

**APPENDIX D: ANALYSIS, RESPONSES AND PREFERRED APPROACH TO THE DENSITY SECTION, PLUS SUMMARIES OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED.**

**ISSUE: HOUSING DENSITY**

<b>Total representations: 91</b>							
<b>Object: 38</b>				<b>Support: 53</b>			
<b>OPTION 102</b>		<b>OPTION 103</b>		<b>OPTION 104</b>		<b>OPTION 105</b>	
<b>SUPPORT:</b> <b>13</b>	<b>OBJECT:</b> <b>2</b>	<b>SUPPORT:</b> <b>2</b>	<b>OBJECT:</b> <b>4</b>	<b>SUPPORT:</b> <b>1</b>	<b>OBJECT:</b> <b>4</b>	<b>SUPPORT:</b> <b>0</b>	<b>OBJECT:</b> <b>5</b>

<b>OPTION NUMBER/OTHER</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES</b>
General comments – Housing Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing density will impact on local transport infrastructure and services;</li> <li>Cambridge is a compact city and any further efficient use of land should be supported through provision of high quality cycle provision. High levels of car parking should be resisted:</li> <li>There is a clear and demonstrable need for this policy if new developments are considered;</li> <li>The policy would need to suit local circumstances;</li> <li>Cross-boundary approach is needed with South Cambridgeshire;</li> <li>The population of Cambridge should not expand any further;</li> <li>Setting density is in conflict with residential space standards;</li> <li>There is a need for a policy, but one which sets maximum rather than minimum densities;</li> <li>Setting densities should be avoided and each site density assessed on its own merits. Arbitrary thresholds could easily result in inappropriate developments in sensitive areas;</li> <li>Any density policy must include safeguards to ensure that the new development fits in with the existing development context;</li> <li>An additional option is required which seeks generally higher densities in central areas, but stresses the importance of also safeguarding the historic core of the city, and lower densities on the fringes of the city to respect the adjoining Green Belt, to ensure that the compact nature of Cambridge is not harmed and the need for family housing is also met;</li> <li>Higher densities should only be possible in areas with</li> </ul>

	good transport infrastructure.
Option 102: No specific density policy or requirements – design led approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option will provide more capacity to deal with growth;</li> <li>• It would allow local context and the housing market to determine the appropriate density on each site. This would result in more contextually appropriate development than Options 103, 104 and 105, which lack flexibility;</li> <li>• Density must be dependent on site and context. Tall buildings must be dealt with by separate policy;</li> <li>• Density is vitally important to the well-being of the city’s residents;</li> <li>• Some sites where high densities have been achieved have given rise to problems with inadequate internal and external spaces and car parking;</li> <li>• Need to avoid cramming development into sites whether following a design-led or dwellings per hectare approach;</li> <li>• Need to specify a maximum density.</li> </ul>
Option 103: Establish minimum threshold densities in the City Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Denser housing is needed;</li> <li>• Option 102 would allow local context and the housing market to determine the appropriate density on each site. This would result in more contextually appropriate development than Options 103, 104 and 105, which lack flexibility;</li> <li>• There should be an option to set maximum densities, rather than minimums;</li> <li>• Densities should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.</li> </ul>
Option 104: Establish a minimum threshold of average net density within 400 metres of district and local centres on high quality public transport routes and transport interchanges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50 dwellings per hectare is a realistic level in such areas;</li> <li>• Option 102 would allow local context and the housing market to determine the appropriate density on each site. This would result in more contextually appropriate development than Options 103, 104 and 105, which lack flexibility;</li> <li>• There should be an option to set maximum densities, rather than minimums;</li> <li>• Densities should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.</li> </ul>
Option 105: Minimum density of 30 dph for all development sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option was not supported by any respondents;</li> <li>• Option 102 would allow local context and the housing market to determine the appropriate density on each site. This would result in more contextually appropriate development than Options 103, 104 and 105, which lack flexibility;</li> <li>• There should be an option to set maximum densities, rather than minimums;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Densities should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.</li> </ul>
<b>NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b>	
No additional options have been suggested.	

<b>SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT</b>	
<b>Option Number</b>	<b>Analysis</b>
Option 102	Option 102 could potentially benefit community and wellbeing as it would assess new developments on a case-by-case basis and enable a range of proposals to come forward in response to market demand. Although the option provides scope to take local context into account, there is a risk that developers are overly ambitious in the number of units per site. Overlooking location and surrounding context could have an adverse effect on landscape and cultural heritage. Similarly, the option would allow for taller buildings, which could have a negative effect on townscape.
Option 103	Establishing a minimum density requirement in the City centre, as set out by Option 103, may contribute to maintaining and improving the quality of the centre by making the best use of existing services and public transport links, and by increasing the viability of sustainable transport through a reduction in average journey lengths. However, a minimum density may lead to developers maximizing development opportunities, which could have a detrimental effect on the historic character of the city centre. Outside of the centre, proposals would be judged on a case-by-case basis, taking into account contextual criteria, which could benefit some of the more deprived areas identified in Cambridge.
Option 104	Option 104 is likely to have a positive effect on communities that fall within the areas the Option covers (e.g. District and Local Centres), on the basis that 'walkable neighbourhoods' are typically based on a 400m (5 minute walking time) catchment, which this option would enable. Subsequently a positive effect on sustainable transport could be expected as journey lengths are minimised. The option would promote efficient land use and is likely to support existing local facilities, with further benefits for the local economy. It should however be noted that the option would not leave opportunities for context driven design and could therefore result in character changes to existing areas that are typically low density.
Option 105	There is potential to combine options 104 and 105 to maximise the resulting benefits. This would include a minimum average density threshold within the City Centre boundary, a minimum threshold within 400m of District and Local Centres (on transport routes) and for areas outside this, proposals would be judged on a case-by-case basis.

	<p>Applying a blanket minimum density for all new developments would ensure the efficient use of land, and flexibility to have higher densities at appropriate sites. This may contribute to reducing carbon emissions through shortened journey lengths and the subsequent increased viability of sustainable transport modes. However, the Option 105 does not take into account specific context or allow for a design driven approach. This could result in sustainable locations that are suited to higher densities, e.g. the City Centre or areas around District and Local Centres not being optimised. Conversely, it does not allow for one-off low density development if required in specific circumstances, which could adversely affect areas for example those containing heritage assets.</p>
--	---

#### KEY EVIDENCE

- Cambridge City Council (2012). Cambridge Local Plan - Towards 2031. Issues and Options Report Appendix C: Urban Densities

#### CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Not applicable

#### ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The National Planning Policy Framework recognises that *'good design is a key aspect of sustainable development'* (Para 58). In addition it does not set minimum density requirements, but instead requires councils to set out their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances (Para 47). Given this, four options for policy relating to density were put forward for consultation, of which three options (103, 104, 105) proposed to establish minimum thresholds for density and the other option 102, proposed an option to assess new development on a case-by case basis. Taking an approach that proposes to assess the density of new development on a case-by-case basis against local character and other design and sustainability policies is entirely consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.

The density of residential development describes the number of houses or flats that are developed on a site. Density can be measured in a number of ways, but it is typically calculated by the number of dwellings per hectare (DPH). By increasing density, land can be used more efficiently and can play an important role in delivering much needed housing and employment, as well as supporting local facilities and services as well as public transport. However, higher density creates challenges in delivering high quality development and in successfully accommodating functional aspects of a scheme, such as bins, bicycles, cars and private and public open space. The juxtaposition of high density developments next to low density ones has the potential to adversely affect the character of lower density areas. As a consequence, high density development may not be appropriate in some contexts.

Overall, some respondents agreed that there was a need for a policy related to the issue of density. Some also recognised the scope for higher densities in areas where

there is good access to public transport, but stressed that any policy would need to safeguard the historic core and ensure that new development 'fits in' with existing context. These points are noted and with regards to the importance of responding to context and development respecting the heritage of the city these issues are addressed through options 61-68, which consider the delivery of high quality design and protection and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment.

Consultation on all four options prompted suggestions that maximum densities should be established instead of minimum thresholds, to prevent 'cramming' and issues related to inadequate internal and external spaces. It is considered that a policy of this nature would be too restrictive and may lead to sites within sustainable locations, which could support higher densities, not being optimised. Higher densities do not automatically equate inappropriate, space poor developments. Unfortunately many schemes are perceived as excessively dense because they struggle to deal with providing a comfortable environment or the more functional challenges of accommodating bikes, cars and bins. Through well thought out, careful design, it is possible to achieve good quality higher density living environments, for example the award winning development Accordia demonstrates this. Indeed, 'capping' densities across the city would not in itself prevent inadequate living environments. The issue of residential space standards is being addressed through options 106-110.

Considering options 103-105, concerns were raised that establishing minimum densities could result in inappropriate development in sensitive areas and would remove the flexibility required to allow development to respond to site specific factors and the housing market. As part of this concern, many respondents outlined a preference for a design-led approach (option 102) where appropriate density was considered on a case-by-case basis. This raises the question as to why we need to set a minimum threshold for density. Essentially, the main thrust of options 103-105 put forward within the Issues and Options Report is to promote the efficient use of land and to support local facilities and public transport. Looking at past trends however, the average net density of development (above 9 dwellings) in Cambridge measured in March 2011 was 65 dph (Cambridgeshire County Council Research Team) and despite this representing a drop in comparison to a peak of 115 dph in 2008, it is not expected that Cambridge will experience a significant reduction in densities given factors such as land availability, the need for growth and market demand. In addition, whilst it is appropriate in some locations to achieve higher densities (as promoted in options 103 and 104), it is recognised this may not be appropriate for all sites that come forward. In some cases, especially on smaller sites, achieving a minimum density that balances against other planning, highways and design matters may be difficult. In reality, the appropriate density of any scheme will depend upon factors such as the context of the site, the prevailing character and the overall location within Cambridge along with the type of development proposed.

A number of respondents supported option 102, which proposes to assess the density of new development on a case-by-case basis against local character, and

other design and sustainability policies. However concern was raised whether this approach to determining the appropriate density would be enforceable and whether such an approach would give rise to overdevelopment. Considering the issue of enforceability, it is important to note that the current 'Designing Cambridge' policies of the 2006 Local Plan (3/4, 3/7 and 3/12) are amongst the most used policies in determining planning applications. These policies consider the development's interaction with the context, its overall quality and accessibility, sustainability and scale and they have been tested at appeal on numerous occasions. These 'tried and tested' policies of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006), therefore form a sound basis for the development of a criteria based approach to developing policies with regards to responding to context, delivering high quality places and the design of new buildings (Options 61-63 respectively), which could effectively cover the issue of density.

Furthermore, it is important to remember that any future policies developed will not be read in isolation and will be considered as a whole, so with regards to the concern of overdevelopment, potential future policies relating to sustainability and climate change, tall buildings, high quality design, and residential space standards for example, would all be taken into account. This point is equally pertinent, when considering the reverse scenario of whether option 102 could potentially allow for very low-density, unsustainable forms of development. It is considered that through clearly written design and sustainability policies, the efficient use of land could still be promoted.

The National Planning Policy Framework recognises that 'good design is a key aspect of sustainable development' (Para 58). In addition it does not set minimum density requirements, but instead requires councils to set out their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances (Para 47). Therefore taking an approach that proposes to assess the density of new development on a case-by-case basis against local character and other design and sustainability policies is entirely consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

The recommendation is to pursue Option 102, and take a design led approach to density, assessing new developments on a case-by-case basis against local character, and other design and sustainability policies. Additional reference could be made within Chapter 6 (Sustainable development, climate change, water and flooding) and Chapter 7 (Delivering high quality places) as to the positive role that increased density can play in making efficient use of land and supporting local facilities and transport networks.

---

# REPRESENTATIONS SUMMARIES - DENSITY

---

---

**CHAPTER: 9 - Delivering High Quality Housing      9.31**

---

**12567 Object**

Summary:  
But this also leads to increased pressure on transport links, services etc. Cambridge is a compact pre-medieval city that was not designed to withstand dense development in the way other cities can.

---

**CHAPTER: 9 - Delivering High Quality Housing      9.33**

---

**12568 Object**

Summary:  
And also impact very negatively on transport, services etc.

---

**CHAPTER: 9 - Delivering High Quality Housing      9.34**

---

**15408 Support**

Summary:  
Strongly agree, and this has led to a compact city.  
Use of large amounts of land space for car parking should be resisted, but new streets should make space for proper cycle provision, not narrow cycle lanes.

### **12580 Object**

Summary:

I am concerned about the language used here that suggests that the council may be powerless to stop over-ambitious developers from over-developing sites- is this not in the council's own control to stop this from happening? There ought to be caps to prevent over-development of sites, not minimum criteria that achieve the opposite.

### **14249 Object**

Summary:

Do Not Support. Better to specify a maximum density for any development in keeping with the density in surrounding areas.

### **6935 Support**

Summary:

Good

### **7693 Support**

Summary:

I'd rather see a heavy emphasis on design.

### **9975 Support**

Summary:

We feel that this option will provide more capacity for dealing with growth. We believe that it can be administered well by Planning Officers to ensure that developers expectations are managed appropriately and negotiations do not become protracted.

### **10995 Support**

Summary:

Bidwells supports the inclusion of Option 102 over Options 103, 104 and 105, as it would allow local context and the housing market to determine the appropriate density on each site. This would result in more contextually appropriate development than Options 103, 104 and 105, which lack flexibility.

### **11419 Support**

Summary:

Criteria for a design led approach seem good, but are they enforceable?

### **12477 Support**

Summary:

Density must depend on the site and its context. NB tall buildings must be resisted by other policies.

### **12574 Support**

Summary:

This to me appears to be the best option out a range of options none of which I particularly like. The emphasis here seems to continually be on getting as much out of a site as humanly possible, rather than taking a cautious approach and address what's best for the site and the local area. Realistically Cambridge's housing needs will only be addressed by significant encroachment into the green belt, but the city could be ruined by an attempt to cram very high density development in for actually relatively little gain in terms of actual dwelling numbers.

### **12985 Support**

Summary:

Support.

### **13502 Support**

Summary:

Deal with density issues on a case-by-case basis.

### **13962 Support**

Summary:

The Consortium supports the inclusion of Option 102 over Options 103, 104 and 105, as it would allow local context and the housing market to determine the appropriate density of a development. Option 102 would result in more contextually appropriate development when compared to Options 103, 104 and 105, all of which lack flexibility.

### **15884 Support**

Summary:

A design-led approach (as opposed to a minimum density target approach) can support innovation and creativity as part of the planning and design process, thereby enabling the formation of distinct and balanced communities, which exhibit their own character and identity. Land at Coldham's Lane, Cherry Hinton can make a significant positive contribution to local area regeneration, whilst supporting the sustainable growth strategy for Cambridge as a whole. The proposed residential development will ensure the active use of an existing vacant brownfield site, within a highly-sustainable and accessible location. New Strategic Open Space will meet the recreational and sustainable transport needs of future residents.



## 16030 Support

Summary:

It is the City that knows too well that density levels are vital to the well being of all residents. No more 2 bedroom flats for sale in Hong Kong but well designed European architecture where families live happily in flats. Good parking underground with space around for people to breath.

## 17448 Support

Summary:

Housing density - should be design-led not imposed. Overly high densities have been achieved on some sites by failing to provide adequate internal space, adequate open space, sufficient parking to avoid overspill, etc

---

### CHAPTER: 9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

### Option 103 - Establish minimum threshold densities in the city centre

---

## 6936 Object

Summary:

Disagree

## 10998 Object

Summary:

Bidwells supports the inclusion of Option 102 over Options 103, 104 and 105, as it would allow local context and the housing market to determine the appropriate density on each site. This would result in more contextually appropriate development than Options 103, 104 and 105, which lack flexibility.

## 12585 Object

Summary:

Why are there no options to set maximum densities - this document has already acknowledged that developer-led over-development can be an issue? For relatively little gain in actual housing numbers (relative to what appears to actually be needed) I don't see the reason to attempt to cram even more housing into the city centre, thereby ruining exactly what we're all trying to protect?

## 13504 Object

Summary:

Deal with density issues on a case-by-case basis.

## 11418 Support

Summary:

Denser housing is needed in UK overall.

## 14251 Support

Summary:

Do Not Support. Better to specify a maximum density for any development in keeping with the density in surrounding areas.

---

### CHAPTER: 9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

### Option 104 - Establish a minimum threshold of average net density within 400m of District and Local Centres

---

## 6937 Object

Summary:

Disagree

## 11000 Object

Summary:

Bidwells supports the inclusion of Option 102 over Options 103, 104 and 105, as it would allow local context and the housing market to determine the appropriate density on each site. This would result in more contextually appropriate development than Options 103, 104 and 105, which lack flexibility.

## 12586 Object

Summary:

Why are there no options to set maximum densities - this document has already acknowledged that developer-led over-development can be an issue? For relatively little gain in actual housing numbers (relative to what appears to actually be needed) I don't see the reason to attempt to cram even more housing into the city centre, thereby ruining exactly what we're all trying to protect?

## 13508 Object

Summary:

Deal with density issues on a case-by-case basis.

## 9952 Support

Summary:

I think 50 dph is a realistic level for such areas.

### **6938 Object**

Summary:

Disagree

### **11002 Object**

Summary:

Bidwells supports the inclusion of Option 102 over Options 103, 104 and 105, as it would allow local context and the housing market to determine the appropriate density on each site. This would result in more contextually appropriate development than Options 103, 104 and 105, which lack flexibility.

### **12588 Object**

Summary:

Why are there no options to set maximum densities - this document has already acknowledged that developer-led over-development can be an issue? For relatively little gain in actual housing numbers (relative to what appears to actually be needed) I don't see the reason to attempt to cram even more housing into the city centre, thereby ruining exactly what we're all trying to protect?

### **13509 Object**

Summary:

Deal with density issues on a case-by-case basis.

### **14255 Object**

Summary:

Do Not Support

Better to specify a maximum density for any development in keeping with the density in surrounding areas.

### **7003 Object**

Summary:

The primary issue here is that there is a need NOT to expand the population of Cambridge - in any density of housing.

Considering the existing parts of Cambridge, there are pleasant existing areas of the city at a wide range of housing densities (e.g. the Mill Rd end of Ross St. at one end through to Beaumont Rd or Barrow Rd at the other); but there are also horrible developments (e.g. George Nuttall Close, Orchard Park) at high densities.

So I do not believe that regulating density will in itself solve any problems, and think that Option 102 is the most appropriate of those offered.

### **14845 Object**

Summary:

This is all in direct conflict with residential space standards. Have an option for maximum (not minimum) density. Stop approving poor quality developments that simply seek to pack the most people into the least possible space.

### **15267 Object**

Summary:

Setting densities should be avoided as they could become the starting point for new development rather than an upper limit.

### **7114 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **9486 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **10730 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **12382 Support**

Summary:

There is a clear and demonstrable need for a policy. The mix of recent construction is that demonstration.

### **12590 Support**

Summary:

Yes, and I would err on the side of setting maximum, not minimum, limits to density. I don't like the word 'efficiency' which seems to be mentioned, suggesting that if an area is developed in a manner that allows a site to have good room sizes and decent gardens then this is in some way wasteful? This seems very target-orientated.

### **13334 Support**

Summary:

Our client recognises the NPPF paragraph 47 requirement to 'boost significantly the supply of housing' and therefore recommends that a minimum density should be applied by the Council across all new development and redevelopment sites and therefore supports the principle of Option 105.

### **14117 Support**

Summary:

Yes

### **14722 Support**

Summary:

Support Option 102.

Different areas are different in character, and to specify minimum densities would inevitably lead to problems.

### **15412 Support**

Summary:

Yes.

High densities are not at all incompatible with good design standards and good public realm, if a developer opts for suitable designs.

## **16538 Support**

Summary:

Yes.

## **16837 Support**

Summary:

Yes - support.

## **17483 Support**

Summary:

The NPPF, at Para 47, requires local planning authorities to set their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstance. As such it is agreed that there is a need for a policy which addresses this matter.

## **17946 Support**

Summary:

Yes

## **18237 Support**

Summary:

There is an evident need for a policy addressing this issue.

## **18324 Support**

Summary:

Yes

## **18366 Support**

Summary:

South Cambridgeshire District Council is consulting at Issue 45 on whether its new Local Plan should include a density policy, with option 3 setting density targets for different types of location, including 40dph on the Cambridge fringe. A consistent approach for fringe sites as is currently the case would be helpful for developers, particularly on any cross boundary sites. The Council wishes to continue cooperating with the City Council to develop an appropriate approach to this issue in the new Local Plans.

### **9491 Object**

Summary:

None of these options. Instead mix of options 103 and 104. Need to specify maximum as well as minimum.

### **10430 Object**

Summary:

Objecting to policies 103 to 105 but supporting policy 102. Market forces are more likely to secure the required outcomes than the cold hand of planning.

### **12106 Object**

Summary:

Difficult one to call. On balance option 104 is preferred; Housing density policy is useful, but it should be mandatorily connected with policies for access to amenities and good public transport. Medium to high densities can only work if housing is built after amenities and public transport infrastructure. Otherwise all the negative aspects of higher density are allowed to flourish.

### **12595 Object**

Summary:

I don't really like the look of any of these options but would emphasise that lower density does not necessarily equal wasteful. It is this low density which in my cases is cited as exactly what makes the city special. I don't suggest that high density housing isn't appropriate at all, but local context (and critically, congestion) is key.

### **14848 Object**

Summary:

This is all in direct conflict with residential space standards. Have an option for maximum (not minimum) density. Stop approving poor quality developments that simply seek to pack the most people into the least possible space.

### **15025 Object**

Summary:

Different areas are different in character, and to specify minimum densities would inevitably lead to problems

### **17484 Object**

Summary:

In respect of the options presented for comment at this stage it is considered that a mixture of approaches is needed, reflecting the balance to be drawn between capitalising on the sustainability and accessibility of a location and having regard to the surrounding context.

### **18242 Object**

Summary:

A robust Spatial Plan is needed before proper consideration can be given to these Options as presented. Where is the future expansion within the City planned to take place, what infrastructure and transport will enable this? We would like to see a vision for high density development within well defined zones, which Option 104 would support. Option 103 could be used in combination with this.

### **18325 Object**

Summary:

Housing density policy is useful, but it should be mandatorily connected with policies for access to amenities and good public transport. Medium to high densities can only work if housing is built after amenities and public transport infrastructure. Otherwise all the negative aspects of higher density are allowed to flourish.

Which option are used depends on CCC's ability to make it compelling not to get in the car. The 4 options do not consider this, so no comment.

### **7115 Support**

Summary:

Option 102

### **9204 Support**

Summary:

Option 105 for sites of 1 ha or more, the same policy for smaller sites being a guideline only.

### **10228 Support**

Summary:

We prefer option 104 because this has the most efficient use of space.

### **10731 Support**

Summary:

Option 104

## **11243 Support**

Summary:

The application of flat rate density figures across areas of the town provide for no innovative thought or site context and thus a case by case basis should be supported as suggested in Option 102.

## **11936 Support**

Summary:

I would support a combination of 103-5 but with flexibility to relax specifications where cogent reasons can be given.

## **13979 Support**

Summary:

I support Option 102 - No specific density policy or requirements - design led approach. The quality of some existing high quality residential areas is being eroded because of inappropriate high density developments (e.g. the projected development of the old waterworks site on Rustat Road, already given planning permission). Setting a minimum density for any areas of Cambridge can only increase the pressures towards over-development of sites within such areas. A design-led approach is preferable.

## **14116 Support**

Summary:

Option 104.

## **14383 Support**

Summary:

The combination of options 103 and 104 seems appropriate. If combined with limits on building height that should avoid over development.

## **15741 Support**

Summary:

We would propose Option 102 which does not impose any specific density policy requirements, rather than establishing a minimum threshold. If anything there should be an expressed guideline that development should be in conformity with the surrounding area, unless there are compelling reasons to depart from that.

## **16541 Support**

Summary:

Not keen on any of them, but options 103 and 104, if a maximum as well as a minimum level of density were to be established.

## **16698 Support**

Summary:

I believe that Cambridge should put a high priority on providing excellent quality homes. Priority should be given to high quality, lower density as opposed to higher density housing.

## **16840 Support**

Summary:

We prefer Option 104, i.e. to set a minimum density threshold for sites that are close to transport hubs.

## **17947 Support**

Summary:

Option 107

## **18367 Support**

Summary:

South Cambridgeshire District Council is consulting at Issue 45 on whether its new Local Plan should include a density policy, with option 3 setting density targets for different types of location, including 40dph on the Cambridge fringe. A consistent approach for fringe sites as is currently the case would be helpful for developers, particularly on any cross boundary sites. The Council wishes to continue cooperating with the City Council to develop an appropriate approach to this issue in the new Local Plans.

**9497 Object**

Summary:

Most of us were concerned about developments largely occupied by London commuters rather than local employees.

**10732 Object**

Summary:

No maximum density is stated.

**12135 Object**

Summary:

In our area (Rustat Road) high density developments (100+dph) have been allowed and some sit alongside low density suburbs built before the Second World War. High density = flats; and almost all studio or 1 to 2 bedroom. So while nearness to the station makes them potentially attractive to buy or to acquire for buy-to-let, they sit badly with the established community of family houses. While a policy on maximum density is not feasible because of differing local environments, we must provide some safeguards to ensure 'fit' with existing housing. Any density policy should have clauses which cover this issue.

**12592 Object**

Summary:

I believe that for some areas the future dph is around 4x the average for that area currently - this seems to be well in excess of what the context of those areas clearly is.

**12646 Object**

Summary:

There should be an option for setting a maximum DPH level. For example, I live in an area of Cambridge where there's not enough space for everyone to have their own garden, but we have a DPH of 42. I feel any more than a DPH of about 50 and you really start to lose quality of life and people have to travel further to find green space. Therefore, I would like to see the Council set a maximum DPH of 50 on new developments. No minimum DPH is required.

**14849 Object**

Summary:

This is all in direct conflict with residential space standards. Have an option for maximum (not minimum) density. Stop approving poor quality developments that simply seek to pack the most people into the least possible space.

**16755 Object**

Summary:

Specify a maximum density for any development in keeping with the density in surrounding areas.

**17485 Object**

Summary:

An additional option is required which seeks generally higher densities in central areas, but stresses the importance of also safeguarding the historic core of the city, and lower densities on the fringes of the city to respect the adjoining Green Belt, to ensure that the compact nature of Cambridge is not harmed and the need for family housing is also met.

**18326 Object**

Summary:

Yes unless the City wants inhabitants to get in a car in the first instance, get the amenity and public transport in first. If policy makers do not have the ability set this in a plan, then they should only provide guidance at lower densities.

**9205 Support**

Summary:

Additional policy/option required on maximum density - anything over 60 dph being allowed only on sites with direct vehicle access to main roads with good public transport.

**11807 Support**

Summary:

The important requirement should be for there to be a MAXIMUM DENSITY for any area dependent on the present density.

**14134 Support**

Summary:

I'd suggest adding a policy on maximum densities to protect already dense areas from over development. Also consider using alternative measures such as land area covered including streets within that measure to gauge the overall 'built-up' nature of an area. Heavily built-up areas are sensitive to the loss of open space in gardens and low density facilities such as garages. Access to daylight, sunlight and views of greenery are especially important to residents in these areas.

## **15743 Support**

Summary:

East Chesterton has been subject to some inappropriate high density planning applications, and its character is in part formed by its existing medium density housing stock. There may be opportunities in the North East Fringe Area to consider some higher density housing without it detracting from the overall character of the area. This is a further factor which makes overall strategic planning of the new station and its surrounds, with full consultation of local residents, to be essential.

## **17948 Support**

Summary:

No

## **18368 Support**

Summary:

South Cambridgeshire District Council is consulting at Issue 45 on whether its new Local Plan should include a density policy, with option 3 setting density targets for different types of location, including 40dph on the Cambridge fringe. A consistent approach for fringe sites as is currently the case would be helpful for developers, particularly on any cross boundary sites. The Council wishes to continue cooperating with the City Council to develop an appropriate approach to this issue in the new Local Plans.

---