

APPENDIX B: ANALYSIS, RESPONSES AND PREFERRED APPROACH ON HIGHER AND FURTHER EDUCATION, PLUS SUMMARIES OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

ISSUE: FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Total representations: 40	
Object: 14	Support: 26

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 143: Continued development of University of Cambridge's Faculty Sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essential that the Council continues to support the University of Cambridge which supports Cambridge's economy, social and cultural life and environment; • Support further faculty development provided the option is monitored; • North West Cambridge will prove to be very sustainable for students; • Strongly support but add Madingley Rise to list of faculty sites; • Old Press/Mill Lane is a prime site for more student accommodation as part of mixed use; • The University of Cambridge should downsize as it has outgrown the nest; • The Colleges equally contribute to economy as they have their own governance, property and staff; • Support but should also support other Higher and Further Education colleges such as Westminster College and Abbey College; • Addenbrooke's has grown enough.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

This option's approach to supporting the University should help positively contribute to the sustainability objectives. In particular the option should provide a balanced approach to development in addressing economic, social and environmental issues. At this stage it is not possible to appraise how this option would contribute to maintaining open and green space and the character of the built environment in West Cambridge, identified key sustainability issues.

KEY EVIDENCE

- National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012).
- North West Cambridge Action Area Plan (October 2009)
- University of Cambridge Masterplan for the West Cambridge Site (2002)
- Cambridge City Council (2010) Old Press/Mill Lane SPD

- University Of Cambridge Estate Management and Building Services (2007). Estate Strategy 2007.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 7/5 (Faculty Development in the Central Area, University of Cambridge)
- Policy 7/6 (West Cambridge, South of Madingley Road)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The University of Cambridge continues to be a world leader in education. The University of Cambridge is ranked in the top three research universities globally based on the two internationally recognised measures. It is a vital driver of the Cambridge economy and is the reason why so many high technology, and knowledge-based employers decide to locate in the city. The University's esteemed reputation has underpinned the Cambridge Phenomenon and much of the city's prosperity in recent years. The University Of Cambridge and its Colleges are also significant employers in their own right providing over 11,700 jobs. The University and Colleges have an income of over £792 million and have an operational estate exceeding 650,000sqm gross in 2008 worth in excess of £1.2 billion. Their reputation and heritage continues to attract students from across the world, tourists, language students, spin out enterprise and medical research. The University of Cambridge continues to be a vital driver of the local and national economy.

The NPPF requires local authorities to support the knowledge industries and the development of a strong and competitive economy. Supporting further education organisations is compatible with national policy aims and the proposed economic vision for the city as a centre of excellence and world leader in higher education.

In 2012, 18,335 students studied full time at the University of Cambridge. The majority live in halls of residence either purpose build or owned by the Colleges. The University of Cambridge continues to maintain a steady growth rate and is not facing the decline in student numbers being experienced by other UK higher education institutions.

Appendix F to the committee report illustrates past and future growth in student numbers at both Universities. Future growth rates are predicted to continue past trends of increases in undergraduates of around 0.5% pa and postgraduates 2.0% pa.

These targets have to be achieved by the 31 Colleges who are autonomous from the University of Cambridge but have to house all students during their time of study in Cambridge. Given land shortages within the city the resulting requirements to house student numbers in college can at times create land use planning issues for the colleges. These are considered in more detail below under Option 144.

One representation has called for some downsizing of the University of Cambridge on the basis that they think the University has outgrown Cambridge. This would not, however, be in the national interest and would have adverse impact on the strength of the local economy. It is therefore not an option, which should be pursued because

of this.

The University of Cambridge has an overall estate comprising around 650,000sqm on 247ha (2008) distributed across a number of key locations in the City Centre and West Cambridge. West and North West Cambridge have been the focus of the University Of Cambridge growth and relocations in the past 14 years. Since 2008, North West Cambridge now has outline consent for a further 60,000sqm of academic and a further 40,000 sqm of commercial research space. Further development has been approved for the final phase of the West Cambridge site including new buildings for Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology, and Material Science and Metallurgy and the new Sports Complex. Remaining development there will focus on further academic development and commercial research and development. Microsoft are also in the process of moving off the site to a new building within CB1. Cambridge Biomedical Campus now has outline consent with reserved matters approved on parts. The only other key locations where significant change is still planned are Old Press/Mill Lane and the New Museums site.

Main components of the University of Cambridge's 2007 Estate Strategy comprise:-

- To develop sites near the University Library for most of the arts and social sciences.
- To concentrate the humanities and social sciences on the Sidgwick, New Museums and Downing sites.
- To concentrate the biological sciences on the Downing site and the rear of the Old Addenbrooke's site.
- To develop the West Cambridge site for physical sciences and technology departments, and associated support functions.
- To continue to add to medical research facilities on The Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust site.
- To consolidate Central Administration on three sites, namely The Old Schools, part of the Old Press/Mill Lane Site and Greenwich House, and to reduce the use of houses in central Cambridge for administrative purposes.
- To redevelop the Old Press/Mill Lane site for mixed uses including University operational purposes, collegiate and commercial, and to redevelop the New Museums site with the introduction of some non-operational uses.
- To reduce the amount of leased accommodation occupied for operational purposes.
- To add to the stock of residential accommodation, providing a range of tenures and accommodation types.
- To establish land which could be used for future expansion, notably at North West Cambridge.

The University of Cambridge believes the current Local Plan (2006) policies provide a flexible and sustainable framework for the continued growth of faculty development in the City Centre at Old Press/Mill Lane and on the New Museums site. These were identified in the last Local Plan and in the University's Estate Strategy produced in 2007 and is an approach that continues to be supported by most consultees.

The University of Cambridge is now focusing upon guiding future development by means of a Capital Plan, rather than an Estate Strategy. This seeks to optimise the use of all existing space and investments. The University expects that its core academic needs will be met by the intensification and better use of its existing sites over the period up to 2031. The current Local Plan policy provides a useful and appropriate focus on key sites.

A Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) has been prepared and adopted for Old Press/Mill Lane in 2010. This will have different status under the new plan as a material consideration rather than an SPD. Masterplanning work is about to commence here and on New Museums. Old Press/Mill Lane is likely to come forward after 2020.

North West Cambridge will provide for most of long term major growth needs of the University Of Cambridge for faculty development and key worker housing over the next two decades. The World Conservation Monitoring Centre and other environmental research units previously identified as needing to cluster at North West Cambridge are now focusing their accommodation search on the New Museums site rather than at North West Cambridge.

Land is also available at West Cambridge, which will conclude development there for further faculty development and commercial R&D development. This will also include new academic facilities and more relocations from central sites e.g. Material Science, Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology who are moving off the New Museums site. West Cambridge is also being considered under employment Option 134 for possible intensification as current densities are low and are not making the best use of land. Responses to this option are coming forward to members as part of the steer on employment policy options next month.

Several representees called for the role of the 31 Colleges in enabling the continued success of the University of Cambridge to be better acknowledged in the Plan. Responses to this are given under Options 144 and 145 in relation to student hostel provision and North West Cambridge in particular. Other types of higher education institutions are dealt with under Options 151.

There is a need to acknowledge the cluster of development focusing on Madingley Rise as additional faculty site in any revision to the current policy.

Old Press/Mill Lane will also be likely to be a key site for the Colleges as part of mixed use development. This should be picked up within any redrafting of the policy and supporting text.

The construction of Addenbrooke's Biomedical Park is just commencing and the provisions of the existing 2006 Local Plan include land for further growth beyond 2016 to the south. Cancer Research UK are planning a further a Phase 2 development within the next 5 years and the recent relocation of the MRC LMB

building will create scope for other refurbishment of academic research space within the main hospital complex. This is covered within the Master Plan for this site. The continued growth of Addenbrooke's and the biomedical cluster is vital to the Cambridge economy and cannot be stifled.

In conclusion the University of Cambridge's key growth needs are being met by the developments in West and North West Cambridge and around Addenbrooke's. The current plan policy towards faculty development on central sites has provided a useful focus and should be rolled forward to deal with remaining future priorities.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to continue to pursue option 143 by way of a similar criteria based policy which also identifies the 2 central sites and 3 edge of City key locations subject to including reference to Madingley Rise in the list of faculty sites.

ISSUE: UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE STUDENT HOUSING NEEDS

Total representations: 56	
Object:	
Option 144: 7	Option 145: 11
Support:	
Option 144: 7	Option 145: 31

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 144: University of Cambridge staff and student housing & Option 145: Expand existing Colleges rather than plan for new Colleges at North West Cambridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong support for the option but it is not an alternative to Option 145; • Adequate housing for the University of Cambridge and its Colleges is fundamental to their continuing success; • Support provided open character of colleges maintained; • Should acknowledge role of small HMOs; • Change of Use Class C3 gives no protection to family housing; • Need to consider the needs of Higher and Further Education Sector as a whole not just the two Universities. • The University of Cambridge supports growth in both locations in order to provide for student needs; • North West Cambridge is too remote from existing colleges. New colleges won't help existing colleges with their shortfall in student accommodation; • Some uncertainty whether new colleges would emerge at North West Cambridge.

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

No additional options have been suggested.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Option 144 should help maintain a greater sense of community and improved well being through provision of accommodation in close proximity to their colleges, while, protecting family residential accommodation. The extent to which the potential restriction on growth on the Cambridge economy is unclear.

Option 145: Cambridge faces a potential shortfall in student accommodation provision. While providing additional rooms at satellite residences would deliver a higher number of available student accommodation compared to new colleges, this approach (Option 145) needs to be balanced against the importance of college facilities, such as pastoral and communal facilities being in close proximity, and the value they add to the college community. The economic benefit of additional accommodation is unclear.

KEY EVIDENCE

- National Planning Policy Framework (2012)
- Student Statistics 2011-12 – Cambridge University Planning & Resource Allocation Office
- Survey of student housing need by University of Cambridge College Bursars Committee April 2012
- North West Cambridge Action Area Plan (Oct 2009)

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 7/7 (College and University of Cambridge Staff and Student Housing)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

An adequate supply of future student hostel accommodation provided by the Colleges is vital in facilitating the University of Cambridge's overall growth and its ability to continue to attract good students from around the world whilst minimising adverse impacts on the city's housing market. The Colleges fulfil a vital complementary role in this regard.

The NPPF's paragraph 21 requires local authorities to support the knowledge industries and the development of a strong and competitive economy. Supporting further education organisations is compatible with national policy aims and the proposed economic vision for the city as a centre of excellence and world leader in higher education.

There are growing pressures on land supply and the new plan needs to try and better understand the nature of these and seek to address them within the constraints of the city land supply. More land needs to be identified within college ownership to provide space for the shortfall in student rooms identified by the Bursars' Committee in their April 2012 survey.

- This revealed that at October 2011, there was a total of 11,948

undergraduate and 6,295 full-time graduate students at the University. This figure excludes 922 part-time graduates.

- Assumptions for the annual increase over the period of the Local Plan (i.e. until 2031) are 0.5% for undergraduates and 2% for graduates. This indicates 13,136 undergraduates and 9,171 graduates, or a total of 22,307, by 2031.
- The University of Cambridge aims for 100% of undergraduates and 90% of graduates to be accommodated in Colleges. Fulfilling this ambition will require 21,389 rooms by 2031.
- The Colleges currently have 14,993 rooms available for use.
- Over the last five years, Colleges have added 790 rooms, or 158 per year, to their room stock.
- A brief survey of current plans and aspirations for the next five years suggests a further 700 rooms, or 140/year may be provided by 2016.
- It is anticipated that 40% of this figure of 700 will be delivered by rationalization and adaptation of existing College properties. It should be noted, however, that there is finite scope for the incremental development of existing sites and it is likely that a shift will need to occur later in the planning period towards greater development of new sites.
- If we assume that Colleges continue to build at the five-year indicated rate between now and 2031, a further 2,660 rooms would be added to the stock, giving 17,653 rooms.
- This would still mean a shortfall of 3,736 rooms by 2031.
- Assuming a development density of 200-250 units per ha for undergraduates and 150-200 units per ha for post graduates (densities used by the of Cambridge in evidence to the 2006 Local Plan)
- The land requirement would be around 4.5-5.6ha for undergraduate accommodation and between 13.1-17.4ha for post graduate accommodation.
- Accommodating this growth, particularly in post graduate student numbers, will put considerable strains upon existing Colleges, not just in terms of room stock but also the provision of other social and teaching facilities and the need to recruit additional, locally based servicing staff. It is also possible that a new College(s) may emerge over this period space for which is set aside at North West Cambridge.

Some colleges have sought for optimum estate management reasons to develop new college hostel accommodation on sites other than those allocated within the 2006 Local Plan e.g. Corpus Christi on Leckhampton House. This has meant the plan allocation has not been required. Very few firm submissions as yet have come forward from the Colleges for new site allocations which can be shared publically. It is hoped the current sites consultation will reveal a number of further possible sites.

Exceptional circumstances for further Green Belt releases for collegiate development have not been made to date. Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) submissions have instead tended to focus on the development of open market housing including some limited collegiate development on the edge of the city within the Green Belt. The site options currently being consulted upon rejected further Green Belt releases on the western side of the city and along Barton Road due to

their impact on the purposes of Green Belt.

A major disadvantage of Option 145 is that college hostel provision at North West Cambridge would not serve existing colleges well being too remote to offer the kind of pastoral care and communal facilities one would expect to find within college. North West Cambridge is a better location for new colleges but will not cater for the needs of existing colleges unless they happen to be one of the few colleges already close to the North West Cambridge site. A few of these are in discussion with the University of Cambridge concerning student hostel provision at North West Cambridge.

The University of Cambridge does not support Option 145 and considers that it is not an issue for planning policy as it would determine the way in which the University provided its student accommodation. The University of Cambridge supports future provision at existing Colleges, sites close to those colleges and at North West Cambridge. All three options will be required to meet the needs of a growing student population.

The two options fulfil different roles are therefore not mutually exclusive of one another. Option 145 would also contradict existing planning policy agreed within the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan.

The Sustainability Appraisal concludes that Option 144 provides a better sense of community and improved well-being whilst protecting the role of family residential accommodation. Satellite locations can provide much needed student rooms but are less sustainable and not likely to enhance existing college communities.

Future policy towards small HMOs is being considered separately under Option 116. Options 151 deals with other types of educational institution.

In conclusion, Option 144 is the only realistic alternative. A further review of student hostel sites will be needed following Issues and Options 2 Site Options Consultation to review existing and new suggested sites for College hostels to ensure it meets the likely increase in student numbers.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 144 to allow for a mixture of new sites, in college refurbishments, and other windfall sites subject to amenity safeguards, and not seek to change the approach towards new colleges at North West Cambridge inherent within Option 145.

Officers will review any submissions from the Colleges as part of the current joint site options consultation to assess the potential of other sites in catering for the overall identified need.

ISSUE: ANGLIA RUSKIN UNIVERSITY FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Total representations: 39	
Object: 14	Support: 25

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 146: Anglia Ruskin University (ARU) Faculty Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ARU needs to expand its postgraduate provision and wants to stay on East Road and Young Street site and is unlikely to relocate;• The Masterplan for East Road should be allowed to evolve;• ARU have a satellite site in South Cambridgeshire District at Whitehouse Lane which is in the Green Belt;• Any satellite should be as close as possible;• Relocate student residences from East Road to create more space rather than developing a second campus;• ARU should be expanded in Chelmsford and find a third site in Norfolk or Suffolk;• ARU is important to local economy but has lost a lot of green space at East Road. They should look to Fulbourn and further afield if they want to expand further;• Petersfield should not become ARU's campus;• There should be no more ARU campuses in the city.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

This option provides a flexible approach to meeting the needs of Anglia Ruskin University and correspondingly conforms well to the sustainability topics. In particular, permitting development of a satellite campus would require a number of environmental criteria to be met including a green and connected location combining a number of sports and social infrastructure helping support a healthy student community.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Anglia Ruskin University (March 2009). Cambridge Campus Redevelopment, Masterplan Revision B.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 7/8 (Anglia Ruskin University East Road Campus)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The growth and success of Anglia Ruskin University (ARU) continues to benefit the local economy. It performs a significant role, which is not confined to the needs of the region. It has a growing number of important specialisms including international links and relations. Its Department of Optometry carries out world leading research. It is also a major provider of training in health and social care and its role internationally is growing. A supportive policy approach would be compatible with the economic aims of the NPPF.

NPPF paragraph 21 requires local authorities to support the knowledge industries and the development of a strong and competitive economy. Supporting further education organisations is compatible with national policy aims and the proposed economic vision for the city as a centre of excellence and world leader in higher education.

Fortunately, ARU has not witnessed the 14% drop in applicants experienced by Universities nationally. The rate of growth in student numbers, however, has not been as rapid as was envisaged at the time of the 2006 Local Plan. Student numbers have not yet reached the 12,000 level forecast in 2006 for 2009/10. ARU currently has 8,911 students of which 7,636 are undergraduates and 1,275 are post graduates. ARU expects student numbers to increase to 9,950 by 2021. Funding for undergraduate courses is reducing but demand is still there. ARU is increasingly diversifying towards post graduate and post doctorate study courses.

Since the 2006 Local Plan was adopted, significant progress has been made on the East Road site in modernising ARU's faculty accommodation within the framework of the agreed 2009 Masterplan. This is largely complete and will provide around 9,000 sqm of new accommodation.

When the Masterplan was written in 2008, Anglia Ruskin University had needs for around 12,000sqm. The Campus on East Road remains one of the tightest in the sector. The Masterplan implementation has left a shortfall in teaching space. This shortfall has grown from 3,000sqm in 2008/9 to between 6,000sqm and 8,000sqm today. The most recent ARU Estate Strategy and Corporate Plan for 2014 has identified a need for at least 6,000sqm of additional space. As well as catering for growth in student numbers there is also a need to enhance existing space as recently redeveloped space e.g. for laboratories is not meeting current day requirements.

A further satellite site at Young Street has recently been approved to provide around 5,000sqm of new accommodation in 3 phases for the Institute of Nursing which is moving from Fulbourn. This floorspace however, does not assist in meeting the shortfall demand on the East Road campus as it is being relocated from Fulbourn.

The existing Local Plan envisaged some satellite development for ARU at Cambridge East. This is now not likely to come to fruition as Cambridge East is not proceeding at the current time as originally envisaged.

Various administrative functions have been catered for in City Centre office space as the East Road site has been redeveloped. ARU have looked at other sites along East Road for possible faculty use. Mackays was one such site but nothing came of the proposal. There may be a case for looking to accommodate administrative back office work in office blocks close to the main campus rather than on the teaching campus itself. The opportunity area around Eastern Gate may also offer other potential. Officers need to continue to discuss and further consider ARU's requirements as we move towards the draft plan.

The East Road site appears to provide little scope for significant further expansion after development agreed in the current Masterplan is built out. One option might be to review the inclusion of student accommodation within the site in order to make more space for faculty development available. This may however not prove to be practical or economic to start removing hostel accommodation already provided. Peter Taylor House is less than 10 years old and is built to a good standard.

Equally, it would also not be practical given the huge level of investment at East Road and in local student hostel provision to consider relocating ARU. It is currently in a highly sustainable location. There are strong advantages in focusing on centralised teaching on one campus. Split campuses do not work as well.

ARU is therefore seeking to meet its core academic needs by the intensification and better use of the existing site during the next plan period. They are therefore looking to initiate discussions with the Council in the near future to review the future of the campus.

Satellite development is not being supported by ARU for teaching space at least. It may however have mileage for student accommodation if it can be based on a sequential approach and have good public transport.

ARU has a satellite site at Whitehouse Lane, but this is in South Cambridgeshire District and is in the Green Belt forming part of green gap between Cambridge and Girton. It has not been identified within the recent 2012 Green Belt Review as an area capable of being removed. Indeed, no exceptional circumstances have been put forward to justify this.

Another site, ARU considered for potential student hostel development was land by the A14 on the approach to Milton village. This is also in South Cambridgeshire and within the Green Belt.

It is desirable and sustainable to continue to focus faculty development on the East Road site up to the capacity limits agreed in the Masterplan.

It may be necessary to consider other locations within the city if they can be identified. ARU is already regionally based and recent successful expansions have been implemented within Peterborough, King's Lynn and Harlow. Existing and planned new settlements may also provide further options and potential growth

points.

In conclusion, ARU's space requirements need to be tested as part of the review of the Local Plan and further discussions should be conducted in order to reach a sustainable and environmentally acceptable conclusion in planning terms.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 146 amended to focus on testing all reasonable alternatives, which cater for long term needs of ARU over the plan period. This may involve drawing up a new/ revised masterplan for the East Road Campus as well as exploring opportunities to compliment provision on adjoining sites such as Eastern Gate.

ISSUE: ANGLIA RUSKIN UNIVERSITY STUDENT ACCOMODATION

Options 147 and 148 will be discussed at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee in February 2013 as they are closely linked with policies within Chapter 9 - Delivering High Quality Housing of the Cambridge Local Plan Towards 2031 – Issues and Options Report (June 2012).

ISSUE: SPECULATIVE STUDENT HOSTEL ACCOMMODATION

Total representations: 53	
Object:	
Option 149: 11	Option 150: 13
Support:	
Option 149: 2	Option 150: 27

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES
Option 149: Speculative Student Hostel Accommodation – limited to Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is inequitable to discriminate against non University Colleges; • Language Schools should not be excluded.
Option 150: Speculative student hostel accommodation widened to include other established educational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Option 150, so additional student accommodation can be provided for other types of institution like Abbey College; • Support, other than the criteria for external amenity space which is difficult on brownfield sites; • Change needed as current policy inequitable; • It applies equally to specialist schools such as language

institutions	<p>schools;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should include student and staff housing for these institutions.
--------------	---

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

No additional options have been suggested.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Option 149 should help towards meeting the need of additional student accommodation for ARU in a sustainable manner. In particular with regards to reducing car ownership by restricting car use to those with an identified need and ensuring developments are of an appropriate size set within high quality environments which will help meet community, landscape and biodiversity objectives.

In addition to comments above, option 150 should also help reduce inequalities in educational achievement across the non-university sector. This option would increase pressure on the local housing market.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Oxford City Council Core Strategy Inspector’s Report (2010)
- Anglia Ruskin University Hostel Provision Table. Anglia Ruskin University (13th April 2012)
- Survey of student housing need by University Of Cambridge College Bursars Committee April 2012

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 7/10 (Speculative Student Hostel Accommodation)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

In view of the student housing shortages, the current Local Plan policy 7/10 supports the provision of speculative student hostels on sites that have not been allocated in the Local Plan but have become available during the plan period. However, the policy includes very few planning criteria to ensure any proposal is tested against the need for such accommodation that it is being provided in a sustainable way.

NPPF paragraph 21 encourages local authorities to support the knowledge industries and the development of a strong and competitive economy. Supporting further education organisations is compatible with national policy aims and the proposed economic vision for the city as a centre of excellence and world leader in higher education.

The Council has a long standing approach to support the growth of both universities within Cambridge because of their key importance to the local economy and their needs to accommodate a high proportion of their students in purpose built hostel accommodation. This aims to minimise impacts on the local housing market and the level of housing available for other residents. The 2006 Local Plan policies prioritised

the identification of sites for ARU in particular as they were starting from a lower base and face far greater reliance upon renting in the local housing market.

Policy 7/10 restricts such speculative development by way of a S106 to housing full-time students attending Anglia Ruskin University or the University of Cambridge. Concerns have been raised that this is unfair to other legitimate and established education providers in Cambridge such as specialist schools (see Options 151 and 152 below).

A similar policy in Oxford (Policy CS25) was overruled by the Inspector at the Examination in Public into the Council's Core Strategy on 21st December 2010.

"...Student accommodation will be restricted in occupation to students in full-time education at either Oxford Brookes University or the University of Oxford. Appropriate management controls will be secured, including an undertaking that students do not bring cars to Oxford."

The Inspector removed the embargo restricting occupation of such hostels to students attending the two universities in Oxford on the basis that it was inequitable and was discriminating against non-university colleges.

The Inspector's report at Paragraphs 4.81 and 4.82 are particularly relevant; they state:-

'The policy restricts the provision of student accommodation to that related to the Universities, effectively placing an embargo on student accommodation to serve the needs of the many non-university colleges in Oxford. The Council points to the greater emphasis of these other colleges on part-time courses and that a lot of their students take up lodging accommodation, so not adding to the pressures on the city's housing stock and limited development sites. Nevertheless, some of the students at these other colleges will be full-time and are just as likely to require housing out in the community and put pressure on the housing market. Where full-time students are on courses of upwards of an academic year, it seems to me that they are as likely as University students to be seeking their own housing as opposed to lodgings.

Whilst removing the policy embargo would increase the competition for any available sites, provided any new accommodation was directed to full-time students, and then the impact on the overall housing market would be very limited. These colleges also make their contribution to the local economy. I find little reason, in terms of housing pressures, to discriminate against non-University colleges. It is not justified in equity terms and I propose some wording changes to reflect this. Detailed consideration of the needs of the non-University Colleges can be looked at as part of subsequent DPDs.'

Whilst Oxford has many similarities to the approach being taken in Cambridge, it

does not have the same policies in place towards other types of educational establishments such as Language Schools. Cambridge has operated a selective management approach to service sector employment historically including language schools on the grounds of impact. Oxford, on the other hand, had a legacy policy from two local plans which attempts to prevent both universities from building more teaching or administrative space where the number of full time students at whichever university is proposing the development who live in Oxford outside University or College provided accommodation should not exceed 3,000 additional students. This was a measure both universities agreed to, to try and reduce impact on the private housing market. The Inspector took the view that placing of an absolute ceiling on total student numbers would be a wholly unreasonable restriction on their activities, contrary to national guidance and could impact unacceptably on their contribution to the prosperity of the wider area.

Any change however in the policy towards language schools and other specialist schools however would mean that the current policy towards speculative hostel building could be considered inequitable by unduly favouring development for the two universities. The response to Options 151 and 152 is suggesting a more flexible approach towards specialist schools.

The principle of targeting the policy towards full time students engaging in a full time course of a year or more at an existing educational establishment providing full time education within the city should serve to broaden the accommodation delivered to a wider range of establishments.

This needs to be balanced with arguments concerning the needs for additional student hostel accommodation for the University of Cambridge and Anglia Ruskin University. At this stage, both universities appear to be suffering from a shortfall in hostel accommodation when set against their growth plans.

The proposed inclusion of a needs test within the policy will help to focus new speculative building in the right location and towards organisations most needing accommodation. This would sit better with the NPPF which would not favour the current policy approach towards hostel building, given the demands from all three sources and potential impact on the local economy.

Many of these issues were rehearsed in the Council's consideration and the subsequent appeal on the proposal to redevelop the Texaco garage site on Histon Road as a student hostel.

The representations concerning staff housing are being dealt with in the proposed response to Options 147 and 148. Other suggested changes concerning amenity are being addressed by the inclusion of the proposed criteria set out under Options 149 and 150. The policy approach was otherwise broadly supported.

In conclusion, the current restriction is unjustified in equity terms and is likely to render the plan unsound. The policy should be reviewed to open up speculative hostel provision to a wider range of institutions by linking it to full time course of one year or more.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 150 and ensure policy in the Local Plan requires a proven statement of need at planning application stage. Tying this to students attending full time courses of one year or more will assist a broader range of educational establishments to benefit from the accommodation thus provided.

ISSUE: SPECIALIST SCHOOLS

Total representations: 10

Object: 4

Support: 6

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 151: Specialist colleges such as secretarial and tutorial colleges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support introduction of new policy to enable specialist schools to provide financial and cultural benefits; • Language schools make an important contribution to the economy; • All specialist schools should be treated the same way.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Allowing the expansion of language schools/specialist tutorial and secretarial colleges will help capitalise on the value that that these colleges contribute to the local economy. It is not clear how the expansion (including providing residential accommodation) would add to local housing pressures. The impact on different topic areas would depend on the location of the language school/specialist tutorial college.

KEY EVIDENCE

- SQW (2011). Cambridge Cluster Study 2011
- EFL Services Ltd Survey (1992). English Language Students in Cambridge
- Cambridge City Council (1983). Specialist Schools & Colleges in Cambridge
- Survey of Specialist Schools Dec 2012 –Cambridge City Council/Cambridgeshire County Council (in progress)

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 7/11 (Language Schools)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The 1996 Local Plan used to have a policy aimed at Specialist Colleges such as secretarial and tutorial colleges. This was dropped as part of attempts to make the 2006 Local Plan shorter. At that time, very few of these types of organisation existed, around 3 establishments and very few applications were received giving rise to the need for a policy in 2006.

There are a growing number of specialist schools in Cambridge, including secretarial and tutorial colleges, pre-university foundation courses, crammer schools and tutorial colleges. These schools concentrate on GCSE and A level qualifications along with pre university entrance tuition. They attract a large number of students and contribute significantly to the local economy.

The NPPF requires local authorities to support the knowledge industries and the development of a strong and competitive economy. Supporting further education organisations is compatible with national policy aims and the proposed economic vision for the City as a centre of excellence and world leader in higher education.

The current Local Plan has a policy which only deals with language schools. However, these are only one type of specialist school, so future policies would need to extend to include all of the other types of independent specialist schools and possibly independent academies. The numbers of these have increased from around three in the 1990s to approximately 11-14 currently. Examples include CATS in Round Church Street, Abbey College in Station Road, and Glisson Road, and Bellerby's College in Bateman Street and Manor Community College. Others such as Cambridge Centre For Sixth Form Studies are educational charities and no profit organisations more akin to a state registered schools catering for local students and boarders.

Many of these types of organisation attract school age children who live with families in the City and surrounding area or commute into Cambridge from other locations in the sub region. As such they do not as a rule place undue pressure on the local housing market and are therefore less of a concern in this regard compared to mainstream language schools which are a distinct and separate type of specialist school. By and large they don't offer English language courses. In some cases, these types of organisation attract students from further afield and if they do they tend to have associated hostel accommodation for boarders as part of the operation e.g. Cambridge Centre for Sixth Form Studies. The former local plan policy made an exception for secretarial and tutorial colleges allowing them to grow by 10% of their overall gross floorspace provided they serve a mainly local catchment and provide residential accommodation, social and amenity facilities for all non local students. This floorspace restriction as in the case of language schools may not however be effective or appropriate.

Reinstating such a policy would fulfil a policy gap in the current plan and would support local educational providers and be good for the local economy. The proposed response to Option 150 by concentrating on students attending courses of

one year or more would help specialist schools as opposed to language schools.

The policy approach was otherwise broadly supported.

In conclusion the current policy vacuum should be filled by the introduction of a new policy to guide future development of secretarial and tutorial colleges and minimise any impact such organisations might place on the local housing market.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 151 and devise a new policy to cater for applications from secretarial and tutorial colleges but dropping the restriction on teaching floorspace as it has not proved to be effective in controlling language schools. This could be combined or separate from the policy towards language schools as long as it was clear which type of establishment the policy clause was aimed at.

ISSUE: LANGUAGE SCHOOLS

Total representations: 42

Object: 16

Support: 26

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 152: Language Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Option 152 preferred provided large residential houses are not lost. Keep controls to prevent too many specialist schools opening;• Both types of school should provide adequate hostels;• Retain a policy on language schools but widen to include other types of school. Restrict as far as legally possible opening of other new schools;• It is inappropriate to refer to behaviour when considering whether a policy towards expansion is appropriate.• Language schools with a good track record should have opportunity to develop their business.

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

No additional options have been suggested.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Relaxing planning policies on the expansion of permanent language schools will add to existing housing and accommodation pressures in Cambridge. Furthermore, additional student numbers would place additional pressure on local transport infrastructure, the city centre and open spaces during peak months. However, this Option (152) would help capitalise on the economic benefits that these schools bring to the local economy, including directly to local residents who provide home stay and similar accommodation.

KEY EVIDENCE

- SQW (2011). Cambridge Cluster Study 2011
- EFL Services Ltd Survey (1992). English Language Students in Cambridge
- Cambridge City Council (1983). Specialist Schools & Colleges in Cambridge
- Survey of Specialist Schools Dec 2012 –Cambridge City Council/Cambridgeshire County Council (in progress)

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 7/11 (Language Schools)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Existing Policy 7/11 does not allow for new permanent language schools to be set up in the city and regulates existing schools by virtue of a 10% tolerance control on new teaching floorspace provided. This policy has been in place for a considerable number of years and stems from concerns about possible impacts on the local housing market and previous Structure Plan policy towards selective management.

Experience with established schools has recently revealed that controls upon increases in teaching floorspace are no longer effective. An approach based on “student weeks” ties in more closely with other national monitoring and licensing of language schools and would be a more effective way of regulating student throughput.

Currently, the annual load of students is thought to be around 31,000 though the average length of stay is only 5 weeks. A survey (Dec 2012) is being undertaken of the 22 current schools to update the Council’s evidence base. 12 responses have been received so far. Officers will follow up non respondents and undertake an analysis of the headline conclusions in the coming weeks as part of work on the draft plan

The industry has matured over the last 20 years and more and more courses are being run throughout the year and are being focused at a much broader range of student clientele.

The Cambridge Cluster Study has recognised the increasing contribution these establishments make to the local economy and has suggested a review in the policy approach as the schools between them contribute £78 million per annum to the local economy. The NPPF would support a policy approach which sought to take advantage of this benefit.

NPPF paragraph 21 encourages local authorities to support the knowledge industries and the development of a strong and competitive economy. Supporting further education organisations is compatible with national policy aims and the proposed economic vision for the city as a centre of excellence and world leader in higher education.

Many schools have been housing their teenage students with host families during

the summer months, which also provide another source of income for local families and does not unduly cause pressures on the local housing market. Others are starting to take on more mature and business students, along with pre University entrance students wishing to improve their English. Most make use of independently provided student hostel accommodation to house their more mature students.

This can put pressure on the local housing market in Cambridge, if students are not accommodated in purpose built hostels or in lodgings with host families.

The current policy, if it were to be relaxed, would need to maintain a restriction on the establishment of new schools, accepting there is a difficulty with temporary schools who can operate outside the planning system. The policy would however benefit from the addition of a clause requiring existing schools to provide hostel accommodation for their students on site or off site provided it was controlled by a S106 legal agreement.

It is agreed that behaviour is not a land use policy consideration. The policy approach was otherwise broadly supported.

In conclusion, a revised policy would be appropriate which continued the restriction on the introduction of new schools but introduces a more supportive approach to the expansion of existing schools provided appropriate hostel provision can be provided.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 152 which will help capitalise on the value that that these colleges contribute to the local economy provided they can provide appropriate hostel provision on or off site.

APPENDIX B - CHAPTER 10: BUILDING A STRONG AND COMPETITIVE ECONOMY
(PARAGRAPH 10.64 TO QUESTION 10.61)

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy **10.49**

8344 Support

Summary:

We support this development (North West Cambridge)

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy **10.49**

11131 Object

Summary:

The North West Cambridge development is welcomed and will make some contribution to student and staff housing but it should be recognised there is an existing shortfall and demand will increase as numbers increase.

Colleges want to provide accommodation on or close to main campus not remote from College.

If two new colleges are built then the proposed accommodation would be logically for these students rather than to address an existing and increasing shortfall.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy **10.49**

13486 Object

Summary:

The North West Cambridge development does not address the existing shortfall and demand will increase as student and staff numbers increase. The College wants to provide accommodation on or close to main campus providing students with direct access to College support services and facilities.

If two new Colleges are built then the proposed accommodation would be logically for these students rather than to address an existing and increasing shortfall in the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy **10.50**

8659 Support

Summary:

Whilst we support this paragraph, we feel it should also make mention of the inclusion in the SPD of student accommodation as part of the mixed use. Such additional wording would be consistent with and reinforce the need set out in para 10.57 to identify other land to meet the accommodation needs resulting from the necessary growth of the University and in its graduate student numbers.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy **10.50**

11132 Object

Summary:

The SPD for Mill Lane proposes redevelopment for mixed uses. Student accommodation, up to 200 units, is listed as a potential use but not a requirement so redevelopment cannot be relied on to ease student or staff accommodation demands.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy **10.50**

12527 Object

Summary:

I put this as an objection because I am concerned about the likely OVER development of the site. The Graduate Centre is already one eyesore too many and one fears the addition of glitzy buildings trying too hard to make an impression. Development of such a large area needs careful monitoring. And no tall buildings!

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy **10.50**

13295 Support

Summary:

The general tenor of the para is supported, but it should mention in particular the SPD's identification and endorsement of the site as a prime location for a substantial amount of student accommodation. This serves specifically to address potential problems with the provision of such accommodation highlighted in the surrounding paras.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	10.50
---	--------------

15180 Support

Summary:

Whilst we support this paragraph, we feel it should also make mention of the inclusion in the SPD of student accommodation as part of the mixed use. Such additional wording would be consistent with and reinforce the need set out in para 10.57 to identify other land to meet the accommodation needs resulting from the necessary growth University graduate student numbers

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	10.51
---	--------------

11133 Object

Summary:

This may address University requirements but not colleges.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	10.51
---	--------------

13511 Object

Summary:

This may address University requirements but not Colleges

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	10.52
---	--------------

8347 Object

Summary:

Academic excellence is important for the local economy but we challenge the assumption that this can be maintained only through further growth.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	10.52
---	--------------

11135 Object

Summary:

This paragraph do not refer to colleges as of equal importance in their contribution to economic growth and continued success. Colleges are distinct from the University with their own governance, finance, property and staff. This distinction needs to be recognised if policy is to support higher and further education in Cambridge.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	10.52
---	--------------

13514 Object

Summary:

This paragraph does not refer to Colleges as of equal importance in their contribution to economic growth and continued success. Colleges are distinct from the University with their own governance, finance, property and staff. This distinction needs to be recognised if policy is to support higher and further education in Cambridge.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	10.53
---	--------------

11137 Object

Summary:

This paragraph do not refer to colleges as of equal importance in their contribution to economic growth and continued success. Colleges are distinct from the University with their own governance, finance, property and staff. This distinction needs to be recognised if policy is to support higher and further education in Cambridge.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.53

13521 Object

Summary:

This paragraph does not refer to Colleges as of equal importance in their contribution to economic growth and continued success. Colleges are distinct from the University with their own governance, finance, property and staff. This distinction needs to be recognised if policy is to support higher and further education in Cambridge.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 143 - Continued development and redevelopment of the Univerisy of Cambridge's Faculty sites

10824 Support

Summary:

Should be allowed

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 143 - Continued development and redevelopment of the Univerisy of Cambridge's Faculty sites

14705 Object

Summary:

Continued development the University of Cambridge's sites has resulted in a variable quality of cycle parking provision. We want to see the 2005 consultant report on cycle parking implemented before any further changes are put in place. We understand the current policy is that each new car parking space at West Cambridge must be matched by removal of the same number of spaces in the city centre and we strongly wish to see this retained. We also want to see the priorities reversed at the Trumpington Road/Pembroke Street junction to favour cycles.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 143 - Continued development and redevelopment of the Univerisy of Cambridge's Faculty sites

14888 Support

Summary:

Support

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 143 - Continued development and redevelopment of the Univerisy of Cambridge's Faculty sites

17597 Support

Summary:

We support Options 143 and 144 provided that this latter is carefully monitored to ensure that the open characher of many existing colleges is not detrimentally affected.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 143 - Continued development and redevelopment of the Univerisy of Cambridge's Faculty sites

17667 Support

Summary:

The major growth of jobs will take place in Addenbrookes and at the two Universities. The present proposals for the Southern edge of the City and in the North West will accommodate the majority of the added workforce without the need to build further on Green Belt. I agree with proposals in the Plan to relax regulations for building speculative student accommodation for all such institutions and that at least some of this accommodation should be incorporated within developments on site. Such provision at West Cambridge would help create a sustainable community for students on site, reducing the need to commute across the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.46

7012 Object

Summary:

There clearly is a need for a policy on university development. I am broadly in agreement with Option 143, with the exception of yet further development of the Addenbrooke's site, which I feel has gone quite far enough.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.46

7126 Object

Summary:

I endorse representation 7012

Which says:

"There clearly is a need for a policy on university development. I am broadly in agreement with Option 143, with the exception of yet further development of the Addenbrooke's site, which I feel has gone quite far enough."

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.46

8404 Support

Summary:

need policy

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.46

8494 Support

Summary:

yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.46

9375 Support

Summary:

Yes. The University is already both accustomed and committed to planning its needs for the long term and this should be encouraged. There is little need for "second guessing" by the Council.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.46

10825 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.46**12304 Support****Summary:**

The University strongly supports a policy promoting the continued development and redevelopment of its Faculty sites. This will help the University maintain its pre-eminent position in respect of higher education and research by allow it to develop teaching, research and administrative facilities that meet ever changing needs.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.46**12371 Support****Summary:**

yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.46**12829 Support****Summary:**

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.46**14200 Support****Summary:**

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.46**15329 Support****Summary:**

Yes but this is not it. The universities appear to have become the cuckoos in Cambridge's nest and should perhaps be encouraged to enhance their quality by down-sizing rather than obsessive expansion beyond the city's carrying capacity. In particular the Addenbrookes complex has made an already daunting site even more nightmarish.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.46**16227 Support****Summary:**

is supported

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.46**18461 Support****Summary:**

The County Council supports the need for policies addressing faculty development at both Universities.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.47

12530 Support

Summary:

The scale of buildings in any Mill Lane development ought to be restricted in any policy on this issue.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.47

12840 Support

Summary:

They should be developed to the highest design and conservation and climate change standards. Any development of the historic centre should be subject to national heritage guidelines. The Local Plan should be robust in ensuring that city centre developments will primarily enhance the historic, aesthetic and cultural environment.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.47

13136 Support

Summary:

We request that a similar policy approach used for development at the University of Cambridge faculty buildings be adopted for Westminster College. This could be in the form of a separate policy for Westminster College, or an amendment to Option 143 to make it clear that other Colleges not part of the University are also subject to similar policies and the application of appropriate criteria in determining development proposals for further teaching and learning facilities as well as related accommodation.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.47

13988 Support

Summary:

We request a new policy, similar to Option 143 and 146, for Abbey College that supports further development within existing college sites or at additional sites if required. We suggest that appropriate criteria could include the following: sensitive to its surroundings, no adverse impacts on the environment or amenity, is an efficient use of land, and is accessible to non-car modes of transport.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.47

14202 Support

Summary:

As long as the University continue to have a presence in the town centre, I am supportive.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.47

16232 Support

Summary:

Option 143 is supported, particularly as it seeks to identify as an opportunity the development of medical teaching facilities and related University research institutes at the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. However there needs to be recognition that the increasing trend is for research and development uses (both higher education, institutional and commercial R&D) to be embedded alongside clinical uses, and they do not need to be separately 'zoned'. Any policy in this area should allow sufficient flexibility for these uses to operate alongside each other, potentially within the same building envelope. NB: Reference should be to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, not the Addenbrooke's Biomedical Campus.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.47

18016 Support

Summary:

Policy should continue to be assessed in close collaboration with the University
Movement of students between sites can produce traffic problems; bicycles as much a problem as cars

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	10.55
11139 Object	
Summary:	
Growth in student numbers will undoubtedly increase demand for hostel accommodation. It cannot be regarded as only a possibility.	
10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	10.55
13526 Object	
Summary:	
Growth in student numbers will undoubtedly increase demand for hostel accommodation. It cannot be regarded as only a possibility.	
10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	10.56
11140 Object	
Summary:	
If the student accommodation is to be part of two new colleges then this makes no impact on existing shortfall or future demand for accommodation.	
10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	10.56
13531 Object	
Summary:	
If the student accommodation is to be part of two new Colleges then this makes no impact on existing shortfall or future demand for accommodation.	
10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	10.59
11141 Support	
Summary:	
The provision of adequate housing for the University and colleges is fundamental to its continuing success. Failure to provide appropriate housing can have a direct impact on attracting not only the students but crucially academic and support staff. Policy should be worded positively to encourage provision by the University and particularly colleges to deliver the necessary housing. Policy should recognise how acute the problem is and that adequate provision would be of such significant public benefit that may outweigh other Local Plan objectives.	
Policy encouraging the continuing expansion of the University needs complimentary policy for adequate housing provision.	
10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	10.59
13533 Support	
Summary:	
Provision of adequate housing for the University and Colleges is fundamental to its continuing success. Failure to provide appropriate housing can have a direct impact on attracting not only the students but crucially academic and support staff. Policy should be worded positively to support the University and particularly Colleges to deliver the necessary housing. Policy should recognise how acute the problem is and that adequate provision would be of such significant public benefit that may outweigh other Local Plan objectives.	
Policy encouraging the continuing expansion of the University needs complimentary policy for adequate housing provision.	
10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	Option 144 - University of Cambridge staff and student housing

8677 Support

Summary:

We strongly support this option. However, whilst it is drafted as an alternative to option 145, it must be understood that only by maintaining this policy and allowing for the development of student accommodation on the NW Cambridge site can the future accommodation needs of the University be met through the collegiate system. Failure to allow for sufficient growth will increase pressure on other housing stock within the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 144 - University of Cambridge staff and student housing

10453 Support

Summary:

This is a better idea than option 145 where one tries to keep Colleges of a size that fosters a collegiate atmosphere.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 144 - University of Cambridge staff and student housing

11142 Object

Summary:

This option does not go far enough in helping to address accommodation issues. A policy should recognise that colleges are increasingly providing residential accommodation for students and staff.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 144 - University of Cambridge staff and student housing

13317 Support

Summary:

Strongly supported. Though apparently drafted as an alternative to Option 145, it is only by implementing development in both areas (Central and NW Cambridge) that the future accommodation demands on the Colleges and University could be met, thereby reducing pressure on general City housing stock.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 144 - University of Cambridge staff and student housing

13537 Object

Summary:

This option does not go far enough in helping to address accommodation issues. A policy should recognise that Colleges are increasingly providing residential accommodation for students and staff.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 144 - University of Cambridge staff and student housing

15181 Support

Summary:

We strongly support this option. Whilst it is drafted as an alternative to option 145, it must be understood that only by maintaining this policy and allowing for the development of student accommodation on the NW Cambridge site can the future accommodation needs of the University be met through the collegiate system. Failure to allow for sufficient growth will increase pressure on other housing stock within the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 144 - University of Cambridge staff and student housing

15330 Object

Summary:

Recognise there are limits to growth and downsize

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 144 - University of Cambridge staff and student housing

17668 Support

Summary:

The major growth of jobs will take place in Addenbrookes and at the two Universities. The present proposals for the Southern edge of the City and in the North West will accommodate the majority of the added workforce without the need to build further on Green Belt. I agree with proposals in the Plan to relax regulations for building speculative student accommodation for all such institutions and that at least some of this accommodation should be incorporated within developments on site. Such provision at West Cambridge would help create a sustainable community for students on site, reducing the need to commute across the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 145 - Expand existing colleges rather than plan for new colleges at North West Cambridge

8683 Object

Summary:

As drafted, this option is self-contradictory and confusing. The headline advocates expanding existing Colleges rather than planning for new ones at North West Cambridge, whilst the text argues for the opposite. In reality, both the NW Cambridge option and the expansion of existing Colleges will be necessary to provide the accommodation needed to enable the University to maintain its pre-eminence, particularly in relation to the growing numbers of graduate students.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 145 - Expand existing colleges rather than plan for new colleges at North West Cambridge

10452 Object

Summary:

Just expanding a college can too easily remove the collegiate atmosphere and make it too impersonal. New colleges (option 144) is a better policy than expanding present colleges on their present sites.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 145 - Expand existing colleges rather than plan for new colleges at North West Cambridge

11147 Object

Summary:

The policy has to be a combination of options 144 and 145 to use every opportunity to make provision for student accommodation. Accommodation for existing colleges in North West Cambridge is not ideal especially as the objective is to have all students onto the main campus. The proximity of academic and support services and communal facilities is particularly important in attracting students and in effectively caring for and managing students whilst at University.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 145 - Expand existing colleges rather than plan for new colleges at North West Cambridge

13373 Object

Summary:

This Option is illogically drafted and presented. It appears to advocate expansion of college accommodation stock where and as possible, which is supported. However, the text proposes exactly the opposite, focussing mistakenly on whether NW Cambridge will be for 'colleges' or 'dormitory suburb'. The world-leading position of the University and its Colleges can only be maintained by the use of both options. The false question of 'colleges' or 'hostels' does not then arise, except correctly that pastoral, social and welfare support of perhaps thousands of academically associated people at NW Cambridge must be more difficult without a localised college structure.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 145 - Expand existing colleges rather than plan for new colleges at North West Cambridge

14883 Object

Summary:

Object

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 145 - Expand existing colleges rather than plan for new colleges at North West Cambridge**

15182 Object**Summary:**

In reality, both the NW Cambridge option and the expansion of existing Colleges will be necessary to provide the accommodation necessary to enable the University to maintain its pre-eminence, particularly in relation to the growing numbers of graduate students.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 145 - Expand existing colleges rather than plan for new colleges at North West Cambridge**

15333 Support**Summary:**

Existing colleges should be improved as a first priority and bear their share of the pain of being squeezed into a pint pot and not enjoy pre-emption rights to the Green Belt even though they appear to win most of it.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.49**

7013 Support**Summary:**

I believe there are already a sufficient number of colleges in Cambridge. I would favour Option 145, with preference being given to those colleges who currently have fewest students.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.49**

7770 Support**Summary:**

I would favour option 144: if the University is to grow in student numbers then new colleges should be created rather than creating more hostel locations. Part of the benefit of the University and to the wider community is the number of opportunities for participation and leadership created by a large number of smaller communities.

Creating colleges could also mitigate the lack of social provision in the existing West Cambridge development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.49**

8405 Support**Summary:**

need policy we prefer option 144

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.49**

8495 Support**Summary:**

yes favour option 144

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.49

11251 Support

Summary:

St John's College support Option 144 which continues the current policy 7/7. We would also take this opportunity to confirm that we continue to support site 7.07 within the 2006 local plan as an allocated site for a student hostel or affordable/key worker housing for the Colleges

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.49

12320 Object

Summary:

The University supports the future provision of student accommodation at existing Colleges, sites close to Colleges, and at North West Cambridge.

Student accommodation at North West Cambridge is secured through the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan. Option 145, related to the nature of student accommodation at North West Cambridge, is not a matter for planning policy as it would determine the way in which the University provided its student accommodation.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.49

12373 Support

Summary:

yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.49

12556 Support

Summary:

The university should be encouraged to increase its accommodation stock for staff and students by requiring contributions to affordable housing if it does not so do. Are there any other ways the Council could incentivise the University to help the city meet its accommodation needs?

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.49

12842 Support

Summary:

Yes, but we dispute that it will be hard for the university to provide pastoral care. Very few students are not mobile on bicycles.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.49

13538 Object

Summary:

A positively worded policy is essential to support the Colleges in providing accommodation within or close to their main sites. It should be recognised that student accommodation which is remote from the main College is not ideal. It simply does not operate as part of the College and the students are isolated. The College seeks to have all their students living as close as possible to the main site. Inevitably because of the ongoing shortage of suitable accommodation this situation will continue.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.49

14204 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.49

14309 Support

Summary:

I support retention of the existing policy with a slight bias towards enabling colleges to build on their main sites wherever possible in order to meet the collegiate and pastoral objectives.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.49

16898 Support

Summary:

The ability for Colleges to provide sufficient levels of accommodation is essential. It is also extremely important for the Colleges to provide a scholarly learning environment for students and central to this is the provision of living accommodation within the respective College communities. As such, the provision of living accommodation within, or in close proximity to Colleges is very important. As such a policy to help achieve this is very important.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.49

17493 Support

Summary:

There is a need to address the issue of accommodation for Cambridge University Students

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.49

17496 Support

Summary:

There is a need for a policy facilitating the continued growth of the University, given the acknowledged importance of the University to the reputation and economic profile of the city.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.49

17598 Support

Summary:

We support Options 143 and 144 provided that this latter is carefully monitored to ensure that the open character of many existing colleges is not detrimentally affected.

With regard to option 145, we support the use of the West Cambridge Site to include additional student accommodation, especially as many technical faculties will be located in this area and the provision of significant amounts of student accommodation here will reduce the commute of students across the City. However this must be tied to infrastructure improvements including public transport to City Centre & shops including the supermarket at NIAB1 and small convenience shops to create an independent community for students.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.49

18018 Support

Summary:

Yes, though it should be able to reach an understanding with the University and Colleges Committee rather have a formal policy

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.49

18375 Object

Summary:

Taking a specific policy approach for student accommodation would remove this flexibility. The Council wishes to explore this issue with the City Council before a decision is made on the approach in its new Local Plan which will have implications for the joint AAP.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.50**

9376 Support**Summary:**

Creation of new colleges has disadvantages in terms of scale and makes fundraising more difficult. In addition, any new colleges might tend to become more specialist as regards subjects, which is against the Cambridge ethos. Expanding existing colleges, albeit on split sites, would be preferable but this should ultimately be the University's decision, though the Council should discuss and advise.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.50**

11143 Support**Summary:**

With regard to the loss of family accommodation this option does not acknowledge that a property can be occupied by up to 6 unrelated people i.e. a small HMO. Many colleges own such properties. A college will retain such properties for the long term with no prospect of selling or re-using for a single family given the serious shortage of college accommodation available. A permissive policy which allowed for redevelopment of such sites for college accommodation would make more efficient use of the land and clearly ease pressure on the private housing market.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.50**

12376 Object**Summary:**

we support option 144

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.50**

12843 Object (W/drawn 2012-10-31)**Summary:**

What are College windfall locations? Use Class C3 (Dwelling houses) is so broad that it gives no protection for family residences not to be bought by colleges and used for undergraduate or graduate accommodation. The premises then often look uncared for, and the gardens grabbed for higher density student accommodation.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.50**

12851 Support**Summary:**

What are College windfall locations? Use Class C3 (Dwelling houses) is so broad that it gives no protection for family residences not to be bought by colleges and used for student accommodation. The premises then often look uncared for, and the gardens grabbed for higher density student accommodation.

Conservation Area declaration is insufficient to stop this, as is happening in Newtown. It needs to be halted now before the Conservation Area has been further degraded. Area specific policies in the Local Plan are required. A change of the Class C3/C4 definition is needed to overcome this.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.50**

13098 Support**Summary:**

This does not acknowledge that a property regarded as family accommodation can be occupied by up to 6 unrelated people i.e. a small HMO. Student accommodation in the private rented sector is commonly occupied in such a manner. A permissive policy which allows for development of student accommodation on campus as well as speculative student accommodation even where it means the loss of a unit which could potentially be occupied as family accommodation would have an overall benefit in making more efficient use of the land and easing pressure on the private housing market.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.50**

13541 Support

Summary:

With regard to the loss of family accommodation this option does not acknowledge that a property can be occupied by up to 6 unrelated people i.e. a small HMO. Many Colleges own such properties. A college will retain such properties for the long term with no prospect of selling or re-using for a single family given the serious shortage of college accommodation available. A permissive policy which allowed for redevelopment of such sites for college accommodation would make more efficient use of the land and clearly ease pressure on the private housing market.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.50

14066 Support

Summary:

Planning policy should reflect the fact a certain fraction of graduate students want and have a need for, cars.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.50

16899 Support

Summary:

Whilst supporting text is supported, Option 144 appears to suggest that the approach of the existing Local Plan is available on the one hand, and on the other under Option 145, is an approach to refocus the provision at North West Cambridge from new colleges to provision for existing Colleges. Our view is that an alternative approach is required. This would involve a policy to allow for development to be brought forward within existing College sites and on new sites, as well as at North West Cambridge.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.50

17494 Support

Summary:

Yet again there seems little perception of the need to provide water in this case for the large planned increase in the student population. Perhaps the availability of water should be considered first before taking the decision that student numbers should continue to rise.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.50

17497 Support

Summary:

There is a need for a policy facilitating the continued growth of the University, given the acknowledged importance of the University to the reputation and economic profile of the city. It is also apparent that there is a pressing need for additional student accommodation to meet an identified shortfall. Greatest possible use should be made of land already allocated for University uses at North-West Cambridge for student accommodation, and therefore Option 145 is supported. The need for student and general housing must be pursued separately so that the acute needs of both sectors are planned for effectively.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.50

17602 Support

Summary:

We support Option 146 for the development of Anglia Ruskin and Option 147 for expansion of student accommodation. However, we feel that it is appropriate to consider the provision of hostel accomosation for the Education sector as a whole and therefore we tie our support for Options 145 and 147 to the fact that Option 150 is an over-riding consideration. Again, this support is tied to improving the local infrastructure to support the additional loads such as student accommodation will impose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.50

18019 Support

Summary:

To house members of the old colleges in North West Cambridge would make it difficult to provide the College functions (educational, social, pastoral etc); also it would increase student traffic between the centre and West Cambridge. Encourage the University to absorb increasing numbers through founding new Colleges in NW Cambridge rather than expanding existing

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.50

18376 Support

Summary:

Option 145 introduces the idea that the potential for a new college(s) at North West Cambridge could be replaced by a specific focus on additional student accommodation. Whilst the AAP was not specific that a new college would be developed given uncertainty over deliverability, the potential to create a new college and the opportunity it would provide to help create a heart to the new University quarter was discussed when the AAP was being prepared.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.51

14206 Support

Summary:

I would like to see the redevelopment of the Grafton Centre to provide a mixture of shops and accommodation.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.51

16332 Object

Summary:

The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European education centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.52

9377 Support

Summary:

Is there scope for the colleges to make greater use of shared accommodation? Rooms shared by two students (often freshmen) was common in my day and should still be workable today.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.52

16335 Support

Summary:

The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European education centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 146 - Anglia Ruskin University - Faculty development

10942 Object

Summary:

The Local Plan needs to put in place a framework which will allow the University to flourish.

Future growth is likely to take place in postgraduate provision.

Unlikely that the University will relocate.

Proposed approach appears significantly more restrictive than the current local plan.

University likely to wish to meet with the Council to discuss potential changes to masterplan.

Restricting development to the current masterplan would be significantly restrictive.

We suggest that the local plan includes the following policy:

"The further redevelopment and upgrade of the University's East Road Campus for teaching, administrative and social facilities will be permitted."

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 146 - Anglia Ruskin University - Faculty development

12111 Support

Summary:

We agree with the outline proposal. However, we would comment that for the University to maximise its cohesiveness and therefore student benefit, the potential satellite campus should be located as close as is reasonably possible to minimise time lost in travel and isolation of particular faculties or student groups. It should aim to achieve the coordination and co-location that Cambridge University is now achieving by co-locating science faculties on the West Cambridge Site.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 146 - Anglia Ruskin University - Faculty development

14889 Support

Summary:

Support

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 146 - Anglia Ruskin University - Faculty development

15335 Object

Summary:

Why a medium size city needs two large and expanding universities defeats me. Both need to be kept within bounds to allow the rest of Cambridge to thrive.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 146 - Anglia Ruskin University - Faculty development

15629 Object

Summary:

Support - We agree with the outline of the proposal. However, we would comment that for the University to maximise its cohesiveness and therefore student benefit, the potential satellite campus should be located as close as is reasonably possible to minimise time lost in travel and isolation of particular faculties or student groups. It should aim to achieve the coordination and co-location that Cambridge University is now achieving by co-locating science faculties on the West Cambridge site.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 146 - Anglia Ruskin University - Faculty development

16320 Support

Summary:

We agree with the outline of the proposal. However, we would comment that for the University to maximise its cohesiveness and therefore student benefit, the potential satellite campus should be located as close as is reasonably possible to minimise time lost in travel and isolation of particular faculties or student groups. It should aim to achieve the coordination and co-location that Cambridge University is now achieving by co-locating science faculties on the West Cambridge site.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 146 - Anglia Ruskin University - Faculty development**

17670 Support**Summary:**

The major growth of jobs will take place in Addenbrookes and at the two Universities. The present proposals for the Southern edge of the City and in the North West will accommodate the majority of the added workforce without the need to build further on Green Belt. I agree with proposals in the Plan to relax regulations for building speculative student accommodation for all such institutions and that at least some of this accommodation should be incorporated within developments on site. Such provision at West Cambridge would help create a sustainable community for students on site, reducing the need to commute across the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.53**

8406 Support**Summary:**

need policy

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.53**

8496 Support**Summary:**

yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.53**

10939 Object**Summary:**

The Local Plan needs to put in place a framework which will allow the University to flourish.

Future growth is likely to take place in postgraduate provision.

Unlikely that the University will relocate.

Proposed approach appears significantly more restrictive than the current local plan.

University likely to wish to meet with the Council to discuss potential changes to masterplan.

Restricting development to the current masterplan would be significantly restrictive.

We suggest that the local plan includes the following policy:

"The further redevelopment and upgrade of the University's East Road Campus for teaching, administrative and social facilities will be permitted."

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.53**

12113 Object**Summary:**

Support. We believe a policy is required in this respect and should a) discourage use of inner City space for warehousing and b) only locate such warehouses in locations where the transportation links are such as to render the impact of the warehousing minimal, both in terms of traffic congestion, noise, pollution, access and road safety. Access to these warehouse spaces should also not be enabled at the expense of the quality of life, safety and congestion of surrounding villages outside or inside the City. Additionally, we do not believe space should be made available for warehousing at the expense of office or housing.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.53**

12378 Support

Summary:

the option seems to have the matter well covered.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.53

12852 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.53

14208 Support

Summary:

yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.53

15631 Support

Summary:

We agree with the outline of the proposal. However, we would comment that for the University to maximise its cohesiveness and therefore student benefit, the potential satellite campus should be located as close as is reasonably possible to minimise time lost in travel and isolation of particular faculties or student groups. It should aim to achieve the coordination and co-location that Cambridge University is now achieving by co-locating science faculties on the West Cambridge site.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.53

16322 Support

Summary:

We agree with the outline of the proposal. However, we would comment that for the University to maximise its cohesiveness and therefore student benefit, the potential satellite campus should be located as close as is reasonably possible to minimise time lost in travel and isolation of particular faculties or student groups. It should aim to achieve the coordination and co-location that Cambridge University is now achieving by co-locating science faculties on the West Cambridge site.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.53

17495 Support

Summary:

There is a need to address the issue of accommodation for Anglia Ruskin University Students

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.53

17600 Object

Summary:

We support Option 146 for the development of Anglia Ruskin and Option 147 for expansion of student accommodation. However, we feel that it is appropriate to consider the provision of hostel accommodation for the Education sector as a whole and therefore we tie our support for Options 145 and 147 to the fact that Option 150 is an over-riding consideration. Again, this support is tied to improving the local infrastructure to support the additional loads such as student accommodation will impose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.53

18020 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.53

18462 Support

Summary:

The County Council supports the need for policies addressing faculty development at both Universities.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.54

8497 Support

Summary:

Having worked at Anglia Ruskin for most of my career, I would argue against a second campus for teaching and research. More space could be found on the present campus if all student residences were to be located on a new site along with facilities that make it attractive to students. Finding an appropriate site should be treated as a matter of urgency. This would also allow the student housing planned for near the station to be used for other purposes. Would there be sufficient space in the New St area?

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.54

9378 Support

Summary:

ARU already has a divided campus. Perhaps Chelmsford could be expanded, or a third site found, possibly in Norfolk or Suffolk?

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.54

10951 Object

Summary:

The option of enabling the agreed masterplan to evolve and change needs to be considered.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.54

12117 Support

Summary:

We believe a policy is required in this respect and should a) discourage use of inner City space for warehousing and b) only locate such warehouses in locations where the transportation links are such as to render the impact of the warehousing minimal, both in terms of traffic congestion, noise, pollution, access and road safety. Access to these warehouse spaces should also not be enabled at the expense of the quality of life, safety and congestion of surrounding villages outside or inside the City. Additionally, we do not believe space should be made available for warehousing at the expense of office or housing.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.54

12185 Object

Summary:

We do not believe a policy is required in this respect and rather feel that market forces should decide. Tourism is decreasing and, if a policy is considered necessary, an integrated policy together with the University Colleges should be considered.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.54

12826 Object

Summary:

Anglia Ruskin University plays an important role in the local economy, but recent developments have removed most of what little green space there was from the campus. This is bad for the health and well being of students and locals alike. I believe there is no more space on the present campus, or in Cambridge, that can (or should) be developed, so development may have to take place further afield (e.g. Fulbourn). No more development should be allowed on or next to Anglia Ruskin's East Road campus.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.54

12857 Support

Summary:

They should be developed to the highest design, conservation and climate change standards.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.54

14209 Support

Summary:

I am disappointed with the quality of new buildings at Anglia Ruskin. It is astonishingly poor, and hostile to residents of Petersfield and for those who do not use the area. It does not meet the existing master plan AT ALL. You need to look again.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.54

15634 Support

Summary:

We agree with the outline of the proposal. However, we would comment that for the University to maximise its cohesiveness and therefore student benefit, the potential satellite campus should be located as close as is reasonably possible to minimise time lost in travel and isolation of particular faculties or student groups. It should aim to achieve the coordination and co-location that Cambridge University is now achieving by co-locating science faculties on the West Cambridge site.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.54

15944 Support

Summary:

There is a danger that Petersfield will be hit with all of ARU's student requirements. The Local Plan sets out a need for a sense of community, therefore the amount of student accomodation in an area needs to be restricted to allow a community to exist. Petersfield must not become ARU's student campus.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.54

16323 Support

Summary:

We agree with the outline of the proposal. However, we would comment that for the University to maximise its cohesiveness and therefore student benefit, the potential satellite campus should be located as close as is reasonably possible to minimise time lost in travel and isolation of particular faculties or student groups. It should aim to achieve the coordination and co-location that Cambridge University is now achieving by co-locating science faculties on the West Cambridge site.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.54

17498 Support

Summary:

There seems little perception of the need to provide water. In this case for the large planned increase in the student population. Perhaps the availability of water should be considered first before taking the decision that student numbers should continue to rise.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.54**

18022 Object**Summary:**

Proximity to good public transport facilities (railway) for access to campus

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.55**

9379 Object**Summary:**

Not in Cambridge

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.55**

10957 Object**Summary:**

The University has land holdings at Huntingdon Road (in South Cambridgeshire), where its outdoor sports facilities are located. The site is currently under utilised owing to its designation as Green Belt. Additional facilities could be delivered at this site.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.55**

12121 Support**Summary:**

We believe a policy is required in this respect and should a) discourage use of inner City space for warehousing and b) only locate such warehouses in locations where the transportation links are such as to render the impact of the warehousing minimal, both in terms of traffic congestion, noise, pollution, access and road safety. Access to these warehouse spaces should also not be enabled at the expense of the quality of life, safety and congestion of surrounding villages outside or inside the City. Additionally, we do not believe space should be made available for warehousing at the expense of office or housing.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.55**

12389 Object**Summary:**

Could the Mill Road cemetery be considered.

This may be difficult and contentious, but this area is also sometimes a 'no go' with many using it for drugs etc and its loss might change the 'ambience' of that part of Mill Road

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.56**

10961 Object**Summary:**

The alternative of enabling the agreed masterplan to evolve and change needs to be considered.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.56**

12125 Support

Summary:

We believe a policy is required in this respect and should a) discourage use of inner City space for warehousing and b) only locate such warehouses in locations where the transportation links are such as to render the impact of the warehousing minimal, both in terms of traffic congestion, noise, pollution, access and road safety. Access to these warehouse spaces should also not be enabled at the expense of the quality of life, safety and congestion of surrounding villages outside or inside the City. Additionally, we do not believe space should be made available for warehousing at the expense of office or housing.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 147 - Anglia Ruskin University - support for student hostel development with affordable housing exemption

10965 Support

Summary:

Policy 7/9 has been successful in delivering more student accommodation and hence easing pressure on existing stock. Removing the exemption is likely to place greater pressure on the housing stock as students seek to find accommodation in shared housing.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 147 - Anglia Ruskin University - support for student hostel development with affordable housing exemption

14418 Support

Summary:

We support the policy of identifying specific sites where student accommodation for Anglia Ruskin will be permitted in lieu of affordable housing. The sites should be well-located to Anglia Ruskin. This is an important policy to help support Anglia Ruskin.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 147 - Anglia Ruskin University - support for student hostel development with affordable housing exemption

17671 Support

Summary:

The major growth of jobs will take place in Addenbrookes and at the two Universities. The present proposals for the Southern edge of the City and in the North West will accommodate the majority of the added workforce without the need to build further on Green Belt. I agree with proposals in the Plan to relax regulations for building speculative student accommodation for all such institutions and that at least some of this accommodation should be incorporated within developments on site. Such provision at West Cambridge would help create a sustainable community for students on site, reducing the need to commute across the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 148 - Anglia Ruskin University - Support for student hostel accommodation but removal of affordable housing exemption

10670 Support

Summary:

Support. Present policy allows developers to exempt themselves from affordable housing element, often in areas which badly need such housing.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 148 - Anglia Ruskin University - Support for student hostel accommodation but removal of affordable housing exemption

10977 Object

Summary:

Policy 7/9 has been successful in delivering more student accommodation and hence easing pressure on existing stock. Removing the exemption is likely to place greater pressure on the housing stock as students seek to find accommodation in shared housing.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.57

8407 Support

Summary:

need policy

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.57

10970 Support

Summary:

Policy 7/9 has been successful in delivering more student accommodation and hence easing pressure on existing stock. Removing the exemption is likely to place greater pressure on the housing stock as students seek to find accommodation in shared housing.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.57

12390 Support

Summary:

yes we need a clear policy

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.57

12564 Support

Summary:

A clear need to address the issue. Exemption should be made provided the supply of accommodation is sufficient to reduce significantly the difference between student accommodation and the number of students.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.57

15338 Support

Summary:

There is a need for a policy that applies to all student housing and it should be around Option 148. Student housing should be the responsibility of the student and the institution they attend. The policy should not restrict itself to CU and ARU, there are other institutions with residential students, although those two are the biggest by far. Student accommodation should make the same contributions to section 106 as any other housing, the exemption currently adds 15% to the value of any site that can get consent for student housing.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.58

8408 Support

Summary:

some of us favoured 147 and some 148

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.58

9380 Support

Summary:

A compromise between the two.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.58

10987 Support

Summary:

We support option 147 as Policy 7/9 has been successful in delivering more student accommodation and hence easing pressure on existing stock. Removing the exemption is likely to place greater pressure on the housing stock as students seek to find accommodation in shared housing.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.58

12394 Object

Summary:

we strongly support Option 148. We acknowledge the need for much more student accommodation but ARU have done well out of CB1. The need for affordable housing is equally as great if not greater and Affordable housing has not fared so well of late given the exemptions granted and the slow pace of house building. Time to reverse the policy and push for more affordable housing

Provision of student rooms is generally facilitated by developers who are looking for a reasonable return, this is market led.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.58

12862 Object

Summary:

Option 148: but better to cap numbers of students in Cambridge and for ARU to use their campuses elsewhere

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.58

14211 Support

Summary:

Option 148

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.58

17601 Support

Summary:

We support Option 146 for the development of Anglia Ruskin and Option 147 for expansion of student accommodation. However, we feel that it is appropriate to consider the provision of hostel accommodation for the Education sector as a whole, and therefore we tie our support for Options 145 and 147 to the fact that Option 150 is an over-riding consideration. Again, this support is tied to improving the local infrastructure to support the additional loads such as student accommodation will impose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.58

18596 Support

Summary:

Option 148

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.59

9381 Support

Summary:

Develop a formula allowing a reduced affordable housing percentage on sites with student hostels, but not on a one-for-one basis.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.59

10993 Object

Summary:

The approach should be extended and apply not only to specific identified sites in the plan but to other sites which come forward for development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.59

12844 Object

Summary:

Anglia Ruskin University does not need any more hostels than have already been agreed by the Council. We want students to feel part of the community, but I fear that putting them in separate secular student blocks will not achieve this - in fact other Cambridge residents are likely to be more accepting of students if they are integrated with the community and can feel part of it.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.59

17603 Object

Summary:

Many students will be of graduate status and have families, this needs to be accommodated in the mix of housing provided for the students and will lead to a more balanced student population in any one housing/hostel group. The proportion and size of such family units will need to be established from typical demographic surveys.

Also it is important that any such housing group provides safe play/recreation areas for children. The units opposite the Institute of Manufacturing on the West Cambridge site are an example of what not to provide, since they have very limited and ramped play areas which are open to the road and hence not safe.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.59

18024 Support

Summary:

Affordable housing is vital to all of Cambridge and should take priority over Anglia Ruskin University

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.60

10997 Object

Summary:

Any sites suitable for residential development would be equally suitable for the provision of student accommodation. Cambridge is a compact city and Anglia Ruskin is easily accessible by a range of modes of travel from locations across the city.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.60

12397 Object

Summary:

Any new accommodation should be as close as possible to the ARU main campus to avoid migration of large numbers of students through existing areas.

Tram Depot and car park at the rear could be over built; but retain the parking. This may include some of the shops fronting East Rd.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.60

14457 Support

Summary:

The site of the former Atrium Health and Fitness club (64-68 Newmarket Road) which runs along Severn Place between East Road and Newmarket Road should be listed as a site where student accommodation for Anglia Ruskin should be provided in lieu of affordable housing. The site is listed for residential development in the Council's SHLAA. The proposals for the site include student housing at the East Road end of Severn Place which is within easy walking and cycling distance of Anglia Ruskin's East Road campus. Anglia Ruskin have expressed an interest in the proposed student accommodation here.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**10.70**

16375 Support**Summary:**

Agree that it is unfair/discriminatory on other legitimate and established providers of higher education to restrict speculative student accommodation and students to the two main universities.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 149 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - limited to Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge**

11004 Object**Summary:**

The suggested criteria are unnecessary. Most are simply general development management criteria which will apply in any event. Others are unnecessary, for example,

* there is already a proven need for more student accommodation

* the university will only enter agreements where the accommodation is adequate and hence the planning authority does not need to involve itself in such matters of detail

* such accommodation is occupied by adults and there is no need to mandate the need for warden controlled premises.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 149 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - limited to Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge**

11149 Object**Summary:**

As set out in paragraph 10.70 this option is inequitable and discriminating against non-university colleges. It should not be taken further.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 149 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - limited to Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge**

12132 Object**Summary:**

Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 149 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - limited to Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge**

12534 Support**Summary:**

Essential to have wardens to control noise and nuisance.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 149 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - limited to Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge**

13099 Object**Summary:**

As set out in paragraph 10.70 this option is inequitable and discriminating against non-university colleges as confirmed by a Planning Inspector a year ago at the EIP to the Oxford Core Strategy. As such it is not an option that should be given any further consideration.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 149 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - limited to Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge**

13546 Object**Summary:**

As set out in paragraph 10.70 this option is inequitable and discriminating against non-university Colleges. It should not be taken further.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 149 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - limited to Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge**

13846 Object**Summary:**

Speculative student hostel accommodation should not be limited to Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge because there is a growing demand for student accommodation in connection with other educational establishments in the city. As set out in paragraph 10.70 this option is inequitable and discriminating against non-university colleges as confirmed by a Planning Inspector a year ago at the EIP to the Oxford Core Strategy. As such it is not an option that should be given any further consideration.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 149 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - limited to Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge**

14077 Object**Summary:**

Planning policy should reflect the fact a certain fraction of graduate students want and have a need for, and are permitted by the universities to have cars. Planning policy should not discriminate against these individuals, who are often effectively doing a job as trainee teachers, doctors, scientists, etc., and ought instead actively seek to ensure their needs are provided for.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 149 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - limited to Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge**

14706 Object**Summary:**

It needs to be clear that car parking is only for disabled students and those with mobility problems. The wording here could potentially allow more car parking than the city can sustain. Cycle parking must of a high standard and quantity.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 149 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - limited to Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge**

15636 Object**Summary:**

Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 149 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - limited to Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge**

16325 Object**Summary:**

Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 149 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - limited to Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge**

16353 Object**Summary:**

Object to Option 149

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 150 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - widened to include other established educational institutions**

11080 Support**Summary:**

A need for accommodation for students should be demonstrated before planning permission is given and the conditions outlined seem sensible.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 150 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - widened to include other established educational institutions**

11151 Object**Summary:**

The policy should include the need for staff as well as student accommodation.

Such a policy would recognise the economic benefits of all educational establishments. However, this should also not prevent the use of the accommodation in academic holidays. This can be of considerable benefit to the economy in providing short term accommodation for students on short term courses, conferences and visitors to the City. The shortfall in such accommodation is acknowledged in 10.77 onwards.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 150 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - widened to include other established educational institutions**

12134 Support**Summary:**

Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 150 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - widened to include other established educational institutions**

13104 Object**Summary:**

Such a policy is supported but provision also needs to be made for staff accommodation. The difficulties of providing staff and student housing applies equally to specialist schools such as language schools as to the Universities and Colleges.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 150 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - widened to include other established educational institutions**

13549 Object**Summary:**

The policy should include the need for staff as well as student accommodation.

Such a policy would recognise the economic benefits of all educational establishments. However, this should also not prevent the use of the accommodation in academic holidays. This can be of considerable benefit to the economy in providing short term accommodation for students on short term courses, conferences and visitors to the City. The shortfall in such accommodation is acknowledged in 10.77 onwards.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 150 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - widened to include other established educational institutions**

13849 Support**Summary:**

There is a growing demand for student accommodation in connection with other educational establishments in the city. There is a recognised economic benefit arising from other educational facilities in the city.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 150 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - widened to include other established educational institutions**

14010 Support**Summary:**

We support Option 150, so that additional student accommodation could be provided for Abbey College students.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 150 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - widened to include other established educational institutions**

14079 Object**Summary:**

Planning policy should reflect the fact a certain fraction of graduate students want and have a need for, and are permitted by the universities to have cars. Planning policy should not discriminate against these individuals, who are often effectively doing a job as trainee teachers, doctors, scientists, etc. and ought instead actively seek to ensure their needs are provided for.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 150 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - widened to include other established educational institutions**

14707 Object**Summary:**

Currently, some schools and colleges (i.e. those under County Council control) are not subject to the cycle parking standards in the Local Plan. This situation must change. Except for disabled spaces, car parking should not be provided.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 150 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - widened to include other established educational institutions**

15638 Support**Summary:**

Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 150 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - widened to include other established educational institutions**

16329 Support**Summary:**

Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 150 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - widened to include other established educational institutions**

16364 Support

Summary:

Any policy on the development of speculative student accommodation should not include an occupancy restriction to students of the two main universities, but expanded to allow occupation of students of educational establishments on full time academic courses.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 150 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - widened to include other established educational institutions

17672 Support

Summary:

The major growth of jobs will take place in Addenbrookes and at the two Universities. The present proposals for the Southern edge of the City and in the North West will accommodate the majority of the added workforce without the need to build further on Green Belt. I agree with proposals in the Plan to relax regulations for building speculative student accommodation for all such institutions and that at least some of this accommodation should be incorporated within developments on site. Such provision at West Cambridge would help create a sustainable community for students on site, reducing the need to commute across the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 150 - Speculative student hostel accommodation - widened to include other established educational institutions

18394 Support

Summary:

We are in full support of Option 150 and the associated set of criteria that is listed, with the exception of the ninth bullet point relating to the provision of sufficient external amenity space for the occupiers. Concern is raised on the inclusion of this clause since often the normal constraints associated with developing on urban brownfield land will mitigate against the prospects of providing such space, as it did in the appeal cases discussed in our full submission. This option would allow the accommodation needs of such specialist schools to be properly catered for and would therefore reduce the pressure on the local housing market.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.62

10241 Support

Summary:

The continuing use of policy 7/10 within any new planned period is inequitable and discriminates against non-university colleges. An amended policy stance which does not restrict occupiers in this manner should be supported. CCSS as an established education provider in Cambridge should constitute such a provider.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.62

11007 Object

Summary:

The suggested criteria are unnecessary. Most are simply general development management criteria which will apply in any event. Others are unnecessary, for example,

* there is already a proven need for more student accommodation

* the university will only enter agreements where the accommodation is adequate and hence the planning authority does not need to involve itself in such matters of detail

* such accommodation is occupied by adults and there is no need to mandate the need for warden controlled premises.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.62

11255 Support

Summary:

We consider that suggested wording together with the criteria against which new development proposals would be assessed are supportable and consider it is Option 150 that should be considered as an appropriate policy approach in any local plan review.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.62

12136 Support

Summary:

Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.62

12401 Support

Summary:

yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.62

12865 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.62

15339 Support

Summary:

Support a policy that does not encourage speculative student accommodation. If student housing were brought wholly within the same rules that apply to other housing this would probably deal with some of the speculative pressure.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.62

15637 Object

Summary:

Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.62

16327 Object

Summary:

Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.62

17511 Support

Summary:

There is a need to address the issue of speculative building of student accommodation.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.62

18025 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.63**

9382 Support**Summary:**

Option 149 though I query whether speculative development should be allowed at all.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.63**

10248 Support**Summary:**

We support Option 150 which widens the current policy stance of the Council to include established educational institutions engaged in academic courses providing full time education in Cambridge

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.63**

10671 Support**Summary:**

Option 149

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.63**

12140 Support**Summary:**

Option 149 Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.63**

12403 Object**Summary:**

There seems little point in pursuing Option 149 given the Inspector's decision in Oxford.

So Option 150 should be adopted, but with strict guidelines and controls in the policy. Care should be taken to review each 'site' on its own merits.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.63**

12883 Object**Summary:**

Option 150 would offer more protection for historic areas close to the city such as North Newtown where we are in danger of having the area swamped by students who have no long term loyalty to the area. If mixed residential communities in the local areas are to be sustainable, a balance needs to be struck between permanent and temporary residents, and a limit to the density of occupation, particularly in Conservation Areas. The Local Plan needs to determine area specific policies especially for areas such as Conservation Areas.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.63**

13853 Support

Summary:

Support option 150 which increases the flexibility of student accommodation to meet the needs of the education sector in the local economy. Over the past 20 years there has been a growth in the number of student weeks. General trend of increase means that there is a demand for student accommodation to meet speculative provision.

City centre sites, particularly over ground floor retail use, are good locations for additional student accommodation because

- High existing student population in and low residential population;
- Close to educational establishments;
- Highly accessible by public transport;
- Low or nil requirement for car parking;
- Close to amenity open space.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.63

14212 Support

Summary:

Option 149

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.63

15639 Support

Summary:

Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.63

16330 Support

Summary:

Language education is an important service provision in Cambridge and should not be excluded.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.63

17512 Object

Summary:

I prefer neither of the options. Speculative building of student hostels accommodation should not be allowed.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.63

18026 Support

Summary:

Option 150

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.64

12538 Support

Summary:

Avoid large numbers of students being accommodated in 'non-student' locations. They can be very disruptive to quiet and established suburbs.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.64

13108 Object

Summary:

This should recognise the economic benefits of all educational establishments. However, this should also not prevent the use of the accommodation in academic holidays. This can be of considerable benefit to the economy in providing short term accommodation for students on short term courses, conferences and visitors to the City and would make the most efficient use of that available accommodation. The shortfall in such accommodation is acknowledged in 10.77 onwards.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.64

18027 Object

Summary:

It is only fair that providers for students on long courses are treated comparably to those at the Universities

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.71

17018 Object

Summary:

There is another specialist school type not mentioned in your policy : Cambridge Performing Arts.

The report does not make the connection between relatively few jobs created and a relatively high need to provide student housing. Given the low unemployment in Cambridge and high local housing need this ratio needs to be examined.

This policy needs to examine if hostel accommodation is at the expense of the local housing market.

The statement in the planning document refers to students from the sub region, but the schools targets international market.

Want policy to reference suitability of premises and recognise impact on surrounding residential property.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.72

13113 Support

Summary:

Evidence that language schools contribute strongly to the local economy should inform policies which enable existing schools to continue to grow, providing improved teaching facilities and accommodation. Language schools are significant employers in the city. In addition, language schools make a strong social and cultural contribution by attracting a diversity of international students to Cambridge. Policy should recognise their contribution to the economy and the accommodation issues they face in the same way as it does for Colleges and ARU.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.74

11083 Support

Summary:

All specialist schools should be treated in the same way.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.76

18395 Support

Summary:

Language schools and other specialist schools make an important contribution to the education sector in Cambridge and provide a significant boost to the local economy, possibly by as much as £78m per annum. This was recognised in the 'Cluster at 50' study which suggested a review of the current policy restriction. We wish to endorse that such a review now takes place.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 151 - Specialist colleges such as secretarial and tutorial colleges

9670 Support

Summary:

A vital part of our economy and education on the international scene with many long-term advantages.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 151 - Specialist colleges such as secretarial and tutorial colleges

12151 Object

Summary:

The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European educational centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for the students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 151 - Specialist colleges such as secretarial and tutorial colleges

12541 Object

Summary:

Too many of these already. The local economy doesn't need an infinite number. This city is crowded enough as it is.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 151 - Specialist colleges such as secretarial and tutorial colleges

15340 Support

Summary:

Agree

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 151 - Specialist colleges such as secretarial and tutorial colleges

15644 Object

Summary:

The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European education centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 151 - Specialist colleges such as secretarial and tutorial colleges

17691 Support

Summary:

The jobs expansion at the Universities and schools will largely be driven by those organisations rather than anything the Council does. However, I agree with proposals in the Plan to relax regulations for building speculative student accommodation for all such institutions and that at least some of this accommodation should be incorporated within developments on site.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 152 - Language schools

7046 Support

Summary:

I think language schools with a good track record for 20,30 or 40+ years should have the opportunity to develop their businesses sensibly. If they can fulfil the criteria proposed, I would support these measures.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 152 - Language schools

10826 Support

Summary:

Broadly in favour

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 152 - Language schools

12153 Support

Summary:

The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European educational centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for the students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 152 - Language schools

12550 Object

Summary:

Look at the streets in the summer! More is worse. Where are these hostels to be built? Who wants to live near one? And why should hostels for yet more students be built, at the expense of housing for residents, and particularly for students who could learn English just as well in Wigan or Newcastle.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 152 - Language schools

13114 Object

Summary:

It is unreasonable and inappropriate to refer to behaviour issues when considering whether a policy to support expansion is appropriate. Actions of groups of young people are too often attributed to language schools when they are actually tourists. Moreover the effective management of the students is down to individual schools.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 152 - Language schools

15341 Support

Summary:

Agree

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 152 - Language schools

15646 Support

Summary:

The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European education centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 152 - Language schools

17693 Support

Summary:

The jobs expansion at the Universities and schools will largely be driven by those organisations rather than anything the Council does. However, I agree with proposals in the Plan to relax regulations for building speculative student accommodation for all such institutions and that at least some of this accommodation should be incorporated within developments on site.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.66

8409 Support

Summary:

need policy

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.66

10269 Object

Summary:

It is important the City Council understands the role and operations of CCSS and accordingly new text is recommended to be inserted into any new plan which confirms the nature of CCSS's organisation and the role and services it offers to Cambridge.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.66

10827 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.66

12158 Support

Summary:

The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European educational centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for the students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.66

12405 Support

Summary:

yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.66

12573 Support

Summary:

Policy 152. There should be a policy on language students. The students should not have purpose-built accommodation (for reasons given in document). Policies should be enacted to reduce the number of weeks to 80000 pa once again. Facilities for local students (secretarial colleges are welcome) and Cambridge can cope with crammers. University students are also welcomed but the expansion is controlled. The situation with language students has got completely out of hand.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.66

12885 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.66

13118 Object

Summary:

The Local Plan objectives include promotion of employment growth and supporting higher education institutions as they continue to grow. The report recognises the contribution of specialist schools to the local economy which is line with Local Plan objectives. The language schools have the same issues in terms of provision of adequate and appropriate teaching space and associated facilities as the Colleges and Universities. Further they have the same difficulties in finding suitable accommodation for both staff and students. As such they should be treated in an equitable manner.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.66

17513 Support

Summary:

There is a need to address the issue of an increasing number of specialist schools as more schools will further increase the demand for water.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.66

17514 Object

Summary:

I prefer neither option. A continuing increase in number of specialist schools should be discouraged.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.66

18029 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.66

18463 Support

Summary:

The County Council supports the need for a policy addressing specialist schools.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.67

8410 Object

Summary:

We prefer neither option. We believe the current policy of restriction is appropriate.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.67

9383 Support

Summary:

Retain option 152 but widen its scope to include other schools. Restrict, as far as legally possible, the opening of new schools.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.67

12160 Support

Summary:

Option 152

The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European educational centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for the students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.67

12406 Object

Summary:

option 152 is preferred

Care must be exercised not to allow large residential homes from being lost to these users. Understood there are some controls in place to prevent too many specialist schools opening.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.67

12889 Object

Summary:

These do not appear to be alternatives as one deals with specialist colleges and the other with language schools. However, for both types of school it would be advisable for adequate hostel accommodation to be provided to relieve pressure on residential accommodation. Colleges at present buy properties to house students and then expand and fill them as much as possible, as has happened in North Newtown. Houses in multiple occupancy should be limited so as to preserve sustainable mixed communities. The Local Plan should have area specific policies especially for Conservation and other historic areas.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.67

13120 Object

Summary:

A supportive policy which allows for additional teaching space would enable the language schools to expand to be able to offer more year round rather than short term. The restriction on expanding teaching space or providing the associated facilities e.g. shared communal spaces, offices etc in the current Local Plan effectively means this cannot happen.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.67

15647 Support

Summary:

Support option 152 - The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European education centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.67

16337 Support

Summary:

The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European education centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.67

17604 Support

Summary:

We support Options 151 & 152 but tied to an enforceable requirement that the schools provide on site accommodation for students. We feel that it is overly optimistic and unenforceable to require education establishments to supervise gathering of students in the City Centre's streets and open spaces. One only has to look at the gathering of young people at the corner of Downing and Regent Streets in the evening to see how difficult this would be.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.67

18030 Support

Summary:

Option 151

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.67

18464 Support

Summary:

The County Council supports Option 152 Language schools.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.68

9384 Support

Summary:

Can Cambridge Regional College help with extra courses and facilities?

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.68

12164 Support

Summary:

The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European educational centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for the students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.68

12891 Object

Summary:

There has to be some limit set on the number of such colleges and schools regardless of the hostel accommodation. Cambridge should remain a university town and not become a crammer town which would result in a very different atmosphere.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.68

17021 Object

Summary:

There is another specialist school type not mentioned in your policy; Cambridge Performing Arts.

The report does not make the connection between relatively few jobs created and a relatively high need to provide student housing. Given the low unemployment in Cambridge and high local housing need this ratio needs to be examined.

This policy needs to examine if hostel accommodation is at the expense of the local housing market.

The statement in the planning document refers to students from the sub region, but the schools target international markets.

Want policy to reference suitability of premises and recognise impact on surrounding residential property.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.68**

18031 Object**Summary:**

Secretarial Colleges and tutorial colleges should not be put at a disadvantage compared to language schools. Their students may be more mature than language school pupils? Expansion of the latter is creating problems in congestion on the pavements and streets. Further expansion should be restricted.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.68**

18466 Object**Summary:**

The possibility of converting existing buildings, vis a vis additional purpose built accommodation should not be discounted; additional on site accommodation would reduce trip generation; the supervision of large groups of students is a management issue.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.69**

9387 Object**Summary:**

No. They should be accommodated on-site wherever possible. This reduces traffic generation and also helps with "control" and oversight of behaviour and pastoral needs.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.69**

12409 Object**Summary:**

Should we be looking at any vacated state schools sites whose land is presumably publicly owned. There have been a few such sites coming available in the last 10 years

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.69**

18033 Object**Summary:**

Are there possible sites in CB1? Near transport links into Cambridge?

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.70**

9385 Support**Summary:**

Can Cambridge Regional College help with extra courses and facilities?

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.70**

12166 Support**Summary:**

The financial and cultural benefit to the City is appreciable and comparisons can be drawn with other European educational centres such as Salamanca. Provided the school can deliver accommodation for the students, and this should be a requirement, the policy should be relaxed to promote growth.
