, paving-over of gardens, or by abuse of rat-run roads - all of which has happened quite rapidly in North Newtown. Each planning application has been decided on too narrowly - no account taken of the degradation to the whole area. Newtown is a valuable recognised historic Victorian/Edwardian residential area within a Conservation Area, but its conservation/protection is failing.

**9230 Support**

Summary:

We agree

---

**9231 Support**

Summary:

We agree

---

**9232 Support**

Summary:

We agree

---

**6918 Object**

Summary:

See PPS 5: The City should adopt constructive conservation

**11108 Object**

Summary:

The first bullet needs to recognise that there are occasions when maintaining the existing use may require a more substantial loss of significance to a heritage asset than a new use.

It is not clear what the third bullet brings to the consideration of climate change and heritage assets.

The CIBSE guide is now ten years old - and there have been many reports and guidance documents since. Similarly in bullet five, there may well be occasions when the use of more modern materials give better environmental performance than traditional materials without affecting the heritage significance of the building.

**13437 Object**

Summary:

The first bullet needs to recognise that sometimes maintaining the existing use may require a more substantial loss of significance to a heritage asset than a new use.

**16690 Object**

Summary:

I feel the hierarchy on how to deal with historic buildings v climate change objectives should be much more weighted to protect the historic asset.

**11554 Support**

Summary:

Agreed

**12199 Support**

Summary:

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

**15228 Support**

Summary:

Agree

**15558 Support**

Summary:

It is reasonable to include a policy although the historic environment policy and NPPF policies should also apply. Supplementary planning guidance on this topic might be sufficient, and would in any event be beneficial in providing more detailed advice.

In bullet 4, we suggest the following amendment: 'using sympathetic approaches, that respect the architectural and/or historic significance of the building.'

**16471 Support**

Summary:

Strongly support

### **12085 Object**

Summary:

The adaption of buildings to meet modern energy efficiency requirements within historic buildings and in the context of heritage controls is challenging. Guidance should be prepared but details should be located in SPD rather than in Policy. Guidance should also apply for instances where changes to historic buildings are required for other purposes, including functional suitability.

### **16883 Object**

Summary:

A particular issue faced by Colleges is the adaption of buildings to meet modern energy efficiency requirements within historic buildings and the context of heritage controls. A specific policy is required in this regard. Option 70 itself seems to be more an argument for inaction, rather than a credible means of attaining the environmental standards the city is obliged to achieve by 2050.

### **8460 Support**

Summary:

yes

### **9233 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **10116 Support**

Summary:

Installation of 'comfort cooling'/air conditioning should be avoided in all buildings, but especially in historic buildings. Natural ventilation should be encouraged.

### **11109 Support**

Summary:

Such a policy has the potential to give useful guidance on the balance between improving environmental performance and protection of heritage significance.

### **11354 Support**

Summary:

yes to a policy; nothing missing and no obvious alternatives

### **12972 Support**

Summary:

Needs a policy and guidance.

Conservation and renewal need to allow for embodied energy. there are good examples of old buildings adapted for climate change.

### **13072 Support**

Summary:

We are very much in favour of having this policy. We consider that, important as it is to protect a heritage asset, this should not be at the expense of the environment. The need to decarbonise all buildings, including historic ones, is urgent, if we are to prevent catastrophic climate change. Retrofitting of historic buildings, of which Cambridge has many, should be done sensitively, but the age and importance of the building should not be used as an argument for no action or too little action to reduce the carbon emissions of such buildings.

### **13441 Support**

Summary:

Such a policy has the potential to give useful guidance on the balance between improving environmental performance and protection of heritage significance.

### **13942 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **14091 Support**

Summary:

Yes but demolishing an historic asset and replacing it with a pastiche that may be more energy-efficient is to be deplored.

### **16472 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **17871 Support**

Summary:

Yes - as suggested



## 18107 Support

Summary:

Yes

---

### CHAPTER: 8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic &

### Question 8.8

---

## 9234 Object

Summary:

We support option 70 in principle but the meaning of "environmentally conscious materials" is not clear as the CBISE guide to which reference is made is available online only on payment of a substantial fee. This needs to be clarified.

## 10648 Support

Summary:

Object:

bullet 1. How can works to a heritage asset be interpreted as its demolition?

Bullets 2-5 seem to conflict, some priority is needed here. If the issue is climate change, that must be the bulleted priority. We cannot see how you can use traditional methods, specify both environmentally conscious materials and traditional methods, and seek to improve the energy efficiency of a heritage asset. In areas such as Newtown and other conservation areas the priority should be specified in the Plan that adaptations or works to the historic fabric should primarily use traditional materials.

## 11110 Support

Summary:

Object: The policy needs to be based on a very clear understanding of the heritage significance of the building (as a whole and of the elements most likely to be affected by the proposed works), assessment of potential options and their respective impacts and the arrangements for monitoring the impacts where necessary.

It must be recognised that traditional methods / materials may not be the most appropriate or sustainable ways of enhancing the performance of historic buildings.

## 13445 Support

Summary:

Object: The policy needs to be based on a very clear understanding of the heritage significance of the building (as a whole and of the elements most likely to be affected by the proposed works), assessment of potential options and their respective impacts and the arrangements for monitoring the impacts where necessary.

It must be recognised that traditional methods / materials may not be the most appropriate or sustainable ways of enhancing the performance of historic buildings.

## 18108 Support

Summary:

No. A stringent criteria based approach is best.

---

### CHAPTER: 8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic &

### 8.13

---

## 9236 Object

Summary:

We felt it to be more important that shop front design be sympathetic to the building than that it conform to the brand stereotype if a multiple. Too much vibrancy becomes strident.

Noise pollution, which according to the NPPF is to be avoided, may also be a problem.

In certain malls there is an unpleasant degree of odour pollution which must affect air quality.

### **9237 Support**

Summary:

We agree

### **15019 Support**

Summary:

I prefer option 72.

### **17522 Support**

Summary:

We believe the height of buildings should be strictly limited, especially in a historic and attractive city such as Cambridge.

The impact of tall buildings is not only the appearance of the skyline but also the reduction of natural light at street level and the overbearing nature of tall buildings.

It is important to apply a good sense of place, scale and proportion in the built environment.

If there are multiple criteria for limiting the height of tall buildings, undesirable results will be much more likely than if there were a straightforward, citywide limit.

### **9238 Object**

Summary:

Support in principle, but it must be made clear that the contribution of shop fronts and signage to the character of the building is required to be sympathetic and positive.

### **10417 Object**

Summary:

Too many policies littered throughout this 350 page document suggest that common sense will be driven out of the window.

### **7675 Support**

Summary:

Signage is often overlooked, but it can really work to reinforce your other objectives.

### **12440 Support**

Summary:

still much to be done on this, particularly with the corporate brand. Just one example - take a look at Phones 4U next to Boots. How many signs do they need. And if you can find a copy, look at Peter Olesen's Paenere Facader (Thaning and Apel); you don't have to read Danish, just look at the photos. He has successfully campaigned for shop fronts that respect the rest of the building.

### **15229 Support**

Summary:

But you must recognise the reality that some shops, especially those selling spirits and tobacco, may require shutters and /or bollards to deter predation by robbers.

---

**12088 Object**

Summary:

There is no need for a separate Local Plan policy on shop fronts and signage. Advice on these and other 'advertisement' related matters could be provided in SPD guidance.

**17872 Object**

Summary:

No - current policy seems to be sufficient

**8461 Support**

Summary:

yes

**9239 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**10117 Support**

Summary:

without a policy setting standards, there can be no rejection of poor/inappropriate designs.

**10152 Support**

Summary:

There is a tendency for signage and shopfronts to be constructed without paying attention to the ambience of the surroundings. This has the effect of lowering the visual quality of the public space. For example shopwindow, or office windows, have been covered with posters creating a boring and repetitious display.

**10585 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**11112 Support**

Summary:

A policy allied to a review of the Shopfront Design Guide would be appropriate.

**11479 Support**

Summary:

Support

**11703 Support**

Summary:

yes, policy would be helpful in controlling this matter

**12444 Support**

Summary:

Commercial development in the historic centre must be controlled in order to maintain the sense of place - there is no attraction in Cambridge city centre simply looking like a copy of every shopping centre you can think of....

**12973 Support**

Summary:

yes. Especially in conservation areas. Cambridge should have beautiful painted shop signs yet the multiples have degraded the City with too much bland typeface and flat plastic.

**13446 Support**

Summary:

A policy allied to a review of the Shopfront Design Guide would be appropriate.

**13894 Support**

Summary:

Needed e.g. areas of Mill Road where the signage significantly detracts from the character of the area (e.g. Avis, Bed Centre signs)

**13943 Support**

Summary:

Yes

## 14033 Support

Summary:

I support the development of policy on shopfronts. Aligned to a policy supporting small units and diversity of use types this could enhance the visual character of our shopping streets

## 17413 Support

Summary:

Shop fronts - greater detailing of design is needed to enhance streets, ensure that shopping areas are attractive, and also support greater and effective enforcement on transgressions

## 18109 Support

Summary:

Yes

---

## CHAPTER: 8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic &

## Question 8.11

---

## 18110 Object

Summary:

No

## 8462 Support

Summary:

There should be a presumption against chains using their house style and an effort made to harmonise the shop fronts in the city centre.

## 9168 Support

Summary:

Many businesses have recognisable national logos or house styles e.g. Tesco, Macdonalds, the banks. Use of these standard designs should not be allowed to become visually dominant and the possibility of using projecting banner-like signs rather than large fascias should be encouraged where appropriate.

## 9241 Support

Summary:

Shop fronts and signage must be required to be sympathetic with the character of the building,

## 10589 Support

Summary:

Need to work towards removing shutters from premises that already have them, and ensuring no new ones are added ( eg Mill Road).They intimidate pedestrians and send out the wrong message about safety on the public realm.

## 10656 Support

Summary:

This policy should be strongly enforced to be able to override the branding and high powered marketing priorities of the large chain stores. In areas such as Newtown and other conservation areas shopfronts and signage should be required to reflect the character of the buildings and surroundings.

## 11704 Support

Summary:

Many businesses have recognisable national logos or house styles e.g. Tesco, Macdonalds, the banks. Use of these standard designs should not be allowed to become visually dominant

## 12197 Support

Summary:

The use of advertising billboards taking up space on busy pavements - should be stopped. Pavements are narrow, there are lots of residents, students and tourists. Notices should not impede walking. Similarly, notices of road works etc should not be permitted to block pavements - find a way to raise the notices to above 2.5 m, so as to minimise the congestion caused.

## 13947 Support

Summary:

I support this policy, but am concerned that there is not enough done to prevent the installation of inappropriate signage such as back-lit illuminated panels. This is especially obvious on Mill Road. Greater education of the value of historic shopfronts is needed.

## 16857 Support

Summary:

This point together with enhancing the local environment should be extended to anything a new development might put up.

## 17415 Support

Summary:

Shop fronts - greater detailing of design is needed to enhance streets, ensure that shopping areas are attractive, and also support greater and effective enforcement on transgressions

### **18111 Object**

Summary:

No

---

### **11117 Object**

Summary:

Consideration of tall buildings should be within the design section of the plan.

The city does NOT have a rich and varied skyline - it is generally flat but punctuated by a limited number of 'landmark' buildings but with other areas dominated by tree canopies.

### **12455 Object**

Summary:

I disagree with the statement that the city generally lacks towers and bulky buildings - the CB1 development, Cambridge Leisure Park and the area around Riverside all have bulky buildings that have been cited, often negatively, in other council documents

### **15559 Object**

Summary:

If the text is retained, we suggest the following changes:

In line 1 - '...varied and predominantly low rise skyline'

In line 6, after chimneys, add 'They have an elegance and grace often because they are required to fulfil functional requirements.'

### **11028 Support**

Summary:

This is what makes Cambridge special. Large solid blocks such as those round the station, and along the river past the old pumping station, do not comfortably fit with that history.

### **12688 Support**

Summary:

The success of "A large proportion of these structures comprise church and college towers, turrets, spires and chimneys" is the fact they contrast (ie stick up) above a general roof line across the city. The danger is that modern tall buildings that do not have turrets etc of the same language, will drown out this aesthetic contrast value to the point where it will be insignificant. It's a question of relative contrast values, and the aesthetic contrast of the visual response to the brain will be dumbed down if the above examples are dwarfed by taller examples.

### **12457 Object**

Summary:

Key elements missing here are that tall buildings are also dense developments and therefore have a disproportionately negative influence on traffic congestion and loss of light too.

### **12720 Object**

Summary:

I object, as there are few opportunities to have tall buildings in Cambridge, as outlined in my other responses. Yes, there is a shortage of land, but this is a good thing as it makes the criteria for having tall buildings more relevant and necessary to consider.

Its land is not always used efficiently, such as the retail parks on Newmarket Road.

Cambridge has world famous institutions, and a high number of world class historic buildings and landscapes, and there is a legitimate fear that tall buildings could easily erode this status, and be extremely visually harmful.

### **15560 Object**

Summary:

Add 'functional' before 'buildings' in line 1.

### **9242 Support**

Summary:

Proposed new tall buildings must take account of context, and enhance the skyline.

### **11312 Support**

Summary:

It is positive to use the land more efficiently, and there are some successful examples. But we should not site tall buildings near historic buildings or on the edge of historic, green space where views and open space provide relief.

**12459 Object**

Summary:

Not just the historic setting of the city that tall buildings impact on - loss of light, congestion etc are all disproportionately negatively impacted by tall buildings.

**17689 Object**

Summary:

Tall buildings - I expect a cityscape impact to be carried out and the cityscape values to be maintained.

**9243 Support**

Summary:

We agree

## **9244 Object**

Summary:

We support the criteria for assessment, but recognise that the historic centre is particularly unsuitable for tall buildings and that there are other areas where this is also true.

Success of the option depends on the robust application of the criteria.

## **11030 Object**

Summary:

It's not just the height, but the overall bulk of buildings which must be considered carefully.

## **12442 Object**

Summary:

Tall buildings are inappropriate in Cambridge unless they are church spires.

## **12463 Object**

Summary:

There is no mention of the impact of tall buildings on densification of areas and therefore increased congestion.

## **12670 Object**

Summary:

Support but:  
The criteria must be much more demanding without being restrictive. The aesthetic expectations must be so much higher. The type of building and what it stands for should also be considered. It's physical presence will last a very long time, so its justification must be for the long term, and must have a long term benefit to the whole community of Cambridge. This ought perhaps be in terms of its use, as well as its looks - in that way it can be integrated into the experience of Cambridge in a richer more connected way.

## **13773 Object**

Summary:

A number of the suggested criteria are inappropriate to determine the location of tall building.

## **15561 Object**

Summary:

The potential difficulty with option 72 is that proposers will claim that they meet the high quality threshold and use that to justify harm to the historic townscape of Cambridge.

We suggest that it would be better to have a policy that precludes tall buildings unless they can clearly demonstrate that they will not result in harm to the setting of historic buildings and the setting of the historic core, including more distant views of the city's skyline.

## **7677 Support**

Summary:

I think tall buildings homogenise the city's landscape. We should emphasise our city's heritage and only approve mid-height buildings.

## **9971 Support**

Summary:

We believe that a sensitive and selective approach to allowing taller buildings would increase capacity for growth whilst demanding sensitive design and protecting valuable views. We believe that this could be used in conjunction with option 73 to create individual, iconic and slightly taller buildings in some areas and groups of significantly taller buildings away from the city's historic core.

## **10802 Support**

Summary:

Important so as not to ruin the character of the city. There is a place for tall buildings, but the siting of them is an extremely sensitive issue

## **11590 Support**

Summary:

This seems a good idea, as it seems ridiculous that only recently the new curved building opposite the entrance to station road, by the botanic gardens was allowed to be built so tall 8-10 storeys? And so close to the road...not in keeping with any neighbouring buildings

## **11614 Support**

Summary:

High building do not really fit with cambridge and should only be allowed in exceptional cases.

## **13180 Support**

Summary:

We would support the development of a policy supported by guidance setting out design and locational criteria in order to assess the suitability of development proposals for tall buildings on a case-by-case basis. This would be supported as it will allow flexibility for developers by not limiting building heights across the city or part thereof. Where developable land is at a premium, tall buildings not only create important landmark features within the city, but also allow increased density and encourage the best use of land.

## **13516 Support**

Summary:

Deal with tall buildings on a case-by-case basis.

## **13579 Support**

Summary:

Case by case sounds reasonable. There is limited space in Cambridge, just as everywhere else, and moderately tall buildings can help to limit urban sprawl.

## **14298 Support**

Summary:

Tall buildings don't fit well within Cambridge and we risk spoiling our city if we allow too many

## **15238 Support**

Summary:

Tall buildings can work well in the right place if proper thought is given to their design

## **16473 Support**

Summary:

Broadly support but we need to know what the Council's definition of 'tall' is before we can comment intelligently on this. Maximum height should be as low as possible.

## **18130 Support**

Summary:

The CAA supports the criteria based assessment approach for tall buildings in Cambridge and are generally in agreement with the list of criteria set out in the document.

We would support this approach, used as part of an integrated spatial strategy for the whole city. The development of the current 3D computer model owned and managed by the City Council would assist all parties in the assessment of the merits of individual applications. The current model is inadequate due to the lack of accurate definition of the existing built environment including roof forms, building shapes and tree canopies. It should be developed to provide greater definition and more accurate representation of building forms and shapes including accurate skylines.



## **9246 Object**

Summary:

We are concerned that no criteria for acceptability are included in this option. The option could be satisfactory with the addition of the list of criteria given under option 72 for judging the acceptability of tall buildings.

## **12447 Object**

Summary:

Nowhere in Cambridge is suitable for the sort of tall buildings we are likely to see proposed. Who thought the Belvedere was a good idea? Why would you want a tower at Adkins Corner? Or a mini Docklands on Marshall's airfield? Enough damage has been done already - just look at the view from, say, the field gate by the Roman road, or from Gt St Mary's tower. Only barbarians or half-wits could do this to Cambridge.

## **12466 Object**

Summary:

I would postulate that there are very few examples of post-war tall building architecture in Cambridge that fulfils the criteria set out here of "enhancing local distinctiveness". For the most-part they are criticised and therefore I cannot see how this will change in the future? I would again argue that there are very limited examples of where new tall buildings are a "positive introduction to the street scene" - many have been criticised in subsequent conservation area consultations and the tall buildings consultation. I fear that this would continue with this option in place. Again there seems to be no mention here of the impact of tall buildings and dense developments on congestion?

## **12768 Object**

Summary:

Cambridge has an uplifting beautiful built environment, that delights the eye and brain. This is not a subjective response, otherwise there would not be so many tourists. The aesthetic response can be analysed. I would point you towards a chapter entitled "Urban Aesthetics" by Peter F. Smith in a book called "Architecture for People" which explains how and why the brain responds to certain visual cues and what it finds most stimulating, pleasing and poetic.

## **13518 Object**

Summary:

Deal with tall buildings on a case-by-case basis.

## **13775 Object**

Summary:

Specifying appropriate locations for tall buildings is unnecessary. Option 61 suggests a policy based upon requiring development to respond to 'local character and distinctiveness'. The height of a proposed building could be assessed against this policy and the policy option put forward as Option 63.

## **16916 Object**

Summary:

Option 73 is superfluous now the masterplan has been approved.

## **9972 Support**

Summary:

We believe that selected areas of taller buildings would help increase capacity for growth significantly. However, this policy should pertain away from the historic core. Within the core, modestly taller buildings should be allowed on a case by case basis and where views can be retained.

## **10803 Support**

Summary:

Very important

## **11036 Support**

Summary:

This seems better than an overall limit. It is important to think about each building in its own context - a blanket limit might lead to the maximum allowable being built every time. Cambridge is not uniform, and should not become so.

## **13190 Support**

Summary:

We support the development of a policy which identifies specific areas suitable for tall areas. Such a policy will allow flexibility for developers by not limiting building heights across the city. Where developable land is at a premium, tall buildings not only create important landmark features within the city, but also allow increased density and encourage the best use of land. The Compass House site within the Eastern Gate would be an area suitable for tall buildings. Tall buildings can provide a positive contribution to the street scene and in locations such as the Eastern Gate should be viewed favourably.

## **15239 Support**

Summary:

One place where tall buildings could work successfully is the North East extension with the new Chesterton Sidings station leading the way by exploiting both height and the flying freehold over the railway to provide a model of better land use for the future development of Cambridge

## **18132 Support**

### Summary:

There is general support for densification of key urban development sites within Cambridge. Densification in these new urban quarters might include taller buildings than would be accepted in other areas of the city. A spatial strategy to be developed to define planning briefs for these sites. Option 72 criteria would apply to all applications.

### **9250 Object**

Summary:

Any upper limit is likely to tempt developers to build to just below it, to the possible detriment of the skyline. Additional criteria must be applied.

### **9973 Object**

Summary:

This option runs the risk of either not solving the problem of increasing capacity or of providing an uninteresting, uniform skyline. We believe that options 72 and 73 provide much more sensitive and creative approaches to this issue.

### **13191 Object**

Summary:

Such a policy would be resisted as this would remove the ability of Cambridge City Council to assess appropriate building heights on a site specific basis. A policy restricting building heights across the city would limit innovative design and would reduce the opportunity to make the most efficient use of land which in turn would impact upon development viability. In the interests of ensuring a high standard of design and variety in the street scene this policy would be resisted.

### **13522 Object**

Summary:

Deal with tall buildings on a case-by-case basis.

### **13777 Object**

Summary:

Specifying a maximum height for buildings is unnecessary.

### **15240 Object**

Summary:

Height should relate to function and purpose so a rigid limit is not appropriate. Guidance in the form of 'buildings over x storeys are generally not acceptable in this location' should be given where height is seen as a sensitive issue

### **16917 Object**

Summary:

Option 74 is not supported as each proposal should be judged on its own merits.

### **18135 Object**

Summary:

The CAA does not support height restrictions in the central area or elsewhere in the city. A criteria based approach for assessment of applications on their individual merit is the preferred option (Option 72).

### **7678 Support**

Summary:

I think the lower-height buildings make Cambridge distinct.

### **9576 Support**

Summary:

A clear policy which limits building heights, especially close to the city centre, is needed.

### **9786 Support**

Summary:

There should be limits on tall buildings in a city like Cambridge; if we support options 72 and 73 we are implicitly approving of tall buildings - there's too much danger of buildings being sited unsympathetically. The Friends of Stourbridge Common is keen to protect the sight-lines from the Common as part of the important 'long views' that this site provides.

### **10119 Support**

Summary:

the taller the building the less sustainable and the more of an intrusion on the landscape it is

### **10418 Support**

Summary:

There needs to be limits on building heights or we could simply see competition as in London for who can build the highest. It is impossible to believe that the quality of life for those in high rise buildings is good unless the noise insulation and the lift facilities are outstanding in quality and ease of maintenance. Evidence from other cities is that high rise building leads to slums.

### **10595 Support**

Summary:

Agree with this option.

## 12450 Support

Summary:

Yes, and a low limit too - 5 storeys. In most places, 7 storeys rear up above trees and mar the skyline. Those vile blocks at the Triangle, like cereal packets, are visible from the Harlton-Haslingfield road, and a good many other places too. Squared tops add nothing of beauty to the skyline.

## 12460 Support

Summary:

I would strongly support this option - this has been a policy from the 50's and I think that it's maintained the city's character. Any significant number of tall buildings, no matter how well developed, will have a huge impact on this compact city.

## 12846 Support

Summary:

I think Cambridge has such an extraordinary collection of historic buildings, of world famous repute, that their setting must surely be safeguarded. To this end I believe there has to be one height restriction over the historic core, and a further less onerous, but proportional, one over the remainder of the city. There is no reason for this not to allow for exemplary design, whilst being respectful to Cambridge's magnificent, and unique, built heritage. It merely puts a curb on the extent of development which ought to be limited in such a sensitive environment.

## 13284 Support

Summary:

If there are multiple criteria for limiting the height of tall buildings, undesirable results will be much more likely than if there were a straightforward, city-wide limit. Elsewhere, the character of the urban environment has been completely changed by the construction of buildings that are much taller than their surroundings, and such development must be prevented in Cambridge.

## 14050 Support

Summary:

I support this option

## 14302 Support

Summary:

Agree with this

## 14340 Support

Summary:

Even Addenbrookes on the outskirts of Cambridge has ruined the splendid view of the city from the "Gogs" entry way. One more tall building anywhere in the City will turn the wonderful feeling of smallness of the city into yet another urban junk yard.

## 14458 Support

Summary:

I support this option on the basis of a maximum of 5 floors to high buildings. Higher than that should be resisted because of the density of development which high rise buildings allow in a small and delicate city; the energy inefficiency of high buildings as they require artificial ventilation and mechanical lifting; and they are visually intrusive swamping existing buildings and trees therefore giving a harsh environment.

## 15403 Support

Summary:

I support this policy. One of the attractions of Cambridge has been its human scale, and the gradual encroachment of the skyline by tall buildings such as Botanic House or the fire station will lead to a situation where Cambridge loses this special human-scale quality.

## 15562 Support

Summary:

We favour this of the three alternatives, as the safest approach.

## 16029 Support

Summary:

It is vital that a policy is urgently put in place. Great distress has been shown by visitors returning to Cambridge confronted by Botanic House. Your Planning Department have made a grave mistake by allowing this to happen. The City must be ringed for any future application. It is so unnecessary. We all live to regret this grave error.

## 16474 Support

Summary:

Support. I don't see why innovative and sustainable approaches should be stifled by this option.

## 16703 Support

Summary:

The skyline is already marred by the tin can look of the Belvedere which glints in the evening sun when viewed from Grantchester Meadows. Height of future buildings should be restricted so as not to dwarf King's College Chapel and other spires of the City. It would be a crime to spoil what has so far managed to survive the centuries.

## **17114 Support**

### Summary:

We agree that there is a need for a policy on maximum heights for buildings in Cambridge and the surrounding area. Developments in Addenbrooke's, West Cambridge, and Station Road are already putting the skyline of Cambridge at risk. We do not agree that innovation in design can only be found through height. A maximum height policy would support, not stifle, sustainable development.

## **17523 Support**

### Summary

We believe the height of buildings should be strictly limited, especially in a historic and attractive city such as Cambridge. The impact of tall buildings is not only the appearance of the skyline but also the reduction of natural light at street level and the overbearing nature of tall buildings. It is important to apply a good sense of place, scale and proportion in the built environment. If there are multiple criteria for limiting the height of tall buildings, undesirable results will be much more likely than if there were a straightforward, citywide limit.

**12094 Object**

Summary:

There is no need for a separate Local Plan policy on this issue. Advice could be provided in SPD guidance. Area-wide restrictions on building heights would be unnecessarily prescriptive.

**13780 Object**

Summary:

There is no need for a policy to deal with tall buildings.

**18203 Object**

Summary:

yes, but it should have guidelines on height of buildings permitted in this historic city, and be prepared to reject plans which fall outside this guidelines

**6919 Support**

Summary:

yes

**7089 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**7108 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**7174 Support**

Summary:

A policy should identify, 'where' within the City and be integrated with public transport systems which are enabled, economically, by population density and the tourist footprint (whose impact on infrastructure has been ignored in planning terms).

**8027 Support**

Summary:

Guidance is clearly nneeded.

**8463 Support**

Summary:

yes

**9169 Support**

Summary:

Yes, definitely. The skyline of Cambridge is a distinct historic asset.

**9251 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**9473 Support**

Summary:

Yes - Buildings in Cambridge are becoming too tall.

**10118 Support**

Summary:

control is needed

**10158 Support**

Summary:

We strongly support a policy given the recent failures to enforce guidelines wrt tall buildings in both our area and others.

**10658 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**10804 Support**

Summary:

Yes

## **11118 Support**

Summary:

But should be in design section.

## **11706 Support**

Summary:

Yes, definitely. The skyline of Cambridge is a distinct historic asset.

## **12637 Support**

Summary:

clearly defined guidance needs to be made policy for strict guidance to be followed in order to safeguard the historic skyline, and to promote high quality design where taller buildings may be admitted.

## **13262 Support**

Summary:

Height of buildings should be strictly limited, especially in a historic and attractive city such as Cambridge. The impact of tall buildings is not only the appearance of the skyline but also the reduction of natural light at street level and the overbearing nature of tall buildings. It is important to apply a good sense of place, scale and proportion in the built environment.

## **13449 Support**

Summary:

But should be in design section.

## **13953 Support**

Summary:

Yes

## **14095 Support**

Summary:

Yes. The recent building of Botanic House by Station Road shows how badly a policy is needed. Low rise city should be maintained except in outlying cluster if appropriate.

## **14221 Support**

Summary:

It is essential that building height and density is in keeping with neighbouring areas, particularly where domestic buildings are concerned. Tight guidelines should be set to ensure that developers are not able to exceed these limits.

## **16475 Support**

Summary:

Yes

## **16695 Support**

Summary:

We do not need tall buildings in this city, they do not fit. Those which have been built are awful and overpowering.

## **16739 Support**

Summary:

It is essential that building height and density is in keeping with neighbouring areas, particularly where domestic buildings are concerned. Tight guidelines should be set to ensure that developers are not able to exceed these limits.

## **16914 Support**

Summary:

Support the policy, but it should be in the previous section.

## **17678 Support**

Summary:

Tall buildings affect cityscape - I am against that

## **17766 Support**

Summary:

Developers should respect the current style of the city and not apply for permission to construct high-rise buildings.

## **17873 Support**

Summary:

Yes - very important. Tall buildings are a focal point as you enter the city

## **18112 Support**

Summary:

Yes.

## 18364 Support

Summary:

Yes. Much of the special character of Cambridge is the significance of the few generally isolated taller buildings which populate the skyline, e.g. the University Library and Kings College Chapel which can be seen from the surrounding countryside.



### **9252 Object**

Summary:

We object to all the options presented.

### **10660 Object**

Summary:

These options are not alternatives. 72 sets out the specifications of the buildings, 73 seeks to identify areas suitable for buildings and 73 sets a limit on their height. They are complementary and all of them must be included.

### **11120 Object**

Summary:

Options 73 and 74 are entirely inappropriate. It is vital that each case is assessed on its merits. Whilst the desire to restrict heights in the historic core is understandable, in practice some tall buildings (eg Peterhouse's William Stone Building) do not detrimentally affect the character of the city. The policy could be kept relatively simple and just seek compliance with the Skyline Guidance Document.(Option 72)

### **11707 Object**

Summary:

Option 72 is the most suitable as options 73 and 74 have disadvantages in that they are too general. However, elements of these could also be included eg guidance on building heights in central and suburb areas and / or a presumption against buildings above a certain height. It is undesirable to designate certain areas as more suitable for clusters of tall buildings: we do not need or want a "Canary Wharf" area, and there are already a disturbing number of tall buildings in the station/Hills Road bridge/old Cattle Market area.

### **13088 Object**

Summary:

Options 73 and 74 are not appropriate as each case should be treated on its merits. The policy could be kept relatively simple and be supplemented by the Skyline Guidance Document.(Option 72)

### **13452 Object**

Summary:

Options 73 and 74 are not appropriate. It is vital that each case is assessed on its merits. Whilst the desire to restrict heights in the historic core is understandable, in practice some tall buildings (eg Peterhouse's William Stone Building) do not detrimentally affect the character of the city.

### **13782 Object**

Summary:

No policy is considered necessary.

### **16859 Object**

Summary:

There should be a limit to Building Heights

### **6896 Support**

Summary:

I prefer option 74

### **6920 Support**

Summary:

Option 74. There is no case for tall buildings in Cambridge. See Rome for a city where they have got this right.

### **6992 Support**

Summary:

I prefer the option limiting height of new build, i.e. the one entitled Option 74; there is definitely a need for a policy limiting height of buildings, as otherwise pressure from land values will cause people to build higher and higher, destroying the beautiful city we have today.

### **7090 Support**

Summary:

Option 74  
It's almost too late after the debacle of the apartments by the Leisure Park/railway line, which can be seen for miles, but I can't think of any development policy which would be more warmly received by city residents than a cap on building height. Limiting it to certain areas in a region which is so flat is pointless; nothing can be hidden. Developers and businesses alike have plenty of opportunity to be successful without towering over Kings Chapel.

### **7109 Support**

Summary:

74. The other options give scope for developers to persuade planners to allow tall buildings in inappropriate places.

## **8464 Support**

Summary:

Option 74

## **9170 Support**

Summary:

Option 72 is the most suitable as options 73 and 74 have disadvantages in that they are too general. However, elements of these could also be included such as a presumption against buildings above a certain height. It is undesirable to designate certain areas as more suitable for clusters of tall buildings: we do not need or want a "Canary Wharf" area, and there are already a disturbing number of tall buildings in the station/Hills Road bridge/old Cattle Market area.

## **9475 Support**

Summary:

Option 74. it will prevent developers being able to argue that their proposals meet the criteria. Their opening gambit is always 'this area needs a landmark building'. We rarely do.

## **10164 Support**

Summary:

We strongly support option 74 because we do not see that any softer option would be adequate protection from exploitation.

## **10805 Support**

Summary:

A combination of options 72 and 73

## **11938 Support**

Summary:

I prefer Option 74 - Yes we should definitely have a limit on the height of buildings.

## **13956 Support**

Summary:

Option 74

## **14307 Support**

Summary:

Option 74. Otherwise developers will do what they want

## **14721 Support**

Summary:

I prefer option 72.

## **14975 Support**

Summary:

A8.14 Either Option 72 or Option 73. Not option 74.

## **16476 Support**

Summary:

Options 72 and 74.

## **16915 Support**

Summary:

Option 72 would be the most appropriate if worded to reflect the thrust of the recent Cambridge skyline document.

## **17417 Support**

Summary:

Tall buildings - a criteria based approach is supported

## **17874 Support**

Summary:

Option 73 would be our preferred option but to combine with option 74 ensuring there is a height restriction

## **18113 Support**

Summary:

Both Options 72 and 73.

### **6922 Object**

Summary:

No. only a strictly applied height limit can rein in phallocentric architects

### **9171 Support**

Summary:

Height should be measured in absolute terms and not by number of storeys, as residential and commercial developments tend to have different floor heights. The need for more space for building services (lift shafts, air-conditioning, water tanks etc) is also relevant and the current practice of allowing these on the top storey only if set well back from the frontage is approved.

### **10122 Support**

Summary:

the false assumption that taller buildings are necessarily higher density and therefore needed.

### **10168 Support**

Summary:

Although we prefer option 74 we think that considerations like the ones in option 72 should also apply.

### **11710 Support**

Summary:

It may be helpful to measure height in absolute terms and not just by number of storeys, as residential and commercial developments tend to have different floor heights, as do older and newer residential houses. This would mean comparisons with existing buildings would be clearer and easier to understand.

The current practice of allowing these on the top storey only if set well back from the frontage is generally.

### **12217 Support**

Summary:

What is missing about the buildings is specific comment about the unsightly junk (air conditioning, lifts, aerials) that can be visible at the top and can be very detrimental to views from afar to the beautiful "landmark" historic buildings within the city. Such rooftop visual garbage is usually much worse than the most unsightly building frontage or profile.

### **13781 Support**

Summary:

There seems to be considerable overlap between the policies for tall buildings, designing in context, skyline, protecting the city's heritage and air safeguarding zones.

### **14976 Support**

Summary:

Preservation of views of open spaces needs to include the blue space of the river Cam corridor.

### **15603 Support**

Summary:

I think we need to be careful with how many high-rise developments we give planning permission for the city this could generally change the character of the city significantly and I am unsure at this stage how we've really mitigating the social problems that this type of property had in the 1960s.

### **16477 Support**

Summary:

Stress that criteria of 72 should be applied to all developments.

### **17128 Support**

Summary:

It is worrying that the wording recurring in the plan about preserving the skyline are so vague as to appear just lip service. This is reinforced by the fact that recent buildings near the Botanic Gardens, at the fire station and on Station Rd. are already dwarfing their surrounding area looming over green spaces and altering the traditional town character in a detrimental way.

### **17875 Support**

Summary:

Only to ensure that options 73 & 74 are combined.

### **6921 Support**

Summary:

say 6 storeys, and applied across the city centre and views into and out of it. Given the flat terrain, this means the whole city. While you are at it, provide for the demolition of Mayflower House.

### **6993 Support**

Summary:

I feel that the desirable limit on height has been exceeded in George Nuttall Close, Orchard Park, and possibly elsewhere, so something less than drove those buildings is desirable.

I believe that such a policy needs to apply across the whole city, not just the city centre.

### **7091 Support**

Summary:

A maximum height above sea level should be proposed, if it's the view of the city we're considering. Clearly a 6-storey building on top of what little hills we have would be more prominent than one down in a dip. And the heights of existing buildings within a certain radius might also be taken into account, as even a 4-storey building can look ugly if all around are half the height.

### **8465 Support**

Summary:

The city could be zoned so that heights are restricted to, say, 4 storeys in the historic centre, to 6 in the areas built up before World War 2, and, say, 12-14 further out except where this would impinge on a beautiful skyline

### **9172 Support**

Summary:

Maximum height in general, say 20 meters. This is equivalent to six residential storeys plus rooftop services. Exceptions might be allowed in the central area where height can contribute positively in a visual sense. Strictly vertical blocks should be discouraged in favour of a degree of tapering (e.g. the tower of the University Library, or the older skyscrapers in New York). There should also be a further restriction where adjoining buildings are less than say three storeys, so that no tall building excessively dominates its neighbours.

### **10672 Support**

Summary:

Need a policy tailored to different areas of Cambridge. The Local Plan MUST account for and provide specific guidance for areas such as conservation areas and other historic areas. There must be NO tall buildings within the historic city centre and there must certainly be a height limit imposed on all building in the adjacent heritage/conservation areas. Any development in these historic areas must primarily consider the historic character of the local area and surrounding buildings.

Tall buildings in the city MUST NOT be visible from anywhere on the river as they would destroy that amenity.

### **11714 Support**

Summary:

While we do not support option 74, we think the recent skyline guidance makes a relevant distinction between central and suburban building heights. Our view is that centrally limits should be 6 storeys and 4 in suburban areas (or their typical height in metres) Strictly vertical blocks should be discouraged in favour of a degree of tapering (e.g. the tower of the University Library)

There should also be a further restriction where adjoining buildings are less than say three storeys, so that no tall building excessively dominates its neighbours.

### **11797 Support**

Summary:

there will be constant pressure to allow building height to increase. Building heights and density should be in keeping with the surrounding area and should not interrupt the City sky line from a distance. Strict guidelines should be put in place and strictly enforced.

### **11963 Support**

Summary:

We need a height limit of five storeys - we've already lost a great historic view in the centre of Cambridge because an eight storey building was allowed to be built. This is very sad, we need to protect our City and its uniqueness.

### **12452 Support**

Summary:

5 storeys maximum. And apply the policy to the whole city. In most suburbs, 3 storeys would be preferable. Anything taller than a tree has to do a great deal aesthetically to justify itself. Personally I would demolish several tall buildings, including the University Library, which was a bad mistake.

### **12471 Support**

Summary:

Tall buildings guidance must be applied across the city - a four-storey block in a two-storey area could have a worse effect than a seven-storey development in the town centre. Context is critical and therefore any policy must be city-wide.

## 13784 Support

Summary:

No height limit is necessary.

## 13992 Support

Summary:

If Option 74 is selected, I would recommend the height limit policy be restricted to the historic inner core of Cambridge. This would protect existing views of spires and so on. Outside of the inner core, I would suggest the height limit take its guidance from existing tall buildings - such as Foster's Mill by the railway station. This would ensure that there are suitable 'zones' for taller office and residential buildings. I don't for a minute buy the idea that this would stifle innovative development. This is just developer-speak for "why won't you let us do what we want?"

## 16478 Support

Summary:

Unsure how to gauge heights, but I would say that Botanic House is way too tall, and entirely inappropriate to its surroundings.

## 17877 Support

Summary:

To not exceed current building heights, such as The Belvedere tower. Both historic core and wider areas should be considered.

## 18128 Support

Summary:

Tall buildings are difficult to define. Generally they refer to buildings which are significantly different in scale to their immediate neighbours. The discussion on the height of buildings needs to be linked to the perceived bulk. Bulk is as much of an issue as height in the assessment of the merit of schemes.

---

### CHAPTER: 8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic &

### Question 8.17

---

## 18114 Object

Summary:

No

## 9173 Support

Summary:

It should also be remembered that tall buildings for residential use have an unfortunate history, now stretching back some fifty years, in terms of both the tendency to become sinks of social deprivation and the inherent disadvantages of having common areas (lobbies, lifts, stairwells) which no residents are obliged to maintain and which can become places of actual danger because they are not visible or accessible from the street.

## 9255 Support

Summary:

We believe that features of all the options should be combined:

Areas of greater suitability for tall buildings identified;  
A height limit in the historic centre and any other areas where the skyline is judged to be important;  
Criteria of option 72 applied to all developments; and  
Public safety respected.

## 17879 Support

Summary:

Yes - as above

"To not exceed current building heights, such as The Belvedere Tower. Both historic core and wider areas should be considered.

---

### CHAPTER: 8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic &

### 8.18

---

## 9257 Support

Summary:

Public safety must surely continue to restrict development where there is a high enough risk of aircraft accident.

---

### CHAPTER: 8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic &

### 8.19

---

## 12472 Object

Summary:

Does this not rule out development of land for residential use south of the airport? I was under the impression that this was being considered?

## 15241 Object

Summary:

The word 'greater' looks as though it is applied to '10,000' whereas grammatically it is qualifying 'risk' so should be 'less'.

**12473 Object**

Summary:

Is it really possible to predict where an aircraft will ditch if it experiences difficulties after take-off? Given they travel so fast even a small difference in time could put it over a totally different part of the city?

---

**13530 Object**

Summary:

Deal with tall buildings on a case-by-case basis. The Air Navigation Orders must already deal adequately with this area of the City?

**7164 Support**

Summary:

The advice in Circulars 1/2003 and 1/2010, and the Direction at Annex 1 of 1/2003 require an appropriate policy regarding the Public Safety Zone and airport safeguarding.

**15242 Support**

Summary:

Necessary

**11122 Object**

Summary:

This policy is entirely unnecessary. A significant number of buildings which exceed the safety zone restriction have been built in the city in recent years.

**13090 Object**

Summary:

This policy is entirely unnecessary and does not relate to the fact that a significant number of buildings which exceed the safety zone restriction have been built in the city in recent years.

**13456 Object**

Summary:

This policy is entirely unnecessary. A significant number of buildings which exceed the safety zone restriction have been built in the city in recent years.

**18607 Object**

Summary:

This Policy is unnecessary

**11723 Support**

Summary:

Yes, policy along existing lines is still needed. There is a strong likelihood that air traffic at Marshalls will increase substantially over the period of the plan. This could well be of economic benefit to Cambridge, but would re-inforce the need for a clear policy and may also lead to the need to provide additional infrastructure

**13994 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**14311 Support**

Summary:

Yes, we also don't want the airport to expand any further

**16479 Support**

Summary:

Yes.

**17881 Support**

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

**18136 Support**

Summary:

Yes

---

**18137 Object**

Summary:

No

**9174 Support**

Summary:

It should be remembered that national policy on relieving the load on Heathrow and other major airports may, within the period covered by the plan, lead to an expansion in the use of the airport. This in turn could bring enhanced economic benefits to the city but could well require the provision of additional infrastructure.

---

**18139 Object**

Summary:

No

---

### **12878 Object**

Summary:

People don't want to ruin their front garden with an ugly hard surface but they have to because the council doesn't control street parking to a level of granularity that is required. Give each house owner one street parking permit and all the rest can pay.

### **7679 Support**

Summary:

This is a real issue and a visual "blight" in many neighbourhoods.

### **13818 Support**

Summary:

this is a logical consequence of the new cycle lanes in gilbert road. It seems likely that in 20 years all the front gardens, which currently contribute to the atmosphere of the road, will be paved over. the use of permeable surfaces should be promoted/required

---

### **10420 Object**

Summary:

This all sounds very heavy handed. Simply require that paved over gardens must have adequate soakaways for their drainage systems. The engineer designing our house in 1950 installed at least two soakaways.

### **7680 Support**

Summary:

This is a real issue in many parts of the city and should be addressed.

### **9258 Support**

Summary:

We agree

### **10806 Support**

Summary:

It blights the physical appearance of a street

### **11041 Support**

Summary:

Ideally soft paving should always be used. Even if this is not universal, then as much as possible is desirable.

### **12454 Support**

Summary:

The degradation of front gardens adds a further depressing blot to suburbia.

### **12475 Support**

Summary:

Strongly agree - this is becoming an issue and will continue to reduce our capacity to reduce flood risk.

### **14216 Support**

Summary:

It is a pity that garden protection can not be stronger. Concrete is such a blight on suburbia. Perhaps a publicity campaign to discourage such paving would be possible?

### **15243 Support**

Summary:

It should be a requirement for all development not just front gardens. to increase porosity by use of appropriate materials and adequate soakaways.

### **15833 Support**

Summary:

The forum would welcome policy based on Option 76.

### **16930 Support**

Summary:

we accept that this policy would impact only on those proposals that would require planning permission, but nevertheless we would support clear guidance on the factors that need to be considered when contemplating the paving of front gardens, including the impact on the character of the area and surface water run-off. As on-street car parking has become more difficult, the pressures to pave over front gardens has increased, with some unfortunate results.



### 9482 Object

Summary:

With the swingeing restrictions on parking in the city, there should not be any impediment to people creating parking places in front of their houses.

### 11124 Object

Summary:

Given that such works are often permitted development, this policy is unnecessary. If a concern in Conservation Areas, this should be flagged up in Conservation Area Management Plans.

### 11732 Object

Summary:

Yes Support. Given the potential visual appearance issues, it is tempting to argue for planning permission to be required for all paving over. But in terms of bureaucracy, this would be a major overkill.

### 14385 Object

Summary:

I would agree with a policy requiring permeable surfacing if required; however I oppose seeking to restrict if people can park a vehicle, or anything else, on their own land, on the grounds it is a disproportionate infringement of liberties and property rights.

### 7175 Support

Summary:

There is a need; permissions should only have allowed the means of access via an existing entrance, the removal of walls (in a Conservation Area) or elsewhere to enable multiple parking which reduces the remaining spaces on adjacent roadway, for the many examples of housing without private parking, is an abuse which should be resisted.

### 7283 Support

Summary:

Yes need for policy -- reduction of drainage capacity a problem. Silly to go in for green rooves if front gardens are being concreted over ...

### 8896 Support

Summary:

Yes there should be a policy and possibly one that could be linked to green infrastructure. Through paving front gardens, other cities have estimated loss of green space equivalent to the size of large parks.

### 9260 Support

Summary:

Although only a small proportion of paving-over requires planning permission, the largest projects do, and these are the ones with the greatest impact on run-off and visual amenity.

### 10597 Support

Summary:

Yes

### 10673 Support

Summary:

Yes

### 10807 Support

Summary:

yes

### 12476 Support

Summary:

Agree there is

### 12975 Support

Summary:

yes. Character of conservation area eroded by solid pavier sets.

### 13077 Support

Summary:

We support this policy as a measure which will help to lessen flood risk and also help to prevent residential street fronts from becoming car parks.

### 13474 Support

Summary:

The policy is needed to preserve the visual amenity, water permeability, wildlife value and food production potential of front gardens.

## **13900 Support**

Summary:

Strongly support for environmental and visual benefits which contribute to the amenity of area (can have significantly negative impacts)

## **13996 Support**

Summary:

Yes

## **14979 Support**

Summary:

Yes, support.

## **16480 Support**

Summary:

Yes, but it should cover all front gardens, not just those needing planning permission.

## **17418 Support**

Summary:

Paving over front gardens - there needs to be clearer control on this, and potentially also measures re rear gardens, and retrospective action against other flood causes in known Cambridge flood risk areas (as with 6.36-38).

## **17883 Support**

Summary:

Yes - as suggested in option 76.

## **18140 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **15405 Object**

Summary:

The provision of cycle parking in front garden areas should not be subject to planning controls.

### **8466 Support**

Summary:

A local bye law forbidding non-absorbent paving of driveways/front gardens, preferably an encouragement to use gravel so that future owners find it easier to green them.

### **9175 Support**

Summary:

Remember that increasing provision for off-street parking relieves the pressure on on-street parking, which is considerable across the whole city. It is possible to reduce any adverse visual impact, particularly in Conservation Areas, by requiring the retention of front walls, fences or hedges which provide screening. (Example: the west side of Clarendon Road.)

### **9261 Support**

Summary:

We ask whether there is the possibility of a neighbourhood plan for residential as well as commercial areas. Could such a plan enable smaller areas of paving-over to be controlled?

### **10677 Support**

Summary:

Since this option can only apply when planning permission needs to be sought it is vital that the provisions of the option are rigorously enforced. Recent planning in Newtown has suffered from non-enforcement of the existing provisions notably altering the visual amenity, biodiversity and water run-off.

### **11487 Support**

Summary:

Paving front gardens is often due to parking pressures elsewhere - for example, introduction of double-yellow lines or residents' parking schemes. Any gardens policy should go hand-in-hand with parking policy

### **11735 Support**

Summary:

As a counterbalance to environmental and visual aspects, remember that increasing provision for off-street parking relieves the pressure on on-street parking, which is considerable across the whole city.

It is possible to reduce any adverse visual impact, particularly in Conservation Areas, by requiring the retention of front walls, fences or hedges which provide screening. (Example: the west side of Clarendon Road.)

### **12225 Support**

Summary:

It appears that in the search for higher density new developments only a very small fraction of the surface area is permeable. It is as though new developments are given permission as if already paved over. So, what is missing, is consistency in policy between old and new.

### **14000 Support**

Summary:

I would suggest that smaller front gardens, such as those on Victorian streets, should apply to this rule as well. Although they are not as large, they nonetheless constitute important biodiversity environments as a whole, as well as contributing to visual amenities. All too often they are used as wheely bin stores or bike dumps and sorely detract from the character of a local area.

### **14982 Support**

Summary:

Do not follow the example of London Boroughs. Allowing residents to pave over their front gardens actually exacerbates the parking problem; it means loss of 1.5-2 parking spaces per width of house. This can mean that elderly members of the community can no longer park near their houses and they too, are then forced into paving over their gardens to guarantee their parking space. This quickly spirals into a downward cycle diminishing the visual appearance of neighbourhoods, reducing green space, depleting urban habitat, compounding surface water drainage issues.

### **17419 Support**

Summary:

Paving over front gardens - there needs to be clearer control on this, and potentially also measures re rear gardens, and retrospective action against other flood causes in known Cambridge flood risk areas (as with 6.36-38).

### **18141 Support**

Summary:

No

---

**17420 Support**

Summary:

Paving over front gardens - there needs to be clearer control on this, and potentially also measures re rear gardens, and retrospective action against other flood causes in known Cambridge flood risk areas (as with 6.36-38).

**18142 Support**

Summary:

No

---

**15950 Object**

Summary:

How should Cambridge preserve its environment and ecology? With greater care and consideration than it does at present. Given the volume of the county that is open countryside, Cambridgeshire's biodiversity is not impressive. There are a few bright spots such as Wicken and Woodwalton Fens, but they are just that: tiny spots on a great, featureless agrarian canvas. This melancholy situation is mostly the result of modern, industrialised farming practices (whither the acrobatic flocks of green plovers or whirring coveys of partridges of yesteryear?), although it is also due to encroaching development and less measurable factors such as climate change.

**9263 Support**

Summary:

Strongly support.

**11314 Support**

Summary:

Yes, let's protect these spaces.

---

**10578 Object**

Summary:

Factual correction - both East Pit and West Pit at Cherry Hinton are part of a single SSSI called "Cherry Hinton Pit" SSSI

**17759 Object**

Summary:

Please note that East Pit in Cherry Hinton is formally known as Cherry Hinton Pit SSSI.

---

**9264 Object**

Summary:

In general we support, but would like to acknowledge that non-statutory sites are also important.

---

**9267 Object**

Summary:

The Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy (2011) assumes "sustainable growth" to be desirable (page 11). Growth cannot be infinitely sustainable; there are patently limits, and we would be prudent to assume we are nearing them. We should aim rather for dynamic equilibrium.

We ask in what way it is intended to "enhance" landscapes.

**12478 Support**

Summary:

Very strongly agree - this policy is entirely in-keeping with most 21st century conservation thinking - that 'landscape scale' conservation is the only viable option to the UK.

**17761 Support**

Summary:

We welcome reference to the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy (2011) which seeks to protect and enhance green infrastructure to provide functional benefits including biodiversity enhancement.

## **9272 Object**

Summary:

We support the enhancement of biodiversity. We wish for indigenous organisms only to be promoted.

## **17763 Support**

Summary:

This section also makes welcome reference to the Lawton Report, the UK Biodiversity Action Plan and the aims for conserving and enhancing the natural environment set out in the NPPF.

### **10971 Object**

Summary:

Bidwells objects to the option requiring Appropriate Assessment on sites that are not covered by The Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994, such as County Wildlife Sites, or City Wildlife Sites. This requirement would be unnecessarily onerous and could adversely affect the viability and/or deliverability of the development. Such sites can be adequately protected through the consideration of direct or indirect adverse impacts and the provision of mitigation and/or compensatory measures to minimise any harm and provide enhancement, where possible, as required by bullet point 3.

### **12480 Object**

Summary:

I object only on the basis that this should be much much stronger in its wording - there should be absolutely no development on current wildlife sites. Cambridgeshire has one of the lowest levels of wildlife-friendly habitat in the UK and preserving what we have is critical.

### **13930 Object**

Summary:

The Consortium objects to the option requiring Appropriate Assessment on sites that are not covered by the Conservation (Natural Habitats, & c.) Regulations 1994, such as County Wildlife Sites, or City Wildlife Sites. This requirement would be unnecessarily onerous and could adversely affect the viability or deliverability of a site. Sites can be adequately protected through the consideration of direct or indirect adverse impacts and the provision of mitigation and compensatory measures to minimise any harm and provide enhancement, where possible, as required by bullet point 3 of the Option.

### **9577 Support**

Summary:

Sites of nature importance need protection.

### **9669 Support**

Summary:

Essential to preserve unique landscape and habitat of south-west quadrant.

### **9787 Support**

Summary:

The Friends of Stourbridge Common believe it is vital to have a policy which vets development proposals affecting sites of nature conservation importance against clear criteria.

### **9885 Support**

Summary:

to protect the sites of nature conservation importance for this and future generations

### **10238 Support**

Summary:

to protect the sites of nature conservation importance for this and future generations

### **10808 Support**

Summary:

Hugely important in an area like Easst Anglia with it's intensive industrial agriculture

### **10928 Support**

Summary:

I support this proposal

### **11319 Support**

Summary:

Very much support the idea of development proposal having to take into account impact on natural environment. Clearly, green and open space are under almost continual development threat in a growing city and so more stringent protection is needed.

### **12456 Support**

Summary:

Of course they should be protected. Development proposals near such sites should not be 'assessed', they should be thrown out automatically.

### **14324 Support**

Summary:

Yes, let's protect these sites. They are precious and development would destroy them

### **14846 Support**

Summary:

It is vital sites like this (SSI's, nature reserves etc) are protected as much a possible from developments that would risk the loss of such places.

## **15244 Support**

Summary:

Necessary but there should a presumption against any such development of open space given the shortfall we already have which will be exacerbated by the intensification of redeveloping existing built-up areas.

## **16743 Support**

Summary:

support

## **17765 Support**

Summary:

Natural England particularly welcomes Options 77 - 83 which aim to protect and enhance biodiversity through development, including nationally and local designated sites and priority habitats and species. We are pleased that Option 77 also refers to sites of geological importance. We believe that a policy which addresses all of these requirements would help to ensure adverse impacts of development on biodiversity is minimised and enhancement opportunities are maximised. Above all, policy/policies should ensure that development will only be supported where it can be adequately demonstrated that proposals will not have an adverse effect on biodiversity; where required, suitable mitigation measures must be acceptable and deliverable.

In line with NPPF requirements the above policy/policies should include a requirement for development to incorporate biodiversity/geodiversity enhancement, as well as protection.

---

### 12104 Object

Summary:

There should be a single policy in the local plan providing appropriate protection for the various national and local designated sites.

### 15716 Object

Summary:

We support Options 77 to 82, but consider that site should not be lost of the importance to local people of all green spaces and their vital importance to the quality of life and recreation of local people.

### 7284 Support

Summary:

Need to flag these areas in robust policy terms.

### 8467 Support

Summary:

yes

### 9273 Support

Summary:

Yes, clearly required by the NPPF

### 9788 Support

Summary:

Yes - support.

### 9886 Support

Summary:

because without it development may harm these sites

### 10240 Support

Summary:

because without it development may harm these sites

### 10588 Support

Summary:

The Wildlife Trust supports the inclusion of a nature site / habitat protection policy

### 10679 Support

Summary:

Yes

### 10809 Support

Summary:

Definitely

### 11321 Support

Summary:

Yes.

### 11736 Support

Summary:

yes to a policy

### 12482 Support

Summary:

Absolutely, and the policy should be enforced - for many of us it is the green spaces and wildlife-rich reserves and commons that represent what's really special about Cambridge.

### 12976 Support

Summary:

yes. support.



### **13085 Support**

Summary:

Yes, a good policy for the Protection of sites of nature conservation importance is necessary, both to enhance biodiversity and the public's connection with and enjoyment of nature.

### **13129 Support**

Summary:

Yes.

### **14002 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **14327 Support**

Summary:

yes

### **14987 Support**

Summary:

Yes, support

### **16481 Support**

Summary:

Yes, emphatically.

### **17885 Support**

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

### **18143 Support**

Summary:

Yes

---

## **CHAPTER: 8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic &**

## **Question 8.25**

---

### **18144 Object**

Summary:

No

### **7314 Support**

Summary:

Better protection is needed for some green spaces and commons within the City, eg not all commons are designated as such. Local designations are necessary as national designated sites are protected by National or EU Legislation.

### **9178 Support**

Summary:

Consider also that there may be adverse effects of wildlife on development - urban foxes, badgers, bats etc. These species can create a public health hazard and a danger to children.

### **9274 Support**

Summary:

We support option 77, with the additional point that measures to improve biodiversity should promote native species only.

### **12485 Support**

Summary:

I'm quite appalled that there is even a suggestion that an SSSI would be considered for development.

### **14992 Support**

Summary:

Please do not forget that the River Cam is a County Wildlife Site.

### **18145 Object**

Summary:

No

### **9179 Support**

Summary:

A tiered approach between national and local importance is recommended

### **9283 Support**

Summary:

Yes, the principles of conservation are the same for all areas of conservation importance. Their degree of importance (local, national, European etc) will be reflected by the vigour with which they are protected and managed.

### **9789 Support**

Summary:

Yes - let's make it a clear and comprehensive policy that's easy to apply.

### **10598 Support**

Summary:

A single nature conservation site protection policy is best for Cambridge, with stronger protection given to sites of County and City-wide importance than previously given, to ensure maintenance and enhancement of a viable ecological network across the city.

### **10810 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **11738 Support**

Summary:

It should be possible to cover all aspects of national and local importance in one policy using a tiered approach.

Having more than one policy is both confusing and over bureaucratic.

### **13140 Support**

Summary:

A single policy would be preferable, a 2 tier system may result in smaller fragmented areas with the city being less valued and therefore more vulnerable to threats from development.

### **17886 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**9320 Object**

Summary:

No, the criteria for judging the desirability of a development should be the same. The threshold for allowing developments may vary (cf 8.26).

**10600 Object**

Summary:

See comments made under 8.26 (below)

The Wildlife Trust would support the use of a single policy in Cambridge, which as a compact and relatively small urban area has very few nature conservation sites of national importance and none of international importance. Those sites of County and City-wide importance therefore have an increased value within the city and are more critical to the creation of a coherent and functioning ecological network across the city. A single policy, while maintaining some form of hierarchical protection in accordance with the NPPF could also be used to raise the bar and increase the level of protection afforded to sites of County and City wide importance above that previously achieved.

**10811 Object**

Summary:

No

**11739 Object**

Summary:

No - It should be possible to cover all aspects of national and local importance in one policy using a tiered approach. Having more than one policy is both confusing and over bureaucratic.

**9181 Support**

Summary:

A tiered approach between national and local importance is recommended

**14005 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**14225 Support**

Summary:

Given that nature is so undervalued in the development world a two pronged approach would seem to offer more potential for protection.

**17887 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**18147 Support**

Summary:

Yes

---

**17889 Object**

Summary:

No

**18149 Object**

Summary:

No

---

**9322 Object**

Summary:

There are 943 species on the section 41 list, and only 18 are included in the Cambridgeshire local biodiversity plan. Is this really a majority of section 41 species occurring in, or with the potential to colonise, Cambridge?

### **9324 Object**

Summary:

We strongly support the objective of protecting the rare or vulnerable species identified in the section 41 list. But in addition there are many vulnerable species not appearing on the list, and when a case is made for protecting such species, it must also be considered.

### **13586 Object**

Summary:

Protecting species on the list is good, but other species need protection, too.

### **9791 Support**

Summary:

The Friends of Stourbridge Common are highly supportive of any policy that protects species and habitat. We encourage the Council to adopt this as part of the Local Plan.

### **10812 Support**

Summary:

Vital

### **10930 Support**

Summary:

I support this proposal

### **11324 Support**

Summary:

Excellent - and agree with comment about the fact that we should be looking at the widest possible list of species and plants - 'at risk' and not merely rare or vulnerable.

### **12020 Support**

Summary:

The considerable biodiversity (see p. 169), as evidenced by many bird species (e.g., herons, owls, woodpeckers) on the river Cam, in the trees and hedgerows, and other wild fauna and flora, contribute essentially to the character of these Green Belt areas; they are highly valued by walkers and others involved in recreational activities. Encouragement and the taking of personal responsibility may be preferable ways of achieving them, rather than via Regulations.

### **12486 Support**

Summary:

I would strongly support referral to Natural England on these matters as independent experts.

### **13581 Support**

Summary:

I support this option and the preceding one. It is essential that the green areas around Cambridge are maintained for future generations. The conservation of the plant and animal species found in these areas should be a major priority.

### **13920 Support**

Summary:

We support Option 78 as Option 16; Broad Location 7 will deliver a net gain in biodiversity by maintaining ecological features through mitigation measures and providing enhanced ecological features.

### **14514 Support**

Summary:

In keeping with legal obligations.

### **15245 Support**

Summary:

This should be based on evidence rather than 'flavour of the month' prejudice.

### **17767 Support**

Summary:

Natural England particularly welcomes Options 77 - 83 which aim to protect and enhance biodiversity through development, including nationally and local designated sites and priority habitats and species. We are pleased that Option 77 also refers to sites of geological importance. We believe that a policy which addresses all of these requirements would help to ensure adverse impacts of development on biodiversity is minimised and enhancement opportunities are maximised. Above all, policy/policies should ensure that development will only be supported where it can be adequately demonstrated that proposals will not have an adverse effect on biodiversity; where required, suitable mitigation measures must be acceptable and deliverable.

In line with NPPF requirements the above policy/policies should include a requirement for development to incorporate biodiversity/geodiversity enhancement, as well as protection.

**12105 Object**

Summary:

There is no need for a policy addressing this issue but detailed guidance should be provided in SPD guidance on Nature Conservation issues.

**8468 Support**

Summary:

yes

**9325 Support**

Summary:

yes

**9792 Support**

Summary:

Yes - please see our comments on the Option itself. The Friends of Stourbridge Common are highly supportive of any policy that protects species and habitat. We encourage the Council to adopt this as part of the Local Plan.

**10137 Support**

Summary:

yes and Rights of Way improvements should be included in the category of development.

**10603 Support**

Summary:

The Wildlife Trust supports the inclusion of a priority species and habitat protection policy

**10813 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**11322 Support**

Summary:

Yes.

**11740 Support**

Summary:

yes, policy needed

**13093 Support**

Summary:

Yes, a good policy protecting priority species and habitats will help give this due weight and so enhance or maintain local biodiversity.

**13604 Support**

Summary:

Yes

Section 7 pages 49-58 of the Quarter-to-Six Quadrant Visioning Document is in effect the representation contained in this response. "Our vision is for the QTSQ to be enhanced and preserved as a very significant part of Cambridge's 'rural lungs', dedicated to public rural enjoyment by the people of Cambridge and visitors to the area. The four parish councils will work together, and with all those already involved in the area, to develop this vision over the coming years."

**13748 Support**

Summary:

Yes. There is also a need to ensure that the policy is adhered to once adopted.

**14007 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**14233 Support**

Summary:

Absolutely. Nature needs all the protection we can muster.

**14995 Support**

Summary:

Yes, support.

## 16482 Support

Summary:

Yes.

## 17890 Support

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

## 18152 Support

Summary:

Yes

---

### CHAPTER: 8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic &

### Question 8.30

---

## 18154 Object

Summary:

No

## 9326 Support

Summary:

Account must be taken not only of the rare and vulnerable species identified in section 41, but also of all the organisms which form part of the ecosystem. What is common now may quickly become rare and vulnerable. When a case is made for protecting such a species, it must also be considered.

## 10681 Support

Summary:

This option refers only to new development but should include priority species, habitats, ecological networks etc in existing areas.

## 12625 Support

Summary:

I want to agree that we need to protect rare species and habitats. But I could not find the documents to which the Plan refers ('Cambridgeshire Local Biodiveristy Action Plan' and 'Section 41') on either City or County Council websites or in this document itself, so I don't know which species or habitats might be considered 'rare'. But in general terms, yes we need to protect the ecology and biodiversity of our habitats, not just specific large sites, but also smaller areas that might be of interest/beauty locally (even if not an SSSI or other designated site).

---

### CHAPTER: 8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic &

### Question 8.31

---

## 18155 Object

Summary:

No

---

### CHAPTER: 8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic &

### 8.35

---

## 9766 Object

Summary:

While the LAF supports this for large and new developments, it also comments that Small developments can affect locally important habitats, even a disused large garden can be important. The wildlife in an area should perhaps not be considered to belong to the person owning the land, but to the community

### **10973 Object**

Summary:

The requirement to minimise the impacts of development on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity is included in the NPPF, therefore, Bidwells considers it is not necessary to repeat national policy in the Local Plan. Bidwells supports Option 81, to incorporate the requirement into Option 64. To reflect the wording of the NPPF, the requirement should state "development should provide suitable protection and enhancement of ecological features of nature conservation where possible".

### **7311 Support**

Summary:

This would require all sites to contribute to the well-being and health of the city in terms of biodiversity. It can be graded to sizes of developments but will be enable fair contributions to enhancing biodiversity as well as sustainability. It should be amended to allow pooling of biodiversity gain in adjacent sites, nearby green spaces and wildlife corridors.

### **9328 Support**

Summary:

Strongly support.

### **9578 Support**

Summary:

If any development takes place, as well as all other safeguards, biodiversity must be enhanced. This has not happened in the past and we must make amends for past errors.

### **9793 Support**

Summary:

This is very important for the sustainable development that the options paper stresses so heavily. If we are serious about this, the sites need to be assessed seriously by third parties. We feel it is incorrect to allow developers to make 'informed decisions' as clearly they will always decide that their project does not adversely impact biodiversity!

### **11325 Support**

Summary:

Yes.

### **12490 Support**

Summary:

Yes, even small developments can contribute hugely when they are considered city-wide - hence back gardens across the UK are so important. Just restricting biodiv considerations to large developments would miss a huge opportunity.

### **13768 Support**

Summary:

Opportunities for maintaining and where possible enhancing biodiversity should be addressed as part of all development proposals regardless of size. Guidance in this regard, including opportunities to reduce costs through identifying and replicating successful approaches, should be developed.

### **13925 Support**

Summary:

We support Option 79 as Option 16; Broad Location 7 will deliver a net gain in biodiversity by maintaining ecological features through mitigation measures and providing enhanced ecological features.

### **16746 Support**

Summary:

Support, but this approach would need to be well monitored

### **17769 Support**

Summary:

Natural England particularly welcomes Options 77 - 83 which aim to protect and enhance biodiversity through development, including nationally and local designated sites and priority habitats and species. We are pleased that Option 77 also refers to sites of geological importance. We believe that a policy which addresses all of these requirements would help to ensure adverse impacts of development on biodiversity is minimised and enhancement opportunities are maximised. Above all, policy/policies should ensure that development will only be supported where it can be adequately demonstrated that proposals will not have an adverse effect on biodiversity; where required, suitable mitigation measures must be acceptable and deliverable.

In line with NPPF requirements the above policy/policies should include a requirement for development to incorporate biodiversity/geodiversity enhancement, as well as protection.

### **7312 Object**

Summary:

This option only refers to larger sites and would not be applicable to smaller development / infill sites

### **9330 Object**

Summary:

Less desirable than option 79 in terms of ensuring easy and very local access for everyone to some natural green space. There should be the expectation, however, that larger developments would include more extensive such spaces, preferably linked by green corridors to green spaces beyond the new development.

### **12491 Object**

Summary:

No - this should be for every development

### **14512 Support**

Summary:

For obvious reasons.

### **17771 Support**

Summary:

Natural England particularly welcomes Options 77 - 83 which aim to protect and enhance biodiversity through development, including nationally and local designated sites and priority habitats and species. We are pleased that Option 77 also refers to sites of geological importance. We believe that a policy which addresses all of these requirements would help to ensure adverse impacts of development on biodiversity is minimised and enhancement opportunities are maximised. Above all, policy/policies should ensure that development will only be supported where it can be adequately demonstrated that proposals will not have an adverse effect on biodiversity; where required, suitable mitigation measures must be acceptable and deliverable.

In line with NPPF requirements the above policy/policies should include a requirement for development to incorporate biodiversity/geodiversity enhancement, as well as protection.



### **9331 Object**

Summary:

Less desirable than option 79 for same reasons as given under option 80 (see below)

Less desirable than option 79 in terms of ensuring easy and very local access for everyone to some natural green space. There should be the expectation, however, that larger developments would include more extensive such spaces, preferably linked by green corridors to green spaces beyond the new development.

### **12493 Object**

Summary:

I would rather that option 79 was added to option 64 to build-in as rigorous consideration of these matters as possible - they are of benefit to people and wildlife

### **7681 Support**

Summary:

very important element.

### **10975 Support**

Summary:

The requirement to minimise the impacts of development on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity is included in the NPPF, therefore, Bidwells considers it is not necessary to repeat national policy in the Local Plan. Bidwells supports Option 81, to incorporate the requirement into Option 64. To reflect the wording of the NPPF, the requirement should state "development should provide suitable protection and enhancement of ecological features of nature conservation where possible".

### **11326 Support**

Summary:

Good

### **13148 Support**

Summary:

so long as 'public realm' would include developments of less than 10 houses. a unified and holistic approach to biodiversity is welcome.

### **13931 Support**

Summary:

We support Option 81 as Option 16; Broad Location 7 will deliver a net gain in biodiversity by maintaining ecological features through mitigation measures and providing enhanced ecological features.

### **17772 Support**

Summary:

Natural England particularly welcomes Options 77 - 83 which aim to protect and enhance biodiversity through development, including nationally and local designated sites and priority habitats and species. We are pleased that Option 77 also refers to sites of geological importance. We believe that a policy which addresses all of these requirements would help to ensure adverse impacts of development on biodiversity is minimised and enhancement opportunities are maximised. Above all, policy/policies should ensure that development will only be supported where it can be adequately demonstrated that proposals will not have an adverse effect on biodiversity; where required, suitable mitigation measures must be acceptable and deliverable.

In line with NPPF requirements the above policy/policies should include a requirement for development to incorporate biodiversity/geodiversity enhancement, as well as protection.

**6994 Object**

Summary:

Yes. However, none of the suggested policies look remotely likely to be effective in reducing the real impact of any development on the biodiversity of the environment. There really is no substitute for leaving nature as it was before humans interfere(d).

**12107 Object**

Summary:

There is no need for a policy addressing this issue but detailed guidance should be provided in SPD guidance on Nature Conservation issues.

**15718 Object**

Summary:

We support Options 77 to 82, but consider that sight should not be lost of the importance to local people of all green spaces and their vital importance to the quality of life and recreation of local people.

**7285 Support**

Summary:

This has to be written into all planning.

**7313 Support**

Summary:

Some sites despite their tremendous wildlife value have not been designated as City/County Wildlife Site -- e.g. Chesterton Sidings (ref: Nature in Cambridgeshire No 43 -- 2001 pp7-16).

**9332 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**10613 Support**

Summary:

The Wildlife Trust supports the inclusion of a biodiversity enhancement policy, though none of the options presented are quite right.

**10682 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**10814 Support**

Summary:

Yes - developers would never do it unprompted

**11742 Support**

Summary:

yes to a policy

**12495 Support**

Summary:

Yes, this is a critical element of what makes Cambridge special, and we live in an area that is hugely deprived of wildlife due to the predominance of intensively farmed land.

**12497 Support**

Summary:

Yes, this is a critical factor of what makes Cambridge so special - please do liaise with the WT etc though to get this right.

**14264 Support**

Summary:

Biodiversity is the foundation of life. It is highly appropriate that the City Council should honour the legacy of Charles Darwin and also provide employment for ecologists.

**14998 Support**

Summary:

Yes, support.

## **15246 Support**

Summary:

Yes, the principle has to be that all proposed developments should make an assessment of impact on the natural and existing built environment, e.g. hedges, fences and walls are most likely features to be unwittingly swept away during site clearance yet both contribute significantly to local ecology by providing shelter and 'wildlife highways' through urban areas. It is not unknown for areas containing important species to be identified without a complete understanding of all the contributors to the creation of the habitat in which it thrives.

## **16483 Support**

Summary:

Yes

## **17892 Support**

Summary:

Yes

## **18157 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **10614 Object**

Summary:

The Wildlife Trust supports none of the suggested options

### **11748 Object**

Summary:

Prefer option 80.

A stand-alone option, not one dependent on Option 64, is required, and it is impractical to require smaller developments to enhance biodiversity, though they may be encouraged to do so.

### **18160 Object**

Summary:

Option 81

### **8469 Support**

Summary:

Options 80 or 81

### **9182 Support**

Summary:

Option 80. A stand-alone option, not one dependent on Option 64, is required, and it is impractical to require smaller developments to enhance biodiversity, though they may be encouraged to do so.

### **9334 Support**

Summary:

Option 79

### **10685 Support**

Summary:

Option 81, that it be incorporated into Option 64 (in chapter 7). Enhancement of biodiversity should not be considered as an optional extra. In Option 64 it should be seriously considered even for small developments, such as garden grabbing, which individually might appear benign, but small developments repeated over time can destroy ecological networks. The Local Plan should give support to conservation and historic areas where green areas and gardens have been eroded by development. As national guidelines recommends, the Local Plan must ensure that developments in historic areas take account of surrounding environment and context.

### **10815 Support**

Summary:

Option 79

### **12499 Support**

Summary:

79, added to 64 for maximum rigour

### **14019 Support**

Summary:

Option 79, as long as this does not affect individual house extension works (such as, say, building a work-from-home studio at the bottom of a garden)

### **14288 Support**

Summary:

Option 79 gives the strongest protection but I see no reason why it should not be cross referenced to option 64. Policy integration must make a more robust package.

### **15001 Support**

Summary:

Option 81.

### **16484 Support**

Summary:

Option 79, and stress the 'all'.

### **17894 Support**

Summary:

Option 80 - Enhancement of biodiversity as part of major developments

**9183 Support**

Summary:

There is a need to recognise that not all biodiversity is beneficial! Urban foxes etc.

**15004 Support**

Summary:

Future maintenance of trees etc. by the owner or occupier should be specified under the planning conditions as should control of invasive non-native species.

**16452 Support**

Summary:

No more housing development on Green Belt land (Option 1) until the space allocated for housing under the last Plan has been used up.

More housing development would take out more Green Belt and I am aware of the importance of the Green Belt for biodiversity and green space. Planned green spaces should include community gardens and fruit and nut orchards as these are far better habitats for wildlife than playing fields and other forms of monoculture, which are currently considered as green spaces.

**17896 Support**

Summary:

No

**18164 Support**

Summary:

No

**9184 Support**

Summary:

There is a need to recognise that not all biodiversity is beneficial! Urban foxes etc.

**9335 Support**

Summary:

We note that, in addition, larger developments must provide "...accessible natural greenspace within 300 metres (or 5 mins walk) of every home in England for exercise, relaxation and well-being" (from the Local Biodiversity Action Plan workstreams). We welcome this requirement and hope that it will be enforced.

**10612 Support**

Summary:

Support the inclusion of a biodiversity enhancement policy, but suggest that it should be wdiier than the options presented.

**15808 Support**

Summary:

Worth noting the valiuue of allotments.

**17897 Support**

Summary:

No

**18165 Support**

Summary:

No

### **7682 Support**

Summary:

Very important element

### **9768 Support**

Summary:

Small developments can affect locally important habitats, even a disused large garden can be important. The wildlife in an area should perhaps not be considered to belong to the person owning the land, but to the community

### **9795 Support**

Summary:

We support the idea of making enhanced biodiversity the objective of landscape projects; it could be interesting as is suggested to bring forward some of these projects on the Green Belt. However, the council itself should be involved in these worthwhile projects and not simply seek to pass the responsibility to developers or citizens.

### **10615 Support**

Summary:

The Wildlife Trust fully supports the inclusion of such a policy which is essential in order to promote the creation of a viable and functioning ecological network across the city and beyond and will help to deliver the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy objectives.

### **11327 Support**

Summary:

Support and enhance biodiversity - good.

### **12501 Support**

Summary:

Yes I think that this is important - and a great goal to have to open up the green belt that is otherwise inaccessible and wildlife-poor for the most part?

### **15247 Support**

Summary:

Large sites need to have this assessment. New developments should have gardens and other open space contiguous to enhance their wildlife value.

### **17774 Support**

Summary:

Natural England particularly welcomes Options 77 - 83 which aim to protect and enhance biodiversity through development, including nationally and local designated sites and priority habitats and species. We are pleased that Option 77 also refers to sites of geological importance. We believe that a policy which addresses all of these requirements would help to ensure adverse impacts of development on biodiversity is minimised and enhancement opportunities are maximised. Above all, policy/policies should ensure that development will only be supported where it can be adequately demonstrated that proposals will not have an adverse effect on biodiversity; where required, suitable mitigation measures must be acceptable and deliverable.

In line with NPPF requirements the above policy/policies should include a requirement for development to incorporate biodiversity/geodiversity enhancement, as well as protection.

### **17778 Support**

Summary:

We welcome Option 82 Support for strategic biodiversity enhancement proposals as this recognises the requirements of the NPPF and the importance of landscape scale biodiversity proposals at the local level. This will ensure that proposals where biodiversity enhancement is the primary objective are given appropriate support in the planning process. We agree that the 2011 Green Infrastructure Strategy will provide a useful starting point for the identification of proposals.

**10694 Object**

Summary:

No

**11750 Object**

Summary:

We do not see it necessary to develop policy here. While in a lot of cases a policy is needed, we need to guard against an automatic assumption that everything needs policy. Be careful we don't drown in them!

**12108 Object**

Summary:

There is no need for a separate policy on this matter but reference to the support for such enhancement should be incorporated in the above policy.

**8470 Support**

Summary:

yes

**9336 Support**

Summary:

Yes we support Option 82.

**10616 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**10816 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**13097 Support**

Summary:

Yes, larger landscape scale sites are critical for effective biodiversity enhancement and we support local policy development on this.

**14021 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**14306 Support**

Summary:

An excellent policy that should resonate with expertise within the Universities. Given the arable nature of much surrounding farm land this would be a good counterbalance.

**15009 Support**

Summary:

Yes, support.

**15719 Support**

Summary:

We support Options 77 to 82, but consider that site should not be lost of the importance to local people of all green spaces and their vital importance to the quality of life and recreation of local people.

**16485 Support**

Summary:

Yes.

**17898 Support**

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

**18167 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**17900 Object**

Summary:

No

**18169 Object**

Summary:

No

**12496 Support**

Summary:

These policies must be rigorously enforced and not just allowed to become 'Greenwash' on the part of developments

---

**17901 Object**

Summary:

No

**18170 Object**

Summary:

No

**9185 Support**

Summary:

The facilitation of existing habitats, including extension where appropriate, is preferable to the creation of artificial new ones.

**10695 Support**

Summary:

Action seems to be being taken according to Paragraph 8.37 and perhaps more paperwork would take resources that would be better put to use in implementing the existing policy, which covers up to 2020.

**11752 Support**

Summary:

The facilitation of existing habitats, including extension where appropriate, is preferable to the creation of artificial new ones.

---

**9337 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**9796 Support**

Summary:

We strongly support all measures to protect Cambridge's beautiful trees. Felling trees and inadequate planting programs are issues that arose strong passions in Cambridge's citizens.

**11329 Support**

Summary:

Cambridge needs not only to protect existing trees but to plant a lot more trees. So many residential areas have a bare, sad look. 'Leafy streets' is a complimentary description for a reason!

**12234 Support**

Summary:

Very strongly support the protection of trees as a requirement in this tree-starved county. Trees are also regarded as excellent for water take up (reduce flood risk) and for decontamination (see works of Prof B Ford for details).

**16486 Support**

Summary:

Strongly support these paragraphs.



**9338 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**12241 Support**

Summary:

Many old trees have been removed by the Council in the last 2 years. This policy seems at odds with the Council's actions. I think that the old trees should be allowed to continue unless dangerous.

**16487 Support**

Summary:

Strongly support these paragraphs.

---

**7683 Support**

Summary:

Trees are also extremely important to the liveability of the city.

### **10422 Object**

Summary:

Again this sounds all very heavy handed and inflexible. A replacement policy would be more sensible than preventing trees from being harmed. In Babraham road there was more concern by planners for trees in Strangeways than for people safely negotiating Babraham road. Inflexible policies get one into these sort of difficulties.

### **12503 Object**

Summary:

I don't like the 'wherever possible' element here which may allow developers to wriggle out of any obligations?

### **13688 Object**

Summary:

A flexible approach should be promoted.

The council seems to be inconsistent in its decisions. There are often good reasons to plant smaller trees to enhance an area where a tree has become overgrown or too large for its current environment.

### **14847 Object**

Summary:

In general I support this but would wish to see the criteria for judging whether tree should be felled made stronger so that clear evidence is needed to prove that the tree or trees needs to be felled.

### **17098 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.

### **17103 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.

### **6923 Support**

Summary:

Needs to be wider and protect trees that are threatened by ignorant insurance companies wrongly claiming subsidence to adjacent property, while at the same time recognising that even veteran trees die and need replacing.

### **7684 Support**

Summary:

Very important! Vital!

### **9340 Support**

Summary:

Strongly support

### **9579 Support**

Summary:

I am pleased to see a presumption in favour of retention of hedges and trees. I would also add that "current fashion" in arboculture must be avoided. There have been too many examples of major changes of mind every fifty years, and healthy trees sacrificed to the whims of fashion as they are no longer what is in vogue.

### **9797 Support**

Summary:

Yes, yes, yes. Strong policy to protect our trees!

### **9887 Support**

Summary:

to protect trees and hedges to enhance our natural living environment

## 10251 Support

Summary:

to protect trees and hedges to enhance our natural living environment

## 11330 Support

Summary:

Yes - so many people are frustrated by the 'bricks trump trees' problem - a presumption in favour of retention is a great idea and yes, replacement planting. Cannot support this strongly enough. UK in general is very tree poor compared to Euro neighbors. This would make a HUGE difference to quality of life if we could get more trees.'

## 12458 Support

Summary:

Another common sense item which enlightened builders followed a century ago - Cadbury at Bournville, for instance. We need trees.

## 12504 Support

Summary:

Broadly supportive of this policy

## 13359 Support

Summary:

I am in favour of the presumption in favour of the retention of hedges and older trees and especially "veteran trees" which enhance the city.

## 13610 Support

Summary:

Very important. To speak of an 'urban forest' in Cambridge is mildly exaggerated, though. Precisely for this reason, trees need to be protected and replaced.

## 14335 Support

Summary:

Very much support this policy

## 15248 Support

Summary:

The approach appears to be broadly correct. People are more aware of trees but this can lead to premature panic when water stress leading to early browning and leaf-fall is interpreted as disease. Felling should always be a last resort but a programme of harvesting and successor planting is fundamental to good tree and forest management and should be encouraged where appropriate, especially in open parkland and woodland before trees reach a stage of life when the risk of limb-drop becomes high.

## 16046 Support

Summary:

The unquestionable importance of trees and hedges emphasises the need for such a policy as this. Full protection of trees and hedges is essential as is new planting wherever possible. Trees and hedges have a huge value visually, provide essential wildlife habitat and help reduce pollution in the air.

## 16488 Support

Summary:

Strongly support.

## 16764 Support

Summary:

Trees and hedges are valuable and important.

## 16900 Support

Summary:

This policy option appears to be designed largely to protect existing trees and hedges etc. from new development, and we welcome that. We would support extending the policy as suggested to recognise the role of trees in the setting and character of the City and its neighbourhoods, and in providing environmental and social benefits. This applies just as much to trees in private gardens as it does in public spaces.

## 17776 Support

Summary:

Natural England particularly welcomes Options 77 - 83 which aim to protect and enhance biodiversity through development, including nationally and local designated sites and priority habitats and species. We are pleased that Option 77 also refers to sites of geological importance. We believe that a policy which addresses all of these requirements would help to ensure adverse impacts of development on biodiversity is minimised and enhancement opportunities are maximised. Above all, policy/policies should ensure that development will only be supported where it can be adequately demonstrated that proposals will not have an adverse effect on biodiversity; where required, suitable mitigation measures must be acceptable and deliverable.

In line with NPPF requirements the above policy/policies should include a requirement for development to incorporate biodiversity/geodiversity enhancement, as well as protection.

### **12112 Object**

Summary:

There is no need for a separate policy addressing this issue which should be dealt in SPD guidance on delivering 'high quality places'.

### **7092 Support**

Summary:

Yes.

### **7286 Support**

Summary:

Without being part of policy framework, overall attention to trees would suffer -- glad to see this.

### **8471 Support**

Summary:

yes

### **9341 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **9798 Support**

Summary:

Yes, a policy would be welcome.

### **9888 Support**

Summary:

yes to ensure trees and hedges are protected

### **10148 Support**

Summary:

yes TPOs provide vital protection for our heritage.

### **10253 Support**

Summary:

to protect trees and hedges to enhance our natural living environment

### **10602 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **10617 Support**

Summary:

The Wildlife Trust supports inclusion of such a policy

### **10696 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **10698 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **10817 Support**

Summary:

Cambridgeshire is one of the least wooded parts of England

### **11594 Support**

Summary:

I agree there is a need for a policy on this issue and I agree with that put forward

### **11754 Support**

Summary:

policy needed here

## 12505 Support

Summary:

Yes, trees are a critical element of what makes Cambridge a special urban environment.

## 12977 Support

Summary:

yes.

## 13110 Support

Summary:

We support the development of a policy to protect existing trees affected by development proposals, as preservation of trees can significantly improve the appearance and amenity value of new developments. With global warming, their shade will be increasingly important for keeping buildings cool in summer.

## 13906 Support

Summary:

Strongly support - trees have an immense significance and positive impact on wider residential community and environment

## 14023 Support

Summary:

Yes

## 14328 Support

Summary:

The presence of trees transforms the urban realm. Places such as Brooklands Avenue, Jesus Green and the Alexandra Gardens are such a joy.

It is clearly an issue of great concern to people in Cambridge and the policy should be backed up by educational bulletins for the public.

## 14336 Support

Summary:

Yes

## 15010 Support

Summary:

Yes, support.

## 15764 Support

Summary:

A presumption in favour of the retention and enhancement of trees etc makes good sense. Not sure that a requirement to replace will provide sufficient disincentive to prevent premature felling.

## 16489 Support

Summary:

Yes

## 17421 Support

Summary:

Trees - a clearer set of sequential tests should be implemented to protect trees, given recent unnecessary losses of trees. Developments that retain existing trees create better living environments, better integrated with their local area

## 17903 Support

Summary:

Yes - as suggested - very important

## 18171 Support

Summary:

Yes

### **17904 Object**

Summary:

No

### **7685 Support**

Summary:

New tree planting in existing neighbourhoods is also needed. A line of trees can transform a street!

### **9186 Support**

Summary:

The plan should recognise that trees contribute to biodiversity and to air quality as well as to the visual amenity, and hence their protection enhances the other environmental policies.

### **9342 Support**

Summary:

Add that replacement trees should normally be chosen from species native to the UK.

### **10226 Support**

Summary:

Planting heritage varieties of fruit and nut trees should be particularly encouraged. Also where a large tree is removed and replaced with a smaller tree, a greater number of small trees should be planted, to ensure similar levels of habitat, improvement in air quality, etc.

### **10702 Support**

Summary:

Amend the first sentence to "This option would allow the development of a policy to protect existing trees." [Omitting affected by development proposals]. Trees/hedges in conservations areas, such as North Newtown, are important. Their removal degrades the environment and affects the visual amenity. The removal of some notable trees/hedges has been allowed by the planning authorities, so this option 83 is needed and should be enforced, particularly in the historic residential areas surrounding the city centre, such as North Newtown.

Insert at bullet 2 Protection of trees that have or WILL have ...

### **11494 Support**

Summary:

The city council's tree officer seems to have been rather zealous of late. A tree protection regime should apply to them also; in other words they should not be both judge and jury, able to decide on their own schemes without equivalent TPO consultation

### **11598 Support**

Summary:

A new policy needs to be added: which is a commitment to a Tree Planting Policy. So CCC policy would not only be to protect existing trees but to increase the number of (large) trees in the City - eg a programme of tree planting along all roads in the city (eg limes, planes) and possibly to think in terms of "garden estates" with new housing developments, and possibly also to see if there are any sites where new woodland could be established.

### **11756 Support**

Summary:

The plan should recognise that trees contribute to biodiversity and to air quality as well as to the visual amenity, and hence their protection enhances the other environmental policies.

### **12249 Support**

Summary:

Replacement planting should be sufficient to at least match the lost coverage within 5 years. It is too easy for developers to remove mature trees and replace with the same number of saplings - and then fail to meet the costs and obligations of nurturing the growth of these saplings.

### **12253 Support**

Summary:

Permission should be required before any tree of trunk diameter greater than 6 inches (at its widest point) can be destroyed.

### **12508 Support**

Summary:

I would add that trees should not be felled where they disrupt an important wildlife corridor.

### **13149 Support**

Summary:

Consideration should also be given to the suitability of replacing felled trees with the same species. Drought and high temperature tolerance should be considered when choosing replanting species.

## 13240 Support

Summary:

Any emerging policy should be in compliance with NPPF paragraph 118 which states:

'planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss...'

The Council's proposed policy should incorporate the flexibility provided in the NPPF, in circumstances where the loss of veteran trees may be outweighed by the benefits of development such as providing much needed new homes.

## 13912 Support

Summary:

To take into account felling of trees in anticipation of development - where this has been done, and significant trees have been felled, development should provide similar replacements

## 14029 Support

Summary:

Although some new developments do plant trees as part of their building works, it is so often the case that once building works have finished, the trees are abandoned, and if they do not 'take', they are cut down and not replaced. I would like to see contributions towards the long-term maintenance of trees planted as a result of large developments.

## 14308 Support

Summary:

I would like to suggest the council consider recording memorial trees, and other trees with special significance. On a number of occasions the history of a tree is lost, or those who know it find out late about proposals which affect it. Knowing the background of a tree is important so well informed decisions can be made.

## 14318 Support

Summary:

The city's tree lined streets should be identified with a view to protecting them in the long term. Plans should be developed for planting cycles/strategies to maintain avenues of trees both alongside roads and on the city's green spaces.

## 14329 Support

Summary:

I think care needs to be taken to ensure that trees with substantial value are protected; but still enable action to be taken against those which are causing a problem - eg. a fast growing conifer tree or hedge which has got out of control and is overshadowing a street.

## 15014 Support

Summary:

Navigation authority (Cam Conservators) may need to use its statutory powers to override Preservation Status in order to undertake emergency works to clear obstructions from the navigation channel on grounds of health and safety. The adjacent land is usually owned by third parties so the navigation authority cannot be responsible for replanting lost trees.

## 17423 Support

Summary:

Trees - a clearer set of sequential tests should be implemented to protect trees, given recent unnecessary losses of trees. Developments that retain existing trees create better living environments, better integrated with their local area

## 17571 Support

Summary:

Cambridge has some of the worst urban air pollution in the country, largely because of its congested traffic and location which allows fumes to collect under an atmospheric inversion. This leads to breathing and health problems this will have to be acted on.

## 18175 Support

Summary:

No

**17906 Object**

Summary:

No

**10704 Support**

Summary:

Include a mandatory tree replacement policy - if not on same site then very close/nearby? Replacement of trees is especially important in conservation and historic areas and the centre of Cambridge.

**17424 Support**

Summary:

Trees - a clearer set of sequential tests should be implemented to protect trees, given recent unnecessary losses of trees. Developments that retain existing trees create better living environments, better integrated with their local area

**18177 Support**

Summary:

No

---

**17910 Object**

Summary:

No

---

**17104 Object**

Summary:

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

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

---

**9343 Object**

Summary:

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

**10978 Support**

Summary:

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

**16492 Support**

Summary:

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

**17779 Support**

Summary:

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



**12114 Object**

Summary:

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

**6995 Support**

Summary:

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

**7110 Support**

Summary:

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

**8472 Support**

Summary:

yes

**9344 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**10149 Support**

Summary:

yes, air conditioning causes noise pollution and is increasing.

**10619 Support**

Summary:

The Wildlife Trust supports the inclusion of relevant pollution prevention policies

**10705 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**10818 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**11759 Support**

Summary:

yes

**12979 Support**

Summary:

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

**13624 Support**

Summary:

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

**14032 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**15016 Support**

Summary:

Yes, support.

**15250 Support**

Summary:

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

## 16496 Support

Summary:

Yes

## 17425 Support

Summary:

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

## 17907 Support

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

## 18187 Support

Summary:

Yes

---

## CHAPTER: 8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic &

## Question 8.43

---

## 9346 Object

Summary:

Clarify final bullet point.

## 18097 Object

Summary:

See extract 4 of submission relating to groundwater.

## 18190 Object

Summary:

No

## 9187 Support

Summary:

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

## 11761 Support

Summary:

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

## 15021 Support

Summary:

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

## 17426 Support

Summary:

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

**17802 Object**

Summary:

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

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

**17911 Object**

Summary:

No

**18192 Object**

Summary:

No

**17427 Support**

Summary:

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

**15023 Support**

Summary:

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

**16498 Support**

Summary:

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

**9347 Support**

Summary:

Yes.

**16499 Support**

Summary:

Broadly support.

**17781 Support**

Summary:

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

**12116 Object**

Summary:

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

**6996 Support**

Summary:

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

**8473 Support**

Summary:

yes

**9348 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**10819 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**11762 Support**

Summary:

yes

**13124 Support**

Summary:

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

**14034 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**15026 Support**

Summary:

Yes, support.

**15252 Support**

Summary:

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

**16501 Support**

Summary:

Yes.

**17428 Support**

Summary:

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

**17909 Support**

Summary:

Pollution - don't build housing next to M11/A14. This is risky for young children - research shows an increased rate of asthma and in older vulnerable adults with respiratory conditions higher level of illness.  
Open green space that is natural and uncluttered by non-natural items, that has natural restful sounds and peaceful space and biodiversity are shown to offer benefits great for mental health. Research shows that sound and air pollution greatly increase stress in humans.

**17913 Support**

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

## **18194 Support**

Summary:

Yes

---

### **CHAPTER: 8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic &**

### **Question 8.46**

---

## **17914 Object**

Summary:

No

## **18195 Object**

Summary:

No

## **9188 Support**

Summary:

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

## **10706 Support**

Summary:

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

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

## **11764 Support**

Summary:

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

## **15029 Support**

Summary:

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

## **17430 Support**

Summary:

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

## **18365 Support**

Summary:

South Cambridgeshire District Council is consulting on whether its new Local

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

to work with the City Council on this.

### **17915 Object**

Summary:

No

### **18198 Object**

Summary:

No

### **6924 Support**

Summary:

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

### **17431 Support**

Summary:

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

### **10640 Object**

Summary:

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

### **11589 Object**

Summary:

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

### **7686 Support**

Summary:

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

### **9349 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **11649 Support**

Summary:

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

### **12510 Support**

Summary:

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

### **14341 Support**

Summary:

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

### **15253 Support**

Summary:

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

### **16749 Support**

Summary:

This should also agree noise controls on existing industrial and other major sources of noise.

### **17782 Support**

Summary:

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

### 6997 Support

Summary:

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

### 8474 Support

Summary:

yes

### 9350 Support

Summary:

Yes

### 10820 Support

Summary:

Yes

### 11768 Support

Summary:

on balance, yes to a policy

### 12511 Support

Summary:

Yes

### 14036 Support

Summary:

Yes

### 14343 Support

Summary:

Yes

### 14355 Support

Summary:

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

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

### 15030 Support

Summary:

Yes, support.

### 16502 Support

Summary:

Yes. I support Option 86 on this.

### 17116 Support

Summary:

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

### 17916 Support

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

### 18200 Support

Summary:

Yes



### **18202 Object**

Summary:

No

### **9189 Support**

Summary:

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

### **11934 Support**

Summary:

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

### **12261 Support**

Summary:

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

### **12513 Support**

Summary:

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

### **15031 Support**

Summary:

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

### **17547 Support**

Summary:

There should be a much stricter attitude to loud noise.

### **17917 Support**

Summary:

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

### **18271 Support**

Summary:

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

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

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

### **17918 Object**

Summary:

No

### **18205 Object**

Summary:

No

### **9191 Support**

Summary:

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

**9351 Support**

Summary:

yes

**15254 Support**

Summary:

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

**17783 Support**

Summary:

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

**12118 Object**

Summary:

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

**8475 Support**

Summary:

yes

**9352 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**11771 Support**

Summary:

yes to a policy

**14038 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**15035 Support**

Summary:

Yes, support.

**16503 Support**

Summary:

Yes.

**17919 Support**

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

**18208 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**9192 Support**

Summary:

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

**11772 Support**

Summary:

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

**14040 Support**

Summary:

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

**17920 Support**

Summary:

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

**18096 Support**

Summary:

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

---

**17921 Object**

Summary:

No

**18212 Object**

Summary:

No

---

**9889 Support**

Summary:

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

### **7687 Object**

Summary:

Vital.

### **10257 Object**

Summary:

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

### **10982 Object**

Summary:

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

Response to Option 84:

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

### **14704 Object**

Summary:

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

### **9353 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **9580 Support**

Summary:

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

### **12461 Support**

Summary:

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

### **12515 Support**

Summary:

All new lighting should be low energy in my opinion.

### **14351 Support**

Summary:

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

### **15413 Support**

Summary:

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

### **17785 Support**

Summary:

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

### **6998 Object**

Summary:

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

### **10259 Object**

Summary:

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

### **12119 Object**

Summary:

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

### **8476 Support**

Summary:

yes

### **9354 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **9799 Support**

Summary:

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

### **9892 Support**

Summary:

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

### **10621 Support**

Summary:

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

### **11774 Support**

Summary:

yes

### **11975 Support**

Summary:

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

### **12516 Support**

Summary:

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

### **12980 Support**

Summary:

yes

### **14042 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **15037 Support**

Summary:

Yes, support.

## **15255 Support**

Summary:

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

## **16511 Support**

Summary:

Yes.

## **16860 Support**

Summary:

Yes there is a need for a policy on light pollution

## **17118 Support**

Summary:

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

## **17922 Support**

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

## **18213 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**17923 Object**

Summary:

No

**18215 Object**

Summary:

No

**9193 Support**

Summary:

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

**9893 Support**

Summary:

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

**10261 Support**

Summary:

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

**11497 Support**

Summary:

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

**11775 Support**

Summary:

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

**12265 Support**

Summary:

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

**16512 Support**

Summary:

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

**16863 Support**

Summary:

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

---

**17924 Object**

Summary:

No

**18216 Object**

Summary:

No

**7688 Support**

Summary:

This is often overlooked and I'm pleased to see it included. It reinforces many of your other goals.

### **9355 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **9581 Support**

Summary:

I would agree that reducing street clutter is an excellent idea.

### **10273 Support**

Summary:

to cut down street clutter to enhance our living environment

### **12462 Support**

Summary:

Another self-evidently sensible policy.

### **15256 Support**

Summary:

In my view the 'swift tower' falls firmly into this category. It has little aesthetic merit and resembles a 1930s advertising hoarding, possibly for a popular fizzy drink. There is a need for well-ordered local advertisement space to reduce the extent of fly-posting for local and community events. Street clutter is a persistent problem but until we can get a coherent approach to street signage it is unlikely to be reduced as each 'informative' appears to have its own unique mandatory regulatory requirements. Any permanent cure probably requires action by national government but there is little likelihood of that.



**12120 Object**

Summary:

There is no need for a separate policy on this issue. Other policies incorporated in the plan should allow these matters to be addressed.

**8477 Support**

Summary:

yes

**9356 Support**

Summary:

yes

**9894 Support**

Summary:

to cut down street clutter to enhance our living environment

**10274 Support**

Summary:

to cut down street clutter to enhance our living environment

**10821 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**11500 Support**

Summary:

Support

**11782 Support**

Summary:

we think it is a really good idea to have a policy here. The concept of visual pollution is important and often overlooked - we are cluttered with signs, notices hoardings etc which often disfigure views.

**14045 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**16514 Support**

Summary:

Yes.

**17925 Support**

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

**18218 Support**

Summary:

Yes

**17926 Object**

Summary:

No

**18219 Object**

Summary:

No

**9194 Support**

Summary:

The design of buildings can itself involve visual pollution! There have been a number of cases in the last decade involving the addition of brightly coloured, almost fluorescent, panels to buildings, and this should be discouraged (through a specific policy requirement) in future.

**11784 Support**

Summary:

The design of buildings can itself involve visual pollution! There have been a number of cases in the last decade involving the addition of brightly coloured, almost fluorescent, panels to buildings, and this should be discouraged (through a specific policy requirement) in future.

**12268 Support**

Summary:

Requiring shops show what lighting is required when open and what lower level will be required when shut. Without a requirement, then commercial premises will keep the exterior lights bright.

**14052 Support**

Summary:

I would like to see this policy applied to conservation areas. All examples of visually-polluting elements should apply for retrospective planning permission, and if it fails, action should be taken to remove it (not simply leave it be). One example should be the large billboard outside Mickey Flynn's in Mill Road West.

**16516 Support**

Summary:

Add mobile phone masts to bullet point 3.

---

**17927 Object**

Summary:

No

**18220 Object**

Summary:

No

---