

APPENDIX D: ANALYSIS, RESPONSES AND PREFERRED APPROACH TO OPEN SPACE AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES, PLUS SUMMARIES OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

ISSUE: STRATEGIC PRIORITY – PROMOTING SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITIES

Total representations: 31	
Object: 12	Support: 19

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 163: A green and pleasant city with vibrant and culturally diverse neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for this option however <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Neighbourhoods should also be relaxing; ○ Green spaces should be multi-functional and support the objectives of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy; • The areas should include proper management of the natural environment and ‘wildlife corridors’; • Community facilities should be protected and enhanced but not preclude the possibility of change of use, multi use or relocation based upon a strategic assessment in Cambridge. The policy itself should be sufficiently flexible to meet changing circumstances. • Make protection and enhancement (including better management) a priority; • Support the ongoing protection of open spaces; • Support the maintenance of a green network of open space linking areas of Cambridge together along the Cam; • No intrusive developments along the Cam; • Relationship between the city and its open spaces is a defining aspect of Cambridge; • Recognise important transport function of paths alongside the Cam; • Support for Local Green Space designations and the need for guidance on green areas; • Risk of existing areas becoming overused if new provision is not made available; • Provide new spaces and not allow developers to pay contributions; • Allotments are essential and should be provided for along with design requirements.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

This option is likely to have significant positive effects against the majority of the sustainability topics. Specific reference to the need to protect and enhance community, and other cultural facilities should help provide opportunities to capitalise on the city's vibrancy and diversity.

The reference to open spaces supports several of the sustainability themes including flood risk, climate change adaptation and mitigation, landscape, biodiversity and community well being.

Specific reference to contributing to the character and appeal of Cambridge should ensure that Cambridge remains an attractive destination.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Cambridgeshire Together Board (2007).
- Cambridgeshire Vision: County-wide Sustainable Community Strategy 2007 – 2021;
- Cambridge Local Strategic Partnership (2007). Cambridge Sustainable Community Strategy 2008-2011;
- Cambridgeshire Horizons (2008). The Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth;
- Cambridgeshire Horizons (2006). Balanced and Mixed Communities: A Good Practice Guide;
- Cambridgeshire Horizons (2006). A Major Sports Facilities Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region;
- Cambridgeshire Horizons (2006). An Arts and Culture Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region;
- Cambridgeshire Horizons (2011). Green Infrastructure Strategy for Cambridgeshire;
- Cambridge City Council (2008). Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan 2008-2012;
- Natural England (2009). Green Infrastructure Guidance;
- Cambridge City Council (2009). Sports Strategy 2009 – 2013;
- DEFRA (June 2011). The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature;
- Cambridge City Council (2011). Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011; and
- Cambridge City Council (2012). Cambridge Public House Study

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Not applicable

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

New and existing open spaces can help support various city-wide strategies related to flood risk management, climate change, health and well-being, sustainable transport, biodiversity and green infrastructure. This approach is supported by the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular the social and environmental aspects of sustainable development. Paragraph 93 of the National Planning Policy Framework promotes measures to counter the impacts of climate change. The Sustainability Appraisal also recognises and supports this approach.

New and existing green spaces should be properly managed to ensure they are properly maintained to maximise their benefit to the community. Green spaces should therefore be multi-functional where possible while continuing to maintain the character of Cambridge. New development should preferably provide new open spaces rather than be allowed to make financial contributions in lieu of new open spaces onsite. However, it is recognised that the delivery of new open spaces in association with small sites (less than 0.5ha) can be constrained by their size to provide high quality open spaces. The lack of new open spaces in some built-up areas of Cambridge is a sensitive issue, particularly in wards where there is an existing open space deficiency.

The strategic objective should help protect the character of the Cambridge including the impact of any new development likely to have an impact on the setting of the River Cam.

Community facilities should be protected and enhanced but the possibility of change of use, multi use or relocation should not be precluded. This approach itself should be sufficiently flexible to meet changing circumstances. It is important that neighbourhoods are able to retain and enhance their range of local community facilities to maintain their own local character, vibrancy and vitality.

Cultural and leisure facilities should be protected and enhanced but the possibility of change of use, multi use or relocation, based upon local need, should not be precluded.

This overall approach is in keeping with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, which in Chapter 8, particularly paragraph 69, promotes greater social interaction within local communities, safe and accessible environments including high quality public spaces that encourage the active and continual use of public areas.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 163 focussed on a green and pleasant city that supports vibrant and culturally diverse communities as well as relaxing neighbourhoods. Additional reference will be made to support for multi-functional spaces that support a variety of city-wide strategies with corresponding management strategy.

ISSUE: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF EXISTING OPEN SPACES AND RECREATION FACILITIES

Total representations: 91	
Object: 38	Support: 53

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 164: Protection of open space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for much tighter criteria regarding the satisfactory replacement of existing areas (including direct and indirect benefits); • Resist loss of open space; • Open spaces form part of the historic character of Cambridge and should be protected accordingly; • Much stronger policy is needed to prevent loss of open spaces under current Local Plan; • Need to continue with current policy protection and protect green lungs within the city and the urban edge (e.g. playing fields); • Overly restrictive policy that prevents development which respects environmental quality; • Potential of expansion of local schools provides an opportunity to enhance the quantity of provision; • Remove reference to Green Belt as this is not open to the public and is already protected as a separate designation; • Policy fails to weigh up the public benefit against the loss of public open space; • Lack of up-to-date evidence supporting existing open space policy; • Allowing protected open space for recreational reasons only to be replaced elsewhere should not be permitted. Where is elsewhere?

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

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT
Protecting Cambridge’s network of open spaces is likely to contribute positively towards the majority of the sustainability topics. In particular, maintaining access to high quality green and open spaces has been identified as a key issue across all of Cambridge. Protecting open space and limiting development that could harm the character of open spaces should help increase the amenity and attractiveness of these areas as places for recreation. This option should also help encourage greater uptake of walking/cycling as a means of transport, which will have wider health benefits.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Cambridge City Council (2009). Sports Strategy 2009 – 2013;
- Cambridge City Council (2010). Cambridge Parks – Managing the City’s Asset 2010 to 2014;
- Cambridge City Council (2011). Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 4/2 (Protection of Open Space)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The City Council’s Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011 was completed to help inform the development of open space related policies and local strategies. This approach is in keeping with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, which in Chapter 8 (Promoting healthy communities) advises on the use of up-to-date local needs assessments in terms of open spaces. The National Planning Policy Framework also advises on the identification of Local Green Spaces which will be addressed in the Site Allocations public consultation starting in January 2013.

It is important that the current approach of protecting open spaces remains because these sites can help support various city-wide strategies related to flood risk management, climate change, health and well-being, sustainable transport, biodiversity and green infrastructure. Paragraph 93 of the National Planning Policy Framework promotes measures to counter the impacts of climate change while paragraph 114 states that Local Planning Authorities should plan “positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.”

The loss of open space will continue to be resisted given the multi-functional role these areas currently perform and/or could perform in the future. The Sustainability Appraisal supports the continued protection of open spaces because open spaces are a key issue for Cambridge, given the positive effect these areas have on the character of Cambridge.

The current Local Plan policy (Policy 4/2) protects designated open spaces for their recreational and, or environmental value as well as undesignated areas that satisfy the assessment criteria for either recreational or environmental, including areas in the Green Belt. This policy approach will be taken forward in the new Local Plan policy.

The existing approach will be enhanced with stronger criteria relating to the satisfactory replacement of existing recreational open spaces. This can take the form of much clearer guidance as to what is regarded as satisfactory. For example, in terms of accessibility, the distance of the replacement open space needs to be within walking distance of the original site, unless it can be proved that a more accessible site is proposed. Accessibility will not just be measured in terms of

distance but also the availability of the site to the general public. The Council's Open Space and Recreation Strategy and its successor documents should be used to guide the planning process on the loss of any open space.

Open spaces of environmental importance including those that contribute to the character and setting of Cambridge will continue to be protected. New developments that have the potential to affect an environmentally sensitive area of open space will need to provide satisfactory justification that the area's environmental qualities are not adversely affected.

Section 77 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 (Playing fields) as amended by the Education Act 2011 requires an application for disposal or change of use of playing fields to be made to the Secretary of State who may instead direct that the land should be transferred to an academy. Academy Trusts wishing to dispose of land for which they hold the freehold are required under the terms of their funding agreement, and under the Academies Act 2010 to seek the consent of the Secretary of State before making any disposal. While the loss of a playing field is a rare occurrence it is not clear that the current legislation covering playing fields is applicable to other play areas. The expansion of local schools should enhance both the quality and quantity of open space provision, rather than leading to a net loss. School play areas will therefore continue to be protected to ensure incremental alterations to school premises to not lead to a reduction in school play provision.

The definition of open space will not include Green Belt as this is protected under a separate designation (NPPF, Chapter 9 Protecting Green Belt Land, particularly paragraph 87 and 88). Paragraph 89 explains the special circumstances when development in the Green Belt is acceptable. However, the new Local Plan policy to protect areas of open spaces will apply to areas of the Green Belt that satisfy the assessment criteria for either recreational or environmental protection.

Details of the circumstances where the public benefit of new development outweigh the loss of protected open space will also be outlined. These details should be flexible enough to respond to the priorities of each ward. In particular, where deficiencies of open space have already been identified as a local issue, the loss of any open space will be resisted.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 164 and ensure policy in the Local Plan clarifies the circumstances where replacement open spaces (protected for recreational reasons) will be acceptable. This will relate to improved accessibility to the local community in terms of open space.

In wards where there is an identified deficiency in existing open space provision, the loss of any open space will be resisted unless it can be replaced in a suitably accessible location in the same ward or an alternative location that is acceptable to the local community where the loss occurs.

ISSUE: PROVISION OF NEW OPEN SPACES AND RECREATION FACILITIES

Total representations: 68	
Object:	
Option 165: 7	Option 166: 10
Support:	
Option 165: 41	Option 166: 10

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 165: Update the standards in line with the Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support principle for allotment provision for all residential developments; • Maxima not minima provision should be sought; • Allotment provision: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unviable or not desirable and would provide long-term issues to do with servicing and maintenance; ○ Unrealistic in built-up area; • New open spaces provided should be adopted and maintained by public organisations to ensure public access
Option 166: Maintain the current standards for open space and recreation provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge has many open spaces and recreational areas; • Allotment provision unviable or not desirable and would provide long-term issues to do with servicing and maintenance; • Inadequate in light of growth plans including allotment provision.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Compared to retaining the current standards (166), updating the standards for provision of open space and recreational facilities in new development (165) is likely to result in significant benefits against the indicated sustainability topics. Option 165's application of the allotment standards to all residential development in Cambridge, as opposed to urban extensions only, and the option's proposed increase in informal open space provision, is likely to help address a number of key health and well being issues. Furthermore, option 165 should also contribute to maintaining and enhancing access to open space across all areas in Cambridge.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Cambridgeshire Vision: County-wide Sustainable Community Strategy 2007–2021
- Cambridge Sustainable Community Strategy (2007)
- Cambridge Sports Strategy 2009 - 2013
- The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature (June 2011)
- Green Infrastructure Strategy for Cambridgeshire (2011)
- Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 3/8 (Open Space and Recreation Provision Through New Development)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The approach requiring the provision of new open spaces and recreation facilities is in keeping with the requirements of paragraph 70 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which advises that planning policies should plan positively, including for the provision and use of shared spaces to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments. Paragraph 73 explains how policies should be based upon robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The City Council's Allotment Study (2009) and Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2011) are in keeping with the requirements of the NPPF and recommends an increase to the City's existing Open Space and Recreation Standards (option 165). The recommendations include the provision of allotments for all applicable housing schemes and not just in urban extensions. With five of City's wards having no allotment provision and two others having less than the recommended standard, opportunities to provide on-site provision should be implemented where appropriate. The city-wide requirement for allotment provision should help to alleviate this deficiency. Any new areas of open space including allotments will need to have a satisfactory management strategy in place to ensure they are properly maintained and remain accessible.

While it can be argued that Cambridge has many open spaces and recreational areas, it also hosts many visitors and tourists who use these areas, particularly the larger park areas in the city centre. It is therefore important that as Cambridge grows it provides sufficient open spaces and recreational facilities accordingly which are reflected in the proposed new standards recommended by the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2011).

The Sustainability Appraisal supports the updated standards (option 165) that are likely to result in significant benefits against the indicated sustainability criteria compared to option 166. Option 165's proposed increase in informal open space provision and the application of the allotment standards to all residential development in Cambridge, as opposed to urban extensions only are likely to help address a number of key health and well being issues. Option 165 should also contribute to maintaining and enhancing access to open space across all areas in Cambridge. Of the two options, option 166 is considered to be the least suitable option for supporting future growth in the city.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 165. The evidence provided by the Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011 suggests that option 165 would be better able to support future growth in the city in a more sustainable manner than option 166. While concerns have been raised over viability and maintenance, should these matters arise they should be overcome at the planning application stage.

Total representations: 25	
Object: 11	Support: 14

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 167: On-site provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support is conditional on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Having clear reasons for not providing an on-site contribution; ○ Presumption in favour of onsite provision; ○ Off-site provision only in exceptional conditions; ○ Very clear guidance; ○ Onsite provision is completed before occupation; ○ No planning permission unless on-site provision is provided • Green spaces should be multi-functional and support the objectives of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy; • Dislike for off-site contributions; on-site provision should be provided wherever possible and weighted according to ward deficit; • Need to consider leisure facilities which provide play and sports facilities; • Accessibility of open space needs to be considered.

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

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT
<p>The provision of open space on-site, as opposed to financial contributions, will ensure that new and existing communities benefit from open spaces in their local areas. This will have a significant positive effect across Cambridge where maintenance and access to open space has been identified as a key sustainability issue. By taking into account the appropriateness of the provision given the nature, location and scale of the development, this option should result in the delivery of sites that are sensitive to the character and distinctiveness of Cambridge’s built environment. On-site provision would have potential benefits for biodiversity and improved green infrastructure, and could potentially contribute to reducing flood risk.</p>

KEY EVIDENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire Vision: County-wide Sustainable Community Strategy 2007–2021 • Cambridge Sustainable Community Strategy (2007) • Cambridge Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan 2008-2012 • The Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth 2008 • Green Infrastructure Guidance (Natural England, 2009) • Cambridge Sports Strategy 2009 - 2013 • The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature (June 2011) • Green Infrastructure Strategy for Cambridgeshire (2011)

- Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 3/8 (Open Space and Recreation Provision Through New Development)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The approach requiring the provision of new open spaces and recreation facilities is in keeping with the requirements of paragraph 70 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which advises that planning policies should plan positively, including for the provision and use of shared spaces to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments. Paragraph 73 explains how policies should be based upon robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The Council's Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2011) is in keeping with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and has identified a number of deficiencies in terms of both the quantity and quality of open space provided.

The Sustainability Appraisal supports the provision of open space on-site, as opposed to financial contributions, to ensure that new and existing communities benefit from open spaces in their local areas. This will have a significant positive effect across Cambridge where maintenance and access to open space has been identified as a key sustainability issue.

To address local concerns regarding the lack of on-site provision with new housing developments, off-site financial contributions in lieu on-site provision will no longer be acceptable. However, there may be exceptions to this. The site itself may have particular constraints that prevent the delivery of quality on-site open space provision and, or the local community would benefit more from the public open space contribution spent on a nearby local play area.

On-site provision should take account of the appropriateness of the provision given the nature, location and scale of the development; this approach is supported by the Sustainability Appraisal and also concludes that this should result in the delivery of sites that are sensitive to the character and distinctiveness of Cambridge's built environment. On-site provision would have potential benefits for biodiversity and improved green infrastructure, and could potentially contribute to reducing flood risk.

Any on-site open space provision should be completed before half of the residential dwellings are occupied. This provides a more flexible approach for a site's deliverability compared with the requirement for the on-site open space provision to be completed before any occupancy is permitted.

Any sites unable to make full on-site contribution will need to provide clear evidence of any exceptional circumstances to justify off-site contributions. Accessibility analysis of all locally accessible open spaces may provide opportunities to improve existing sites with off-site contributions.

The Council's Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011 and its successor documents should be used to guide the planning process on the provision of open space by continuing to inform the masterplanning process for the urban extensions and through the consideration of all new development. Where possible, any new green spaces should be multi-functional and support the objectives of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy.

Unless a development is large enough to provide on-site indoor sports provision contributions will be collected and used to support the Council's current Sports Strategy. Some policy flexibility should be provided to allow new sport leisure facility contributions to be provided in the form of improved access to private leisure facilities through community use agreements, assuming there is sufficient excess capacity. This option would be beneficial in circumstances where the alternative financial contributions are not sufficient to provide a new leisure facility.

In relation to large developments and urban extensions where over 1ha outdoor sports provision is required, future policies should ensure sufficient ancillary facilities are provided (e.g. changing rooms and car parking) and clustered together.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 167 and ensure policy in the Local Plan clarifies the circumstances where on-site open spaces provision is necessary. The Council's Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011 and its successor documents should be used to guide decisions regarding the provision and enhancement of open spaces.

ISSUE: PROTECTION OF EXISTING LEISURE FACILITIES

Total representations: 33	
Object: 11	Support: 22

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 168: Protection of existing leisure facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for the policy option; • Policy needs further clarification particularly in relation to the terms used. • Need to consider wider social and recreational needs of a community with consideration of accessibility; • Policy criteria should consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stringent tests and consultation of existing and potential users of leisure facilities; ○ Facility use and reasons behind current performance; • Need to provide new leisure facilities in existing built-up areas; • No recognition that alternative uses outweigh retention of existing leisure facility;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include sites on Community Asset Registers; • Growth must be accompanied with new leisure facilities; • Local need should not be defined by landowners and developers. Local opinions should take priority; • Contributions to support the new facilities are essential; • Increase access of sporting facilities owned by University, colleges and schools to the public.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

This option should help protect and enhance leisure facilities and is also likely to help improve the health and wellbeing of residents. In addition it should contribute to reducing inequalities in health through improved accessibility. Providing protection to leisure facilities will help address the potential loss of these to alternative development. Providing accessible leisure facilities will help minimise the need for people to travel helping reduce transport related greenhouse gas emissions and associated air quality impacts.

KEY EVIDENCE

- An Arts and Culture Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (Cambridgeshire Horizons, 2006)
- Balanced and Mixed Communities: A Good Practice Guide (Cambridgeshire Horizons, 2006)
- Cambridgeshire Vision: County-wide Sustainable Community Strategy 2007–2021
- Cambridge Sustainable Community Strategy (2007)
- GVA Grimley (2008). Cambridge Sub-Region Retail Study, Vol. One: Report & Plans;
- Cambridge City Council (2012). Local Leisure Facilities Survey

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 6/1 (Protection of Leisure Facilities)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Cambridge's leisure facilities can make a significant contribution to the city's attraction as a destination to live, work, study and visit, that its economy and future growth depend upon. Moreover, leisure facilities can contribute to and support economic, social and environmental factors; they have an essential role to play in building and maintaining a strong, responsive and competitive local economy as well as promoting healthy and inclusive communities. In particular, Chapter 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Ensuring the vitality of town centres) recommends policies that support the viability and vitality of town centres that provide customer choice and Chapter 4 (Promoting sustainable transport) a balance of land uses within their area to encourage people to minimise journey lengths for leisure pursuits, amongst other uses.

It is therefore critical that Cambridge continues to provide a range of leisure facilities to serve both residents and visitors. Any new policy should include rigorous criteria to guard against the unnecessary loss of leisure facilities that reduce local access to these types of facilities while at the same time allowing new and existing leisure operators to expand and contract according to economic circumstances. This approach is supported by the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular Chapter 1 (Building a strong, competitive economy) paragraph 21 and Chapter 2 (Ensuring the vitality of town centres).

Any net loss of leisure provision should only be permitted where the alternative use outweighs the retention of the leisure facility. Rigorous criteria will need to be satisfied to support any loss. The criteria will include:

- Marketing the site for a minimum 12 months as a leisure facility to help determine the viability of the existing leisure use; and
- A local needs assessment will be needed to help determine both the benefit and impact of each use (leisure and proposed alternative) in order to help assess the importance of each facility.

The locality of the site will also be an important factor in determining the suitability of each use. For example, the loss of leisure uses that are compatible with the city centre or a district centre will be resisted. This approach will help protect the vitality and vibrancy of these areas and at the same time resist inappropriate alternative development that would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area.

Some policy flexibility will be required for leisure facilities whose viability is dependent on public or private subsidies (e.g. a theatre). In these circumstances, the need for marketing will not be required because it is not a reliable means of testing viability. For sport related leisure facility applications, the results of Sport England's planning tools should also be provided to as a part of the assessment process to justify the loss of any sport facility.

The Sustainability Appraisal concludes that protection and enhancement of leisure facilities should improve the health and wellbeing of residents. Improved accessibility should help reduce health inequalities. Protecting leisure facilities will help safeguard their potential loss to alternative development. Providing accessible leisure facilities will help minimise the need for people to travel helping reduce transport related greenhouse gas emissions and associated air quality impacts.

The definition of leisure facilities can be split into two categories, **sports** and **entertainment**.

Leisure sport facilities include: indoor facilities e.g. bowling alleys, indoor boxing, badminton & squash courts, swimming pools, snooker/pool halls and gymnasiums.

Leisure entertainment facilities include: cinemas, nightclubs, and 'arts and cultural' uses such as performance venues and theatres.

N.B. The lists of uses are not exhaustive.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 168 and ensure policy in the Local Plan

clarifies the rigorous criteria that should be satisfied to determine if the loss of a leisure facilities is acceptable or not. These may include:

- the facility can be replaced to at least its existing level and quality within the new development; or
- the facility is to be relocated to another appropriate premises or site of similar accessibility for its users; or
- the facility/site is no longer needed as a leisure facility. This will be tested by:
 - the marketing of the facility/site for a minimum 12 months as an equivalent leisure facility; and
 - a local needs assessment is completed that demonstrates there is no longer a need within the local community for the facility or that the need can be adequately met at an alternative facility of similar accessibility for its users.

Developers will be expected to provide adequate evidence of a lack of local need, accessibility to users, the capacity of alternative facilities and of the level of demand from other organisations providing community facilities in order to justify the loss of a community facility. The following information will be required:

- details of site marketing attempts made to attract other leisure uses for which the premises are suitable;
- demonstration of site accessibility to users by all means of transport including foot and cycle;
- details of current or most recent use of facilities;
- evidence of spare capacity or agreement to accommodate displaced users at other equivalent leisure facilities with similar accessibility for users; and
- a local survey to establish the level of interest in and viability of the continued use of the premises as a leisure facility.

This approach is very similar to that used in the current Local Plan 2006 by saved policy 5/11, Protection of Existing [Community] Facilities. This policy will be applicable to all leisure facilities including arts and cultural proposals, local and sub-regional facilities unless a specific sub-regional policy exists.

ISSUE: NEW LEISURE FACILITIES

Total representations: 47	
Object: 19	Support: 28

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 169: New leisure facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for the policy option with some suggesting clarification; • Policy needs further clarification and clarification of the terms used; • Local people should be involved with the design and management of new facilities. Support for securing community use of sports facilities built on educational sites;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to clarify definition of leisure facilities; • Include sites on Community Asset Registers; • Assessment of the long-term viability of leisure facilities.
--	--

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

No additional options have been suggested.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Supporting new and improved leisure facilities will have benefits for communities and wellbeing, and improve accessibility and help reduce inequalities in health within Cambridge. By ensuring new facilities are to be an appropriate scale to the locality will help ensure the scale of development is sensitive to character and distinctiveness of that local area and help protect the city’s townscape.

KEY EVIDENCE

- An Arts and Culture Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (Cambridgeshire Horizons, 2006)
- Balanced and Mixed Communities: A Good Practice Guide (Cambridgeshire Horizons, 2006)
- Cambridgeshire Vision: County-wide Sustainable Community Strategy 2007–2021
- Cambridge Sustainable Community Strategy (2007)
- A Major Sports Facilities Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (Cambridgeshire Horizons, 2008)
- The Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth 2008
- Cambridge Sports Strategy 2009 - 2013

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 6/2 (New Leisure Facilities)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Cambridge’s leisure facilities can make a significant contribution to the city’s attraction as a destination to live, work, study and visit that its economy and future growth depend upon. Moreover, leisure facilities can contribute to and support economic, social and environmental factors; they have an essential role to play in building and maintaining a strong, responsive and competitive local economy as well as promoting healthy and inclusive communities. In particular, Chapter 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Ensuring the vitality of town centres) recommends policies that support the viability and vitality of town centres that provide customer choice and Chapter 4 (Promoting sustainable transport) a balance of land uses within their area to encourage people to minimise journey lengths for leisure pursuits, amongst other uses.

It is therefore critical that Cambridge continues to provide a range of leisure facilities for residents and visitors. Where a development generates on-site provision for indoor sports facilities these should be provided on-site or as close as possible within a reasonable walking distance where possible. Any new policy should ensure that the

range, quality and access of any replacement leisure facilities should follow the applicable design guidance and not lead to a net reduction in leisure facilities in terms of range, quality and access. Proposals should also take into account their local environment to ensure they are sensitive to their location and the character of Cambridge. For new sport related leisure facility applications, the results of Sport England’s planning tools should also be provided to help justify new sport facilities.

The Sustainability Appraisal supports this approach. The impact of any new facilities will be assessed to ensure they complement and not compete with the city centre (assuming they are located outside the centre), to ensure the centre’s vitality and vibrancy will not be adversely affected. This approach is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.

The definition of leisure facilities can be split into two categories, **sports** and **entertainment**.

Leisure sport facilities include: indoor facilities e.g. bowling alleys, indoor boxing, badminton & squash courts, swimming pools, snooker/pool halls and gymnasiums.

Leisure entertainment facilities include: cinemas, nightclubs, and ‘arts and cultural’ uses such as performance venues and theatres.

N.B. The lists of uses are not exhaustive.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 169 and ensure policy in the Local Plan includes a reference to the application of relevant design guidelines where applicable.

This policy will be applicable to all leisure facilities including arts and cultural proposals, local and sub-regional facilities unless a specific sub-regional policy exists.

ISSUE: PROTECTION OF EXISTING COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Total representations: 38

Object: 11

Support: 27

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 170: Protection of existing community facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for protecting community facilities; • Policy needs to enable new provision: • Include sites on Community Asset Registers with reference in Local Plan; • Need to take account of a balance between densification and local community needs; • Consider extending the marketing period to 18 or 24 months; • The means of access to new facilities remains the same as the previous facility; • Policy needed to provide the planning criteria to assess

	<p>proposals for new public houses and separate from Option 176 New Community Facilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More emphasis on venues for use by various age groups for community activities; • Support for community interaction; • Many different views on what should and should not be included in the definition of community facilities; • Definition should include community kitchens, swap shops, free shops, tool libraries, charity cafés, local shops and pubs, private huts and places of worship, affordable community dance halls, boat clubs; • Inclusion of educational facilities dependent on local needs; <p>Highways and private places made open to the public.</p>
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

This option will ensure continued protection of existing community facilities and contribute significantly to addressing key community health and wellbeing issues. Only where comprehensive evidence is demonstrated would this option allow redundant community facilities to be redeveloped into other uses. This should minimise any potential adverse impact on local communities and add another level of protection against the loss of community facilities to other uses. The protection of existing facilities should help reduce the need for people to travel and enabling more people to access facilities by walking and cycling.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Balanced and Mixed Communities: A Good Practice Guide (Cambridgeshire Horizons, 2006)
- Cambridgeshire Vision: County-wide Sustainable Community Strategy 2007–2021
- Cambridge Sustainable Community Strategy (2007)
- A Major Sports Facilities Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (Cambridgeshire Horizons, 2008)
- The Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth 2008

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 5/11 (Protection of Existing Facilities)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Community facilities can make a significant contribution towards the support and development of a healthy and inclusive community by encouraging community activities and interaction. Community facilities may include traditional local services that would have previously not been considered a community facility such as a corner shop or a public house. The National Planning Policy Framework's Chapter 2 (Ensuring the vitality of town centres) recommends policies that support the viability

and vitality of town centres while Chapter 8 (Promoting healthy communities) recommends policies that increase the opportunity for community interaction with community members who might otherwise never meet.

It is therefore critical that Cambridge continues to provide a range of community facilities in order to support and develop local community life for residents and visitors. Any new policy should include rigorous criteria to guard against the unnecessary loss of community facilities that reduce local access to these types of facilities while at the same time allowing new and existing community facilities to expand and contract according to local and economic circumstances. This approach is supported by the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular Chapter 8 (Promoting healthy communities) paragraph 70.

Any net loss of community facilities should only be permitted where the alternative use outweighs the retention of the community facility. Rigorous criteria will need to be satisfied to support any loss. The criteria will include:

- marketing the site for a minimum 12 months as an equivalent community facility or for 6 months, if a marketing strategy is agreed with the Local Planning Authority prior to any marketing exercise;
- A local needs assessment will be needed to help determine both the benefit and impact of each use (community facility and proposed alternative) in order to help assess the importance of each facility; and
- The impact on accessibility to the nearest alternative type of community facility (that is lost) should also be assessed to determine how local access would be affected. If access is reduced then the loss should be resisted.

This approach will help protect local services by taking a robust and integrated approach towards community provision. Any alternative development that may harm the character of the area would be considered to be inappropriate and therefore would be resisted. Replacement facilities are considered under Option 176 in this document.

The new Local Plan's definition of community facilities will be based upon the definition used in the current Local Plan 2006 with notable additions including public houses (which will be dealt with as a specific topic in Options 171-175). Greater clarification of what constitutes a community facility will be provided without being too prescriptive and yet still retaining long-term flexibility. For example, a community building could include a specific building or use that is valued by the local community. The value of which is demonstrated by local concern regarding its retention/loss/protection. Buildings that support community interaction or activities will also be protected as community facilities. The definition of community facilities will include all education sites (public and private) and all sites on the Community Asset Register.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 170 and ensure policy in the Local Plan

clarifies the rigorous criteria that should be satisfied to determine if the loss of a community facilities is acceptable or not. These may include:

- the facility can be replaced to at least its existing level and quality within the new development; or
- the facility is to be relocated to another appropriate premises or site of similar accessibility for its users; or
- the facility/site is no longer needed as a community facility. This will be tested by:
 - the marketing of the facility/site for a minimum 12 months as an equivalent community facility; and
 - a local needs assessment is completed that demonstrates there is no longer a need within the local community for the facility or that the need can be adequately met at an alternative facility of similar accessibility for its users.

Developers will be expected to provide adequate evidence of a lack of local need, accessibility to users, the capacity of alternative facilities and of the level of demand from other organisations providing community facilities in order to justify the loss of a community facility. The following information will be required:

- details of site marketing attempts made to attract other community uses for which the premises are suitable;
- demonstration of site accessibility to users by all means of transport including foot and cycle;
- details of current or most recent use of facilities;
- evidence of spare capacity or agreement to accommodate displaced users at other equivalent community facilities with similar accessibility for users; and
- a local survey to establish the level of interest in and viability of the continued use of the premises as a community facility.

ISSUE: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF EXISTING OPEN SPACES AND RECREATION FACILITIES

Total representations: 91		
Object:		
Option 171: 6	Option 172: 6	Option 173: 16
Support:		
Option 171: 7	Option 172:4	Option 173: 52

OPTION NUMBER/OTHER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Public Houses – general comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public houses are vital to the vitality of the high street. The change of use for pubs needs to be stopped; • Support for and against protecting public houses; • Need to protect public house gardens; • Failure to reflect community and historical value of pubs regarding their replacement; • More positive approach should be adopted;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate restaurant in former pubs becoming pubs against instead of alternative uses.
Option 171 - Public Houses: Market led approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With this option, there would be no clear means by which developers could establish that the premises were not viable as a pub business; • If business was truly viable then it would not be up for closure – protection of some public houses would be futile; • Pubs represent important community facilities and must be protected; • Pubs need to be given a chance to be viable – market forces can be variable.
Option 172 - Protection for all Public Houses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With this option, there would be no clear means by which developers could establish that the premises were not viable as a pub business; • This option would not be a true reflection of current market trends and would lead to an increase in disused pubs which may never reopen; • This approach may not offer complete protection of public houses as they could simply become a restaurant before changing into an alternative use; • Support for this approach – loss of public houses could lead to isolation of communities.
Option 173 - Safeguarding Public Houses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for this approach as it would provide a clear means by which a developer can objectively establish viability; • This option would provide a much needed safeguard against unwelcome closures and unsuitable conversions; • Independent assessment of a pub's viability is very important; • Concern that the policy could become overly restrictive – needs to be flexible to reflect economic realities and the values and benefits of alternative uses; • Presumption in favour of maintenance is a very good idea.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Not protecting public houses in Cambridge could have a significant adverse effect on community spirit and the vibrancy and vitality of local neighbourhoods. Similarly, this option could result in a loss in Cambridge's character, and subsequent appeal to tourists. However, where pubs are demonstrably no longer viable or cannot successfully continue to trade as a public house then conversion into alternative uses may provide opportunities for local scale redevelopment and contribute to improved public realm.

The protection of all public houses has an uncertain effect against the majority of the sustainability topics. In affording some protection from higher value uses, the positive role of public houses in communities would be maintained. However, it could result in redundant public houses remaining unused. Buildings, which are dilapidated or boarded up, can have a negative effect upon the appearance of an area.

Option 173 ensures some protection from higher value uses but offers flexibility where the existing use as a public house is found to be unviable. This is likely to help address issues relating to community and wellbeing through the continued provision of community space, and should help contribute to creating vibrant and inclusive communities. The proposal to undertake pre-application consultation with local residents should help ensure any new use is in keeping with the needs and character of the local area.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Cambridge Public House Study (2012);
- Interim Planning Policy Guidance on The Protection of Public Houses in the City of Cambridge (2012);
- Recent appeal decisions:
 - The Unicorn, 15 High Street, Cherry Hinton, APP/Q0505/A/11/2167572;
 - The Carpenters Arms, 182-186 Victoria Road, APP/Q0505/A/12/2168512;
 - The Plough, High Street, Shepreth, Royston, APP/W0530/A/11/2167619;
 - Royal Standard, 292 Mill Road, APP/Q0505/A/12/2174210;

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Not applicable

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Cambridge's public houses can make a significant contribution towards the support and development of a healthy and inclusive community by encouraging community activities and interaction. In particular, Chapter 8 (Promoting healthy communities) of the National Planning Policy Framework recommends policies that increase the opportunity for community interaction with community members who might otherwise never meet. Community facilities may include traditional local services that would have previously not been considered a community facility such as a corner shop or a public house.

Public houses are also an important part of the Cambridge economy, not just for the

direct and indirect jobs they provide in the pub supplier, food and brewing industries, but in supporting the city's main industries by attracting and providing a meeting place for students, academics, scientists and entrepreneurs, and in attracting office workers, shoppers and tourists. Chapter 2 (Ensuring the vitality of town centres) of the National Planning Policy Framework recommends policies that support the viability and vitality of town centres.

It should be recognised that some public houses are no longer viable due to a range of reasons from business decline despite business diversification and, or a lack of interest from other public house operators wanting to take on the public house. It is also important that public houses are not necessarily lost to alternative uses that prevent their use returning permanently. A public house would be unable to return to the site due to the differential in land values i.e. residential use can often be twice the amount of public house value. Some flexibility is however required for public house sites to diversify beyond their original use that would still allow the public house use to return if economic conditions permit. The NPPF, Chapter 1 (Delivering sustainable development) recommends policies should be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances.

New and replacement public houses will be dealt with under the suite of proposed retail policies in particular those concerning 'vitality and viability' and 'environmental considerations'. An outline of these is scheduled for the 19th February Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee.

Option 171 - Public Houses: Market led approach

Concerns about this option have been raised over its effectiveness, as it would not require developers to establish a public house's viability as a pub business. Although it is also argued that a viable business would not close and the protection of some public houses would be futile. Strong public opposition to this option remains with concern for the protection of community facilities. Concern remains over the effectiveness of the market forces option to establish that the premises were not viable as a pub business.

The Sustainability Appraisal considers this option could have a significant adverse effect on community spirit and the vibrancy and vitality of local neighbourhoods as well as having the potential to harm Cambridge's character, and subsequent appeal to tourists. However, the conversion of unviable public houses into alternative uses could help improve the character and appearance of local neighbourhoods.

Option 172 - Protection for all Public Houses

In general, the Sustainability Appraisal identified a number of uncertain effects against the majority of sustainability topics. The protection of public houses from higher value uses would protect these facilities. However, this option could result in redundant public houses remaining unused. Buildings, which are dilapidated or boarded up, can have a negative effect upon the appearance of an area.

While there was support for this approach to avoid communities becoming isolated this option would not be able to force closed public houses to remain open. This option would not be a true reflection of current market trends and would lead to an increase in disused pubs that may never reopen. Option 172 would need to protect the site rather than the use otherwise public houses could simply become a restaurant before changing into an alternative use. Finally, as with option 171, doubts about this option have been raised over its effectiveness, as it would not provide a clear means by which developers could establish that the premises were not viable as a pub business.

Option 173 - Safeguarding Public Houses

The Sustainability Appraisal supported this option as it balanced the need for some protection from higher value uses with the need for flexibility where the existing use as a public house is found to be unviable. The pre-application consultation requirement with local residents should help ensure any new use is in keeping with the needs and character of the local area.

This approach would provide developers with a clear and objective way in which to establish viability, using an independent valuation for the marketing of the site. For local communities, this option would provide safeguards against the unnecessary closure of viable public houses and help to identify the value associated with a public house. This will allow planning decisions to consider the value of the existing public house use and that of any alternative proposal that will result in the permanent loss of the public house. Evidence of diversification will demonstrate that the business has attempted to adapt to changing circumstances.

With regard to public house amenity spaces such as car parks and gardens, large outdoor spaces attached to pubs will be subject to similar pressures for residential development as for large private dwellinghouse gardens or other open spaces. The relevant policy safeguarding public houses will also include reference to the circumstances where the loss of any amenity space including car parking would be acceptable. At Environment Scrutiny Committee on 9th October 2012, it was agreed that the use of Article 4 Directions would be investigated as a means of safeguarding public houses. This work is ongoing and will be reported to the respective committee when this work has been completed.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 173 and ensure policy in the Local Plan clarifies the rigorous criteria that should be satisfied to determine if the loss of a public house site is acceptable or not. The option will be applied to a list of safeguarded public house sites (provided with this option), the use of which should provide much greater clarity over the application of option 173. The list of safeguarded sites represents premises that were public houses in July 2006, the date when the current Local Plan was adopted. This ensures consistency between the Local Plan 2006, the Interim Planning Policy Guidance on the Protection of Public Houses in the city of Cambridge, the National Planning Policy Framework and the new Local Plan. This list includes pubs with unimplemented planning permissions,

former public houses that are either in an alternative use (i.e. a restaurant) or are simply closed and where the public house use could potentially return. The list of safeguarded public house sites provides a suitable benchmark that will be updated periodically to ensure it remains accurate. Public house sites that are redeveloped for uses that prevent the return of the public house use will be removed from the list. Similarly, new public houses will be added to the list. Any applications involving the loss/conversion/development of these public house sites will be determined in accordance with option 173.

Option 171 is considered a threat to the vitality and vibrancy of local neighbourhoods and the character of Cambridge as an attractive place in which to live, work, study or visit. The lack of viability testing would mean pubs could convert to alternative, higher values uses regardless of their viability.

Option 172 is considered to be too restrictive because it prevents pub owners/developers from establishing the viability of a pub business and may prevent disused pubs from providing alternative uses to the community and blighting the appearance of neighbourhoods with derelict pub buildings.

Total representations: 36		
Object:		
Option 174: 2	Option 175: 0	Other representations: 8
Support:		
Option 174: 12	Option 175:7	Other representations: 13

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 174 – Extend safeguarding of public houses to former public houses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This approach should be adopted; • To try and bring properties back into pub use when they have been out of this use for a considerable time is a disproportionate policy response.
Option 175 – Allow flexible re-use of public houses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Former public houses identified as such and in use as a community facility should be able to revert back to this use without the need for a planning application.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

By extending option 173 to include former public houses, option 174 is likely to help protect the vibrancy and vitality of local areas by maintaining community space provision. The protection of such facilities from higher value uses may bring about a beneficial economic effect, for instance through safeguarding tourism. By using the criteria of option 173 to assess the need for protection against community requirements, this option should ensure that protective measures are balanced against the need to tackle deprivation through conversion / redevelopment in certain areas of the city.

Option 175 is likely to provide the necessary flexibility for the public housing market to expand as well as contract, resulting in similar effects to option 174 on community well being and the economy. However, the effect of this option across the city is uncertain, as it may distort the market by creating too many A-uses and restricting the creation of residential units, which has an uncertain effect on issues such as tackling deprivation.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Cambridge Public House Study (2012);
- Interim Planning Policy Guidance on The Protection of Public Houses in the City of Cambridge (2012);
- Recent appeal decisions:
 - The Unicorn, 15 High Street, Cherry Hinton, APP/Q0505/A/11/2167572;
 - The Carpenters Arms, 182-186 Victoria Road, APP/Q0505/A/12/2168512;
 - The Plough, High Street, Shepreth, Royston, APP/W0530/A/11/2167619;
 - Royal Standard, 292 Mill Road, APP/Q0505/A/12/2174210;

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Not applicable

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) puts uses of land and buildings into various categories known as 'Use Classes'. Planning permission is not needed when both the present and proposed uses fall within the same 'class', or if the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order says that a change of class is permitted to another specified class. Under the Use Class Order, public houses and other A4 uses can change to higher order use class (A3, A2 or A1) without needing planning permission. Although, planning permission could be required for building alterations. Under the Use Class Order, community facilities generally categorised under class D1 and some Class D2 uses. This means that for a community facility to become an A4 use planning permission will be required. However, in the new Local Plan it is the intention to include public houses in the definition of community facilities.

The difficulty of applying safeguarding measures to former public houses not on the list of safeguarded public house sites is exemplified in the following situation where a restaurant is gradually established in a former public house building. If a public

house already served food it may already have had a kitchen with extractor fans etc. in order to provide food. Overtime, it would be permissible for the pub to turn into a restaurant without formerly requiring planning permission. It is therefore difficult to determine when a public house changed into a restaurant unless some form of audit took place or specific planning permission was granted indicating a different use was now in operation. Anecdotal evidence may suggest when a pub became a restaurant however this could not be relied upon as a means of determining its date of conversion. This means it is difficult to establish when a public house stopped being a public house and changed use legitimately into a different use without planning permission. It would therefore be reasonable to only apply the proposed safeguarding guidance to those public house sites on the safeguarding list.

The Sustainability Appraisal support the flexible re-use of public houses in order to provide the necessary flexibility for the local public house market to expand as well as contract. Care will need to be taken to ensure the local market is not saturated with A-uses that may restrict residential development. The NPPF, Chapter 1 (Delivering sustainable development) recommends policies should be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

Option 174 risks creating uncertainty for properties and, or businesses which may have once occupied an historical public house site. The proposed list of safeguarded public houses sites are those that were public houses in July 2006, the date when the current Local Plan was adopted. This ensures consistency between the Local Plan 2006, the NPPF and the emerging new Local Plan.

The recommendation is to pursue option 175 and ensure policy in the Local Plan provides public house sites with some flexibility to diversify beyond public house use while retaining the potential for its original use to return.

ISSUE: NEW COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Total representations: 35		
Object:		
Option 176: 1	Option 177: 5	Other representations: 1
Support:		
Option 176: 9	Option 177: 7	Other representations: 12

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 176: New community facilities Option 177: The provision of community facilities through new development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 176 and 177 are complimentary; • Relocation of hospice to Southern Fringe; • Shared facilities are not always possible due to conflicting demands and needs; • A new sixth form college needed in North West Cambridge;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shortfall in the provision for climbing in Cambridge; • Support for a policy. • Lack of attention paid to existing deficits in community facilities; • Needs an option with more emphasis on making good shortfall in existing communities; • No reference to applications for entirely new public houses.
Faith Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for carrying out a survey; • Council should adopt a policy supporting the provision of faith facilities; • No specific policy required.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Support for new and improved community facilities is crucial, as demand will increase with population growth. The provision of adequate community infrastructure where there is local need should contribute significantly to protecting and enhancing community provision particularly in wards anticipated to experience population growth, as well as addressing key issues of deprivation and contributing to local vitality. In addition, this option should reduce the need to travel helping reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve local air quality.

The impact of option 176 on key issues relating to landscape and biodiversity is uncertain and would be dependent on a site by site basis. Enforcing the provision of community facilities through development (option 177) may be a more certain method of delivery, as new facilities would be required where development leads to an increased demand for community facilities. However the timeframe for delivery may be longer than option 176. Conversely, provision through development may overlook areas in need that do not attract new development.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Balanced and Mixed Communities: A Good Practice Guide (Cambridgeshire Horizons, 2006)
- Cambridgeshire Vision: County-wide Sustainable Community Strategy 2007–2021
- Cambridge Sustainable Community Strategy (2007)
- A Major Sports Facilities Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (Cambridgeshire Horizons, 2008)
- The Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth 2008

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 5/12 (New Community Facilities)
- Policy 5/13 (Community Facilities in Areas of Major Change)
- Policy 5/14 (Provision of Community Facilities Through New Development)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

It is important that as Cambridge grows, new community facilities are provided to support new and existing local communities. In particular, these facilities can make a significant contribution towards the support and development of a healthy and inclusive community by encouraging community activities and interaction. In particular, Chapter 8 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Promoting healthy communities) recommends policies that increase the opportunity for community interaction with community members who might otherwise never meet. Community facilities may include traditional local services that would have previously not been considered a community facility such as a corner shop or a public house. Chapter 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Ensuring the vitality of town centres) recommends policies that support the viability and vitality of town centres.

It is therefore critical that Cambridge supports new community facilities in order to support and develop local community life for both residents and visitors. New and replacement facilities will be supported where there is a local need, in particular where existing deficits in community provision have already been identified. Proposals should also be of a design, size and scale that are appropriate to the character of the local area and the local area they serve. Circumstances may arise where shared facilities are not suitable and these cases should be treated on a their merits on a case-by-case basis where the local need for the proposal is considered against the wider impact of the proposal especially in terms of local access. The relocation of facilities that serve the whole city should be retained within the city and not located outside.

Any new facilities should increase access for the community. This can take the form of a multi-functional building which supports different types of activities for different community groups across the broadest age range possible, at the same time. New public houses will be considered under proposed retail policies concerning 'vitality and viability' and 'environmental considerations'. An outline of these is scheduled for the 19th February Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee.

The definition of community facilities will cover a broad range of facilities owned by a variety of organisations in both the private and public sector. This means that the City Council can help support strategies to maintain and enhance community centres within the Council's responsibility but not those owned privately. It can, however through the planning system seek to protect existing community facilities (regardless of ownership) and encourage new community facilities through new policies proposed in the new Local Plan. The City Council has already completed a Cambridge Public House Study to assess the impact of public house closures. While the City Council is limited in its authority regarding the provision of faith facilities, it is keen to better understand the current scope and long-term aspirations of each faith community and the range of services they offer their community/wider community. The Council is therefore planning to complete a Faith Facilities Survey by contacting all active faith groups in Cambridge regarding: the provision of places of worship about the facilities they currently use; their adequacy in meeting their needs; and their anticipated provision for community groups available to serve the growing

population of Cambridge.

Along with the proposed policies, monies will also be collected through the Community Infrastructure Levy, to help fund improvements to local infrastructure where development takes place. This combination of policies is considered sufficient to address concerns over community facility provision.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 176 and option 177. Option 176 will not include new and replacement public houses, which will be dealt with under the proposed retail policies concerning 'vitality and viability' and 'environmental considerations'.

The proposed policy relating to 'vitality and viability' would consider how new and replacement drinking establishments (as well as other retail uses) would support / benefit the vitality and viability of the city centre and local neighbourhoods.

The proposed policy relating to 'environmental considerations' would consider how new and replacement drinking establishments (as well as other retail uses) would impact their locality in terms of noise, pollution and other environmental considerations. It is also recommend implementing Option 177 using the Community Infrastructure Levy charge or on-site provision which will arise with new housing development.

ISSUE: ARTS AND CULTURE

Total representations: 43

Object: 14

Support: 29

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 178: Support for arts and cultural activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for this option but further clarification is required and real demand for venue exists; • Consider former public houses identified for redevelopment to be converted into arts and culture centres; • Theatres should not be included in a description of leisure facilities but in cultural facilities. Viability may apply to leisure facilities but not with the same weight for cultural facilities; • This option should be linked to transport strategy; • Facilities need to be protected and enhanced as the sub-region expands; • Proven need is crucial; • Opportunity for a legacy building; • Designate Cultural Quarters;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need an innovative arts and archive centre.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT
<p>Maintaining facilities to support art and cultural activities will help Cambridge retain its position as an important cultural centre. This is likely to have a positive effect on the growth of tourism in the city. Enhancing existing facilities and supporting new opportunities for facilities will also contribute positively to the quality and vitality of the city centre.</p> <p>The impact on landscape and biodiversity is uncertain, as it is dependent on the criteria used to source a suitable location for new facilities. Similarly the impact on transport will depend upon where new facilities are located.</p>

KEY EVIDENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Arts and Culture Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (Cambridgeshire Horizons, 2006) • Balanced and Mixed Communities: A Good Practice Guide (Cambridgeshire Horizons, 2006) • Cambridgeshire Vision: County-wide Sustainable Community Strategy 2007–2021 • Cambridge Sustainable Community Strategy (2007) • Cambridge Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan 2008-2012 • A Major Sports Facilities Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region (Cambridgeshire Horizons, 2008) • The Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth 2008

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

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE
<p>Cambridge’s arts and cultural facilities can make a significant contribution to the City’s attractiveness as a destination to live, work, study and visit. Arts and cultural facilities can contribute to and support economic, social and environmental factors; they have an essential role to play in promoting healthy and inclusive communities. In particular, Chapter 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Ensuring the vitality of town centres) recommends policies that support the viability and vitality of town centres that provide customer choice and Chapter 4 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Promoting sustainable transport) a balance of land uses within their area to encourage people to minimise journey lengths for leisure pursuits, amongst other uses.</p> <p>While theatres are a form of ‘arts and culture’ use they also come under the wider definition of entertainment related leisure use because they help sustain the vitality and vibrancy of the city. It is therefore proposed to define theatres under ‘arts and cultural’ use within entertainment leisure uses.</p>

Arts and cultural facilities are a form of leisure use and share many similar considerations for both the protection of existing facilities and the development of new venues. Therefore these should be protected like other leisure uses proposed in Option 168 and not protected under a separate option 178. The proposed policy for protecting leisure facilities (including arts and cultural venues) should ensure that the range, quality and access of any replacement arts and cultural facilities should follow the applicable design guidance and not lead to a net reduction in arts and cultural provision in terms of range, quality and access. Proposals should also take into account their local environment to ensure they are sensitive to their location and the character of Cambridge. Arts and cultural uses that receive subsidies to remain open will be exempt from the marketing requirement as a means of testing their viability as part of an application involving their loss. Information on real demand for these uses will however be required.

The recommendation is for option 168 to be applicable to the protection of arts and cultural facilities including their replacement. Similarly, option 169 should be applicable to new art and cultural venues given their similarity in matters that need to be considered in their planning, for either local or sub-regional facilities unless a specific policy exists for a particular type of facility.

Option 168 and 169 will ensure policies in the Local Plan include reference to sub-regional facilities where there is no specific policy for a sub-regional facility. The accessibility of both new/replacement arts and cultural facilities including their loss should be assessed in terms of local need and accessibility to alternative arts and cultural venues. Opportunities to provide a legacy building, such as either an innovative arts venue or an archive centre will be considered on their merits under the respective policies including the policy developed under option 169.

The Sustainability Appraisal supports this approach, as it will help Cambridge retain its position as an important cultural centre, support tourism in the city and enhance the quality and vitality of the city centre. The location of new facilities and their potential impact on local transport will need to be carefully considered. Without knowing the location of new facilities, it is difficult to establish the potential impact a location will have on landscape and biodiversity. It is anticipated that separate policies concerning landscape, biodiversity and transport will be provided in the new Local Plan in order to minimise the impact proposals may have on these matters.

There is no proposed designation for a cultural quarter as there is no specific evidence that there is a need for one. Any designation may also have an unintended consequence by deterring or restricting proposals outside an identified cultural area.

Any conversion of former public house sites into arts and culture centres will be considered on the proposal's merits. For those public house sites that are safeguarded, option 173 will still be applicable to determine the viability of the existing public house site and its loss to the local community.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is not to pursue option 178 for arts and cultural proposals. Rather it is recommended to consider arts and cultural proposals as an entertainment leisure facility under the broader definition of leisure. Therefore these types of facilities will be protected by the policy created under option 168, Protection of existing leisure facilities. When arts and cultural facilities are proposed to be lost to alternative uses, this option will be applicable. Option 169 on new leisure facilities will be applicable to proposals involving new and replacement arts and cultural facilities.

APPENDIX D: CHAPTER 11: PROMOTING SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITIES
(PARAGRAPH 11.1 TO QUESTION 11.38)

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 163 - A green and pleasant city with vibrant and culturally diverse neighbourhoods

7234 Support

Summary:

This is not only for the happiness and health of us all, but also because business needs to recruit and retain staff against global competition.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 163 - A green and pleasant city with vibrant and culturally diverse neighbourhoods

9080 Object

Summary:

Overall we support this option. However, add that neighbourhoods should not only be vibrant but also relaxing, in different areas or at different times.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 163 - A green and pleasant city with vibrant and culturally diverse neighbourhoods

12193 Support

Summary:

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

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 163 - A green and pleasant city with vibrant and culturally diverse neighbourhoods

12765 Support

Summary:

Strongly agree.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 163 - A green and pleasant city with vibrant and culturally diverse neighbourhoods

13150 Support

Summary:

Sounds wonderful!!

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 163 - A green and pleasant city with vibrant and culturally diverse neighbourhoods

13659 Support

Summary:

Option No. 163 - A green and pleasant city with vibrant and culturally diverse neighbourhoods

Support/Object: Support

Option 163 seeks to protect and enhance a range of existing facilities within Cambridge, including leisure facilities, because they make Cambridge an appealing place to live and visit. Cambridge Leisure clearly contributes to this appeal, in terms of the mix and range of leisure and other uses it provides.

We support the aims of Option 163.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 163 - A green and pleasant city with vibrant and culturally diverse neighbourhoods

14810 Object

Summary:

Important to protect open spaces and include consideration of city centre 'wildlife corridors'.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 163 - A green and pleasant city with vibrant and culturally diverse neighbourhoods

14894 Support

Summary:

Support

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 163 - A green and pleasant city with vibrant and culturally diverse neighbourhoods**

15387 Support**Summary:**

Agree

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 163 - A green and pleasant city with vibrant and culturally diverse neighbourhoods**

15862 Support**Summary:**

We support this option.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 163 - A green and pleasant city with vibrant and culturally diverse neighbourhoods**

17119 Support**Summary:**

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

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 163 - A green and pleasant city with vibrant and culturally diverse neighbourhoods**

17640 Support**Summary:**

Support

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 163 - A green and pleasant city with vibrant and culturally diverse neighbourhoods**

17789 Object**Summary:**

Options 163, 164 and 167 aim to protect and enhance green spaces are welcome; suggest these be multi-functional and complies with the objectives of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure (GI) Strategy, where relevant.

GI should be an integral part of the creation of sustainable communities; the Local Plan can provide a useful starting point for consideration of GI provision within new development. The requirement for local GI provision through development should be implicit within the Local Plan. This will ensure the Local Plan is compliant with paragraph 114 of the NPPF and will help ensure effective delivery of local scale GI.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 163 - A green and pleasant city with vibrant and culturally diverse neighbourhoods**

18480 Object**Summary:**

Supports policy Option 163 as a strategic priority in so far as community facilities such as libraries/schools should be protected and enhanced. This should not preclude the possibility of change of use, multi use or relocation based upon a strategic assessment of library/community hubs in Cambridge. The policy itself should be sufficiently flexible to meet changing circumstances over the life of the Plan in order that the overriding national policy of enabling sustainable development embodied within the NPPF is not compromised. Options 69 and Option 170 are inherently related to Option 163; an amendment to Option 163 could be considered.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Key Facts**

15086 Object

Summary:

Does the hectare estimate of protected open spaces include the river Cam as it flows through the city?

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	Objectives
--	-------------------

9081 Object

Summary:

Overall we support strongly. We agree that open spaces should be protected and enhanced and that new facilities should be provided where appropriate. Give more emphasis to providing for the needs of existing communities especially those for which underprovision has been recognised by the city council.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	Objectives
--	-------------------

12936 Object

Summary:

Why mix of growing demand and growing city - can you not have the former without the latter? Remove growing city as presumes physical growth is required.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	Objectives
--	-------------------

15863 Support

Summary:

We support these objectives.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	11.5
--	-------------

9772 Support

Summary:

The City's green spaces are important with access already good.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	11.5
--	-------------

9803 Support

Summary:

We support the on going protection and enhancement of existing open spaces as a key element in good quality of life.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	11.5
--	-------------

11490 Object

Summary:

Protection and enhancement of these precious spaces should be an absolute priority. If we are going to stuff the city up with ever more houses, people are going to need their green spaces more and more and they will be more heavily used. Enhancement to me would also include better management of the intense amount of littering that occurs on all these spaces.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	11.6
--	-------------

9082 Support

Summary:

We support this paragraph especially the final sentence, "these qualities are highly valued by residents, workers and visitors; they are fragile, finite and irreplaceable, and should be safeguarded."

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	11.6
--	-------------

9805 Support

Summary:

We support the maintenance of a green network of open space linking areas of Cambridge together along the Cam.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	11.6
--	-------------

11493 Support

Summary:

Yes - so let's not site tall buildings, big new intrusive housing developments, etc. next to the Cam.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	11.6
--	-------------

13248 Support

Summary:

This is an important and, in many ways, defining aspect of the best of Cambridge.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	11.7
--	-------------

11366 Support

Summary:

Concern should also be taken regarding development that might be visible from the River Cam, as well as nearby. For example, Addenbrookes incinerator tower is visible from Grantchester Meadows. This means that development, for example, west of Trumpington Road, would spoil the character of the river valley despite not being next to the river.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	11.7
--	-------------

13254 Object

Summary:

As stated, not only is the Cam beautiful, useful for leisure and important for wildlife, it also plays a vital role in reduction in flood risk. As such, the strong presumption should be no development along or near the banks of the Cam.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	11.7
--	-------------

15381 Object

Summary:

The paths alongside the River Cam also form an important transport function, and this should be recognised.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	11.7
--	-------------

15834 Support

Summary:

The forum welcomes the prominence given to the river and recognition of its environmental and recreational value.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	11.8
--	-------------

9083 Object

Summary:

We support the concept of Local Green Space and the need for guidance on green areas. There is a need to state clearly the important functions of green space as "green lungs" for sustaining air quality, and as encouragement for wildlife locally. These functions are as important as making provision for specific activities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	11.8
--	-------------

15945 Object

Summary:

I trust this new local plan will make provision for the urgent need for more public open space in Petersfield.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	Option 164 - Protection of open space
--	--

7180 Support

Summary:

The reduction of green spaces, in public or private hands, should be resisted to maintain these assets in perpetuity.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	Option 164 - Protection of open space
--	--

9084 Object

Summary:

Overall we support option but the concept of an open space being "satisfactorily replaced elsewhere" needs a more specific, tighter definition (lines 3-7 and 16-18). For example, state who is being considered in an assessment of "satisfactory" replacement; state that both the direct and indirect benefits of a space must be satisfactorily replaced, remembering the "green lung" benefits in the local area around the open space, in addition to the benefits of direct access to open space and use of particular provision therein. If these details are omitted there remains a loop-hole for those wishing to build on open spaces.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	Option 164 - Protection of open space
--	--

9150 Support

Summary:

Continue protection of open spaces. Protect against actions such as recent moves by Gonville and Caius College to stop access to the 'open space' field between Wilberforce Road and Clerk Maxwell Road.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	Option 164 - Protection of open space
--	--

9806 Support

Summary:

We support a strong policy to protect Cambridge's open spaces.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	Option 164 - Protection of open space
--	--

9933 Support

Summary:

Green Belt and green spaces which are of environmental and or recreational value in the city should be protected from development. They also in some places form part of the historic character of the city and should additionally be protected for that reason.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

10324 Support**Summary:**

Representation: We strongly support this option. Green Belt and green spaces (publicly or privately owned) which are of environmental and or recreational value in the city should be protected from development. They also in some places form part of the historic character of the city and should additionally be protected for that reason.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

10828 Support**Summary:**

Important.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

11153 Object**Summary:**

This would result in a very restrictive policy which has no flexibility in recognising the need to develop in line with the objectives and positive policy approach to supporting the expansion of the economy and particularly the continuing success of the University and colleges and housing delivery. A blanket policy is not appropriate. The importance of protecting open space is recognised but it must allow for some loss when weighed up against public benefit and the need to make best use of space within the City.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

11172 Support**Summary:**

Open space should be protected. If development is allowed on part of the green belt eg Trumpington, all the green belt will be threatened with development. Open spaces are valuable assets.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

11496 Support**Summary:**

I think the policy needs to perhaps be stronger. If the current policy is that 'where a site is protected for environmental reasons, development would not be allowed which would harm the character of, or lead to the loss of the open space,' then there are already some projects which have threatened this (bridge across Stourbridge, large building adjacent to Midsummer Common, new housing cluster overlooking the Cam at the Penny Ferry site), etc. These things have happened under 'current policy position,' so I would argue it is not strong enough.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

11818 Object**Summary:**

Support subject to tighter definition of 'replacement' provision with regards to recreational open space.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

12034 Support**Summary:**

Vital policy.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

12186 Object**Summary:**

The potential expansion of local schools is not a threat to sports provision and open space and instead should be seen as an opportunity to enhance the quality of the provision.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

12206 Support**Summary:**

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

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

12566 Object**Summary:**

There is an inconsistency in this option; you aren't protecting open space if you lose it to developers. A 'replacement' isn't strictly possible; it would be like having your garden built on and being given an allotment several streets away.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

12705 Object**Summary:**

I object to the Green Belt being added here in the context of open space for public benefit! Most of the green belt is inaccessible, intensively farmed agricultural land and therefore should not be included in this option unless it is stipulated that it should be actively changed to publicly accessible land.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

12773 Object**Summary:**

Disagree to this blanket ban on development on the greenbelt. Most of the greenbelt is not of aesthetic, recreation or biodiversity use. If a development were put up that included a country park- with close attention paid to design to make this an area of high biodiversity then this would be a much better use of the greenbelt. Not all green is equal!

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

13121 Object**Summary:**

This would result in a very restrictive policy which has no flexibility in recognising the need to develop in line with the objectives and positive policy approach to supporting the expansion of the economy. It prevents institutions making the most effective use of their land for expansion of teaching space or accommodation. A blanket policy is not appropriate.

The importance of protecting open space is recognised but it must allow for some loss when weighed up against public benefit and the need to make best use of space within the City.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

13128 Object**Summary:**

We request that Westminster College is not included in the new Local Plan as a designated 'private protected open space'.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

13551 Object**Summary:**

This would result in a very restrictive policy which has no flexibility in recognising the need to develop in line with the objectives and positive policy approach to supporting the expansion of the economy and particularly the continuing success of the University and Colleges and housing delivery. A blanket policy is not appropriate. The importance of protecting open space is recognised but it must allow for some loss when weighed up against public benefit and the need to make best use of space within the City.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

13984 Object**Summary:**

Option 164 proposes to add a further layer of policy protection to land designated as Green Belt on the proposals map. The Consortium considers that the Green Belt already offers overarching policy protection at the highest level and additional policy protection through open space is not therefore required and has not been justified. It is unclear why Green Belt land requires further policy protection in the form of open space protection.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

14272 Support**Summary:****Support & Note**

Continuation of the Council's current policy position of protecting open spaces is important for environmental and/or recreational reasons.

Please Note:

Access to the field owned by Gonville & Caius College has been blocked off. The field is between Wilberforce Road and Clerk Maxwell Road.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

14420 Object**Summary:**

The concern on the policy approach is if an open space is protected for its environmental quality then that piece of land is blighted for any development or change, even when that change could be a positive one. A clearer and responsive policy position must be:

"Where a site is protected for environmental reasons its development will not be allowed unless its environmental qualities can be retained or mitigated for."

This amendment would allow for some flexibility to enable sites to be considered on their own merit and allow good development that can respect the environmental qualities to come forward.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

14513 Support**Summary:**

Open spaces desirable from every point of view.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

14711 Object**Summary:**

Field (owned by Gonville & Caius College between Wilberforce Road and Clerk Maxwell Road) provides soak-away in heavy rain. Tennis club is a thriving and highly valued institution.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

14812 Support

Summary:

I agree with paragraphs 11.5 - 11.9.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 164 - Protection of open space

14895 Support

Summary:

Support

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 164 - Protection of open space

14966 Object

Summary:

The protection of open spaces Option 164 goes too far. Many of the protected sites are designated for environmental quality; this has the effect of blighting the site for development. The policy must be amended to:

"Where a site is protected for environmental reasons its development will not be allowed unless its environmental qualities can be identified and retained or mitigated."

This would allow for good development that can respect environmental quality such as at the Emmanuel College Playing field off of Wilberforce Road where a well-considered development could add to the contribution the land makes to environmental quality.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 164 - Protection of open space

15392 Support

Summary:

Agree with the broad policy approach. Once green space is lost it is lost forever. It is essential to retain the like for like replacement in the case of established sports pitches but there should be a presumption against any further loss of such facilities. Cambridge is poorly served even for football and large parts of the city have no access to cricket or tennis and public bowling greens have been removed quite recently.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 164 - Protection of open space

15864 Support

Summary:

We support Option 164.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 164 - Protection of open space

15885 Object

Summary:

The continued implementation of the existing policy of conserving Protected Open Space is not appropriate as this would not be sufficiently informed by a robust up-to-date understanding of the quality and demand for Open Space in a particular locality.

The Anderson Group own land identified within the OSRS:

NAT 37 & NAT 38 Former Landfill Site West(11.59Ha) & East(8.86)of Norman Way, respectively.

NAT 38 is proposed for residential purposes with NAT 37 as publically-accessible parkland which will contribute to the future sustainable development of Cambridge by providing new Strategic Open Space, with provision made for biodiversity, and sustainable transport modes.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 164 - Protection of open space

16592 Object

Summary:

Support with a reservation. The last sentence before the bullet points: "Where a site is protected for recreational reasons only, development that leads to the loss of the open space will only be permitted when it can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere." Where would 'elsewhere' be? It should not be permitted at all. It is another let-out.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

16761 Support**Summary:**

Gonville & Caius College has blocked off all access to the field it owns in between Wilberforce and Clerk Maxwell Roads, closing footpaths that used to run around that field as well as denying its use by the public.

Within this area is the Cambridge Lawn Tennis Club, a community-based not-for-profit club committed to making tennis available to all ages, abilities and social groups. Tennis is played all year. This is a huge asset to the City of Cambridge and its central location adds to its importance.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

17045 Object**Summary:**

The most important open space in our area was missed off the Open Spaces and Recreation Strategy 2011. This was queried but never properly explained.

The triangle of land on Tenison Road at the junction with St Barnabas Road and Lyndewode Road contains a number of fine forest trees and provides the only open space in the area covered by our Association. It is extensively used by local children and also provides a pleasant area of visual amenity. We would like to see this area included as it more than fulfils the criteria in appendix F.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

17120 Support**Summary:**

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

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

17641 Support**Summary:**

Support

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

17790 Object**Summary:**

Options 163, 164 and 167 aim to protect and enhance green spaces are welcome; suggest these be multi-functional and complies with the objectives of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure (GI) Strategy, where relevant.

GI should be an integral part of the creation of sustainable communities; the Local Plan can provide a useful starting point for consideration of GI provision within new development. The requirement for local GI provision through development should be implicit within the Local Plan. This will ensure the Local Plan is compliant with paragraph 114 of the NPPF and will help ensure effective delivery of local scale GI.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

17876 Object**Summary:**

I would add "Where an open space is adjacent to population of residents it is a vital provision that offers a balance between urban and wild space and it will be given highest importance. In particular land with unfettered natural habitat where the population can hear natural sounds that recharges their mental and physical batteries, supports their Wellbeing and helps them to destress. This type of open space is essential for healthy child development (see Richard Loov's research on childhood disorders due to lack of natural wild space). These spaces are particularly important for the population who are actively working to reduce their carbon footprint by not having a car and for those on such low incomes that they are unable to travel to wild space."

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 164 - Protection of open space**

18021 Support**Summary:**

The city should preserve and positively plan a network of accessible open space - of diverse character and use - to encircle and criss-cross the city - connecting with the surrounding landscapes and providing a foreground for development in the tradition of the Backs and the city's Commons and Pieces.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.1**

7014 Support**Summary:**

Yes, there is a need for a policy on this, and I would support that entitled Option 164.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.1**

7127 Support**Summary:**

I support Option 164

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.1**

8069 Support**Summary:**

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.1**

8126 Support**Summary:**

Strongly support protection of open space.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.1**

8615 Support**Summary:**

The Trumpington Residents' Association supports Option 164 concerning the protection of open space.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.1**

8948 Object**Summary:**

Allowing development of a protected area on the basis that it can be replaced elsewhere should not be considered. The Green Belt should be maintained not shifted elsewhere.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.1**

9085 Support

Summary:

Yes. It is essential for the maintenance of a good quality of life in all its aspects.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.1

9936 Support

Summary:

To prevent the loss of these green lungs from which everyone benefits even if some only benefit by seeing some green, rather than using it.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.1

10349 Support

Summary:

it is even more essential than ever to protect the green lungs within the city and towards the urban edge formed by college playing fields and other protected green spaces as Cambridge expands, as already planned, into the Green Belt.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.1

10381 Support

Summary:

Seems essential.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.1

10622 Support

Summary:

The Wildlife Trust supports the inclusion of an open space protection policy similar to that already in existence which gives strong protection to open spaces of environmental value.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.1

10829 Support

Summary:

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.1

11498 Support

Summary:

Yes, but it should be stronger, not merely a continuation of existing policy.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.1

11810 Support

Summary:

The Council's current policy of retaining open spaces for recreation and sport needs strong support. An open space covered can never be retrieved.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.1**

12937 Support**Summary:**

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.1**

13607 Support**Summary:**

Yes

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

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.1**

13701 Support**Summary:**

Essential. Pressure on open space is growing as more apartments are built in the city. These residents need parks and recreation grounds, shown by the numbers at Lammas Land in the recent hot weather.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.1**

13760 Object**Summary:**

Let's have the strongest possible policy to protect Cambridge's diverse open spaces, because they are a key and irreplaceable element of our city's unique character.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.1**

14247 Support**Summary:**

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.1**

14456 Support**Summary:**

Yes - protection of green belt is vital.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.1**

15087 Support**Summary:**

Yes, support.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.1**

16593 Support**Summary:**

Yes, emphatically.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.1**

16861 Support**Summary:**

Yes - support.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.1**

18059 Support**Summary:**

Yes - As suggested - Assuming that NPPF have not changed their policy or requirements as to the criteria that is required to be met.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.1**

18534 Support**Summary:**

We support Option 164 concerning the protection of open space.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.2**

9086 Object**Summary:**

These points should be added:

- (a) Need to state specifically that protection of open spaces applies whether or not there is public access;
 - (b) It is essential that provision for existing residents should be recognised as being just as important as provision for new residents and communities; and
 - (c) Need to define "satisfactory". See comment under Option 164.
-

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.2**

9807 Support**Summary:**

The current policy, which you propose to continue, is basically sound; however, there has been some unsightly development in recent years which suggest that guidelines are not clear enough (viz, the tall building that now overshadows Midsummer Common). There is room to strengthen guidance.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.2**

9937 Object**Summary:**

only if anything can be done to strengthen the protection of playing fields in particular, e.g. to prevent cynical reduction in recreational use in order claim it surplus to requirements

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.2**

10332 Object**Summary:**

Only if anything can be done to strengthen the protection of playing fields in particular, e.g. to prevent cynical reduction in recreational use in order to devalue its legitimate protection as of recreational value

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.2**

11154 Object**Summary:**

Such a policy makes no distinction between open spaces the Council has recently designated as POS and those that would meet just one criteria for protection.
Such a policy has to recognise the quality of the open space as a factor. For example different parts of an open space may vary in their environmental or recreational value. Development may lead to improvements in the quality of the remaining space e.g. enhanced biodiversity or public benefit - visual or access - to the space which could mitigate against loss.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.2**

12707 Object**Summary:**

There is an opportunity here to put in place measures that will seek to alter the green belt for the public good- which is a founding principle of the green belt in the first place which is being seriously neglected around Cambridge.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.2**

12939 Object**Summary:**

Please include ALL open spaces in North Newtown in list on p.65 of Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011, e.g. the playing field behind Panton Hall, garden areas in Russell and Princess/Hanover courts, and residual garden within Stephen Perse foundation, Union road. Enhance poorly greened spaces in North Newtown e.g. chemistry labs, school and other extensive off-street parking areas which are tarmaced and tree/hedge denuded.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.2**

13123 Object**Summary:**

Such a policy makes no distinction between open spaces the Council has recently designated as POS and those that would meet just one criteria for protection.
Such a policy has to recognise the quality of the open space as a factor. For example different parts of an open space may vary in their environmental or recreational value. Development may lead to improvements in the quality of the remaining space which may not just be mitigation but enhancement. e.g. enhanced biodiversity or public benefit - visual or access.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.2**

13158 Object**Summary:**

Policy 164 continues current policy - Plus. NB the protection of open spaces has to be encouraged as well as improving those already there.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.2**

13259 Object

Summary:

The policy should be strengthened and should include specifically a mention of the importance of mitigation of flood risk.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.2

13553 Object

Summary:

Such a policy makes no distinction between open spaces the Council has recently designated as POS and those that would meet just one criteria for protection.

Such a policy has to recognise the quality of the open space as a factor. For example different parts of an open space may vary in their environmental or recreational value. Development may lead to improvements in the quality of the remaining space e.g. enhanced biodiversity or public benefit - visual or access - to the space which could mitigate against loss.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.2

13770 Object

Summary:

Yes, the following point could be added to increase protection: ensure that all Cambridge's current and planned publicly-owned allotment provision is clearly designated as statutory allotments. I believe that some (e.g. Empty Common) are currently still designated as temporary allotments, despite a long period of continuous use as allotments, and therefore lack the additional protection (that is, protection beyond the planning system) enjoyed by statutory sites under section 8 of the Allotments Act 1925.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.2

13885 Object

Summary:

I suggest that public footpaths be included in the list of open space facilities. They are not just for sustainable transport, but serve a valuable purpose in themselves. They contribute a tremendous amount to the physical and mental well-being of the City, for individuals and groups. Existing ones need to be properly signed and maintained, and new ones designed and created. They make the Green Belt more valuable, keep city dwellers in touch with farmland and are particularly important for people without their own open space.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.2

13919 Object

Summary:

Consider including informal areas of open space (e.g. pub gardens) which provide important amenity, particularly in areas already deficient in open space.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.2

15088 Support

Summary:

Please confirm that the River Cam is an area meeting the criteria for protection in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011. If it is not specified in that document then it needs to be given its own consideration.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.2

15946 Object

Summary:

St Matthews Piece is already over-used and the situation will be exacerbated with the new developments in the area.

There is an opportunity to increase the public open space on St Matthew's Piece, by returning the land occupied by the Howard Mallett Club to the local people as originally envisaged; it is a subject very important to the local community.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.2**

16862 Object**Summary:**

Option 164 is adequate. However, it should be amended to refer to the removal of green belt land from protection where housing development is required and approved.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.2**

18062 Support**Summary:**

No

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.2**

18240 Object**Summary:**

The areas near the river, from Grantchester to Fen Ditton should be protected, not just for the flood plains, but as public amenities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.2**

18483 Object**Summary:**

Regard should be made to strategic reviews of service provision by the County Council.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.3**

15089 Support**Summary:**

A waterspace strategy as an adjunct to the protection of open space policy.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**11.10**

9087 Support**Summary:**

It would be all too easy for existing open spaces to become overused if new provision is not made for new residents, especially as many existing built-up areas are already underprovided.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**11.10**

11503 Support**Summary:**

Yes, this is important, but why are developers allowed to pay funds (106 money) to get out of the obligation to provide this? I think far better to force creation of new spaces - perhaps buying up old building sites and creating pocket parks or roof gardens on existing buildings.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**11.11**

9088 Support

Summary:

These are minimum standards and essential for the maintenance of good quality living in Cambridge.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities 11.13

10537 Support

Summary:

New housing developments, large and small, result in higher densities and more people have no gardens they can call their own. It is very important that residents can rent an allotment if they want to. This policy is necessary to protect existing allotments, encourage new local allotment projects and require new allotments on urban extensions. The definition and design requirements of allotments should be set out in detail.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities 11.15

15383 Support

Summary:

St Matthew's Piece (Petersfield) should be expanded and protected against development. The former proposal for the Citylife building was not appropriate and was rightly rejected. Stronger policy is needed to protect this land. The City Council should use S106 funds to buy out the County Council's part of the land so that a more coherent and larger park space can be achieved.

Strongly agree that open space should be provided on-site and not dealt with by commuted payments.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities 11.16

11507 Support

Summary:

Support

11 - Promoting Successful Communities Option 165 - Update the standards in line with the Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011

7181 Object

Summary:

Maxima should be adopted, not minima; if there is an economic impact affecting viability, then development should not proceed.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities Option 165 - Update the standards in line with the Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011

11029 Object

Summary:

Bidwells considers that the provision of allotments for all new residential development is unlikely to be viable or desirable and would provide long term issues in relation to servicing and maintenance, particularly for small developments. Bidwells considers that the requirement for allotments should continue to apply only to the urban extensions, where they can be satisfactorily designed into the masterplans, where there may be more of a demand for allotments, and it would be more financially viable than for smaller development sites in relation to the provision and future maintenance of the allotments.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities Option 165 - Update the standards in line with the Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011

11508 Support

Summary:

Support

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 165 - Update the standards in line with the Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011**

12710 Support**Summary:**

I would hugely support this as a critical element of any city growth plan - how can it not be? I would also urge the council not to view any potential incursion into the green belt as a universally bad thing for open space, but as an opportunity to open up this land for public benefit.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 165 - Update the standards in line with the Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011**

12777 Support**Summary:**

Agree- all of these are very important to quality of life.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 165 - Update the standards in line with the Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011**

13024 Support**Summary:**

I strongly support this. Obesity levels are high and physical activity levels low - the more we can encourage outdoor recreational activity the more likely we will be able to tackle this serious public health issue.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 165 - Update the standards in line with the Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011**

13648 Object**Summary:**

I think it is important that public open space on new developments is adopted and run by public bodies and open and accessible to all. Where open space on new developments is privately maintained, and paid for out of service charges, we have residents of new developments paying twice for open space maintenance, once through their council tax, and again privately through their service charges, this situation should be avoided.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 165 - Update the standards in line with the Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011**

14205 Support**Summary:**

The principle that allotments should be provided for all new residential development makes sense, otherwise the city's overall provision will be diluted. Dense infill development has tiny gardens (if any) that are unsuitable for growing food, therefore it is especially important that the residents have another option. Such allotments will ultimately be self-managed (like most existing provision) and will not be a burden for the City. In most cases there will be insufficient space so the additional provision should be created within the nearest urban extension, possibly amalgamated with the new provision pertaining to that development.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 165 - Update the standards in line with the Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011**

15393 Support**Summary:**

This should be an absolute requirement in the urban extensions but is probably an unrealistic aspiration in redeveloping previously built-up areas. Increasing levels of development make safeguarding what we have and our rural borders even more urgent.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 165 - Update the standards in line with the Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011**

15404 Support

Summary:

Innovative and sustainable communities should be the presumption upon which the wider development plan should rest. Having not yet discovered where in the very lengthy issues and options report this might be addressed, a recommendation for existing allotment sites to be protected, and for new allotments and community green spaces such as the Romsey Community Garden to be included where possible within any new or redevelopment of existing residential spaces.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 165 - Update the standards in line with the Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011

15886 Object

Summary:

The OSRS confirms sites NAT 37(11.59 Hectares) and NAT 38(8.86 Hectares)- Former Landfill Site West & East of Norman Way are not of recreational value and have a quality value of 35% and 35.71% respectively. These scores are comparatively low in regard to other identified Protected Areas of Open Space across the Cambridge Urban Area. The OSRS does state that NAT 37 and NAT 38 have environmental value. NAT38 is proposed for residential purposes with enhancement of (NAT 37) as publically-accessible parkland. This will deliver significant qualitative environmental improvements, through the delivery of a new Strategic Open Space Network.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 166 - Maintain the current standards for open space and recreation provision

8949 Support

Summary:

Cambridge has lots of open spaces and recreational spaces.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 166 - Maintain the current standards for open space and recreation provision

11031 Support

Summary:

Bidwells considers that the provision of allotments for all new residential development is unlikely to be viable or desirable and would provide long term issues in relation to servicing and maintenance, particularly for small developments. Bidwells considers that the requirement for allotments should continue to apply only to the urban extensions, where they can be satisfactorily designed into the masterplans, where there may be more of a demand for allotments, and it would be more financially viable than for smaller development sites in relation to the provision and future maintenance of the allotments.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 166 - Maintain the current standards for open space and recreation provision

11510 Object

Summary:

Object - inadequate in light of growth plans.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 166 - Maintain the current standards for open space and recreation provision

14224 Object

Summary:

There are two problems relating to the current standard for allotment provision:

- Restricting new provision to urban extensions only means that provision gets diluted over time. Meanwhile demand is rising.
- Even 0.4ha/1000 will be inadequate. Inevitable resource depletion means that we can expect eventual demand to match the 1945 national provision of around 0.75ha/1000, which is almost double Cambridge's current provision.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 166 - Maintain the current standards for open space and recreation provision

15395 Support

Summary:

Support this as a fall-back position.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 166 - Maintain the current standards for open space and recreation provision**

16420 Object**Summary:**

I would like to say that I see no commitment in the Local Plan to promoting and strengthening local food producers and retailers and to encouraging more "Grow Your Own". Without areas set aside for food production, valuable land may be covered by development and lost for future generations to grow their own food.

All new housing should have at least the wartime allocation of 0.7 Hectares per 1000 head of population for allotments and "growing your own" food in Cambridge. At present the allocation is less than 0.4 Hectares with more than 400 people on allotment waiting lists.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.4**

7128 Support**Summary:**

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.4**

7425 Support**Summary:**

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.4**

8500 Support**Summary:**

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.4**

9089 Support**Summary:**

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.4**

10260 Support**Summary:**

Open spaces are important for quality of life and as local resource and to promote community.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.4**

10678 Support**Summary:**

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.4**

10830 Support

Summary:

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.4

11511 Support

Summary:

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.4

12714 Support

Summary:

Yes, this is key to a city which continues to have green open space at its heart.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.4

13167 Support

Summary:

An important area in terms of quality of life in the city. We must have a strong policy.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.4

13872 Support

Summary:

It is expensive for developers to provide open space, and it must continue to be a requirement.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.4

14234 Support

Summary:

Yes.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.4

14252 Support

Summary:

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.4

15090 Support

Summary:

Yes, support.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.4

16594 Support

Summary:

Yes.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.4

18068 Support

Summary:

Yes - a policy is most necessary.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.4

18214 Support

Summary:

Sports facilities and open space should be adequately allowed for and provided.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.5

7129 Support

Summary:

165

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.5

7426 Support

Summary:

Option 165

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.5

8501 Support

Summary:

Option 165

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.5

9090 Support

Summary:

Prefer option 165 because there is a need for allotment standards in all new residential development. Also, 2.2 hectares per 1000 people is preferable to 1.8 hectares; open space is so important.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.5

9476 Support

Summary:

Option 166 as a minimum. 165 and 166 are not that different, but increasing the open space provision must be balanced with other needs for space, especially housing.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.5

10262 Object

Summary:

Option 165 for the point about allotment standards being expanded to all new residential development in Cambridge, rather than restricted to new urban extensions only. However, the standard of 0.4 ha/1000 population for allotments is unlikely to satisfy even today's as waiting lists are still very substantial. We propose aiming for 0.7 ha/1000 as was standard during wartime, in preference to increasing the informal green space allocation. The informal green spaces should include areas with trees and bushes, especially fruit bushes, in preference to large areas of grass for greater amenity.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.5

10680 Support

Summary:

Option 165 - why otherwise have a new strategy ? Esp need for informal open space and allotments.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.5

10831 Support

Summary:

Option 166

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.5

11838 Support

Summary:

Sport England supports Option 165 as this is based on a more up to date evidence base (otherwise why carry out new assessments of need)? We note, however, that standards for indoor/outdoor sport remain the same as previously adopted. Standards for indoor sports facilities will rarely, if ever, justify the need for on-site facilities as part of a single development proposal, therefore it is critical that an appropriate supporting document is adopted which sets out how contributions will be secured (CIL/S106?) and, preferably, which priority projects will be funded via such contributions.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.5

12715 Support

Summary:

165

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.5

12941 Support

Summary:

Option 165

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.5

13173 Object

Summary:

Policy 165 - we need to move further than the current policy allows and aim to make up some of the deficits, particularly in the identified wards.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.5

13214 Support

Summary:

Option 165, but the allocation of 0.4 hectares/1000 is not much above current provision and there are over 400 people on allotment waiting lists. I would argue for a higher provision closer to 0.7 hectares/1000.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.5

13923 Support

Summary:

Option 165

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.5

14238 Support

Summary:

Option 165.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.5

14250 Support

Summary:

Option 165

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.5

15092 Support

Summary:

Option 165 preferred.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.5

15865 Support

Summary:

Yes due to the reasons in paragraph 11.15. The area north of the river is, in general poorly served in that regard. We believe that every effort should be made for this deficiency to be redressed and would therefore support option 165.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.5

16595 Support

Summary:

Option 165 preferred.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.5**

18066 Support**Summary:**

Option 166 - Maintain the current standards for open space and recreation provision.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.6**

7427 Support**Summary:**

Allotment provision within any new developments, and preferably within the city as a whole, should conform at least to the standard of 0.4ha/1000. This should be statutory allotment land. South Cambs should be encouraged to do the same on developments on the city periphery. New provision of allotments must not be too fragmented. Provision should always be made for storage of rainwater for irrigation and community composting.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.6**

9091 Object**Summary:**

Important to improve existing spaces and remedy deficits; otherwise these needs tend to be overshadowed by consideration of new developments.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.6**

10267 Object**Summary:**

Community Gardens are not classified as open spaces and we believe should be.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.6**

13273 Support**Summary:**

Financial contributions towards open space should be sought from developments of student accommodation. It might be the case that the universities provide students with many or most facilities but students still use the city's facilities and new developments should make a contribution to the quality of life for all in this area (As things stand, new student accommodation does not make a contribution to affordable housing).

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.6**

14271 Support**Summary:**

In the current Clay Farm development, part of the new allotment provision (as required by the 2006 Local Plan) was re-purposed by the developers as "Community Gardens". Whatever merits these gardens may have, they are not clearly for the purpose of growing food, and as such do not meet the intent in that Plan. Therefore, for the avoidance of doubt, new allotment provision must be clearly defined as such in the new Local Plan with reference to the Allotments Act. People know what allotments are for - this in itself helps them to achieve their purpose.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.6**

15095 Support**Summary:**

Provision of one or more new boathouses to accommodate the anticipated growth in recreational rowing on the River Cam.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.6**

16453 Object**Summary:**

No more housing development on Green Belt land (Option 1) until the space allocated for housing under the last Plan has been used up. More housing development would take out more Green Belt and I am aware of the importance of the Green Belt for biodiversity and green space. Planned green spaces should include community gardens and fruit and nut orchards as these are far better habitats for wildlife than playing fields and other forms of monoculture, which are currently considered as green spaces.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.6**

17111 Object**Summary:**

Yes to something other than shopping as the National Pastime for central Cambridge residents; yes to an Ice Rink, a better auditorium - somewhere we can host ballet and dance to a good standard without half the dancers falling off the Corn Exchange stage. Yes to many more outside sports areas, a cycle rink, a host of boules or petanques areas, basket ball hoops, small hardplay surfaces, netball courts - many more free tennis areas.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.6**

17553 Object**Summary:**

Councils need to recognise that they can raise taxes to provide 'essential services' and should use this and not spend money on the folk festival, jazz in the park etc. Funds deposited by builders should be used to provide more open spaces in the City.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.6**

17800 Support**Summary:**

Central government is seeing the harmful social results, particularly on young men, of the decisions to sell off playing fields. It would be wrong to allow building development on the golf course, and any of the playing fields. At present young people can walk or cycle to sport, as can spectators. We do not want to make sport an activity that requires a car. Nor do we want to remove from the people who live in the centre the pleasure of watching sport on their doorstep.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.6**

18071 Support**Summary:**

No

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.6**

18238 Object**Summary:**

We need more school playing fields.
Maximum open space for playgrounds, adults to sit and read the newspaper during lunch hours, etc.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.7**

15097 Support**Summary:**

Commissioning a waterspace strategy study to look in more detail at the need for recreational provision at the land-water interface and on the blue space itself.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**11.18****17061 Object****Summary:**

The area covered by our Association is high density housing with little public open space. The deficiency is quantified in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy.

Have previously strongly objected to the practice of the Council accepting payments under S106 to compensate for lack of onsite provision.

The provision of this money is of little use since there are no open spaces available to purchase in the area.

The policy should be much tighter and have a presumption in favour of onsite provision of open space with a no 'get out 'clause.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 167 - On-site provision****9092 Object****Summary:**

Guidance must be spelt out. Extremely important.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 167 - On-site provision****15380 Object****Summary:**

The definition of "Where it is not possible to provide on-site provision" needs to be clearly-defined.

Would "not possible" include a developer who "cannot" provide space simply because they have chosen to maximise the use of land for housing to increase the profitability of the land, for instance?

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 167 - On-site provision****15397 Object****Summary:**

This is a reasonable provision but where site preparation is necessary it should be made a condition that it is done and largely completed before occupation of the development.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 167 - On-site provision****16596 Object****Summary:**

On-site provision of open space is essential for residential development. If it is not possible to provide it, the site should not be built on.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 167 - On-site provision****17066 Object****Summary:**

The area covered by our Association is high density housing with little public open space. The deficiency is quantified in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy.

Have previously strongly objected to the practice of the Council accepting payments under S106 to compensate for lack of onsite provision.

The provision of this money is of little use since there are no open spaces available to purchase in the area.

The policy should be much tighter and have a presumption in favour of onsite provision of open space with a no 'get out 'clause.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 167 - On-site provision****17500 Object****Summary:**

Option 167 supported, but with off site provision only in exceptional circumstances, unlike several recent developments.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 167 - On-site provision**

17792 Object**Summary:**

Options 163, 164 and 167 aim to protect and enhance green spaces are welcome; suggest these be multi-functional and complies with the objectives of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure (GI) Strategy, where relevant.

GI should be an integral part of the creation of sustainable communities; the Local Plan can provide a useful starting point for consideration of GI provision within new development. The requirement for local GI provision through development should be implicit within the Local Plan. This will ensure the Local Plan is compliant with paragraph 114 of the NPPF and will help ensure effective delivery of local scale GI.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.8**

9093 Support**Summary:**

Yes, issues must be spelt out clearly.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.8**

9478 Support**Summary:**

Provision of informal open space and play space for children should be on-site, and adequate, in all cases.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.8**

10683 Support**Summary:**

Yes. Too many developers make cash payments in lieu if open space which makes a mockery of the requirement for provision. Especially when there are no nearby sites within a safe and easy walk. Student accomodation especially needs open space.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.8**

13179 Object**Summary:**

A clearer policy is needed. We would argue that, given the limited opportunities for new open spaces, any funds taken in lieu must be spent to maintain, enhance and improve the existing areas of Public Open Space.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.8**

15100 Support**Summary:**

Yes, support.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.8**

15866 Support**Summary:**

We support Option 167 for the provision for open space and recreation on site though it should state explicitly that commuted sums be taken as an exception only.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.8**

16597 Support

Summary:

Yes.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.8

16856 Support

Summary:

Yes - support.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.8

18074 Support

Summary:

Yes - would be an excellent edition to the current policy.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.9

7235 Support

Summary:

Leisure facilities need to be considered as they provide not only open space but sporting and play facilities. Current standards do not include provision for allotments except in urban extensions.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.9

10268 Support

Summary:

As well as the ha/person standard, we need to consider accessibility. There should be standards set for the distance from houses to recreation sites. This may require on-site provision in many cases.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.9

10686 Support

Summary:

On site provision should be a priority not an opt-in.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.9

12945 Object

Summary:

This section is confusing - we cannot see how open space elsewhere in city centre is to be made available. The suggestion that off site provision could be bought gives too much wriggle room to developers and does not prioritise the importance of green spaces and historic character which is especially important in the city centre and in surrounding conservation areas.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.9

15947 Object

Summary:

It is suggested that if new developments cannot provide open space then a financial contribution should be considered. I think this is a slippery slope and if open space cannot be provided then it points to over-development. All new developments should provide open space.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.9

16858 Support

Summary:

On-site provision of open space should be provided wherever possible.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.10

7236 Object

Summary:

Onsite provision needs to be primary focus with commuted sums by exception only and weighted according to deficit in the area

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

11.19

16598 Support

Summary:

Yes, absolutely essential.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

11.21

9106 Support

Summary:

Extremely important to protect existing leisure facilities for all age groups.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 168 - Protection of existing leisure facilities

9094 Object

Summary:

Support in general but object over specific points, thus:
Need to clarify whether protection applies to public facilities, private facilities or both;
We are not clear about the difference between recreation, leisure and community facilities;
Bullet point 2: define "its users". Suggest "for its users already existing and new";
Bullet point 6: needs clarification. We don't understand; and
Final sentence: a delay is tolerable as long as there is appropriate provision in the longer term.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 168 - Protection of existing leisure facilities

11517 Support

Summary:

Agree. Case in point is sad degradation of Parkside pool - when it opened it was state of the art. It's been revamped a bit, but it's been allowed to get pretty squalid. Why? Is it because it's under private management?

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 168 - Protection of existing leisure facilities

11840 Support

Summary:

Sport England supports a policy aimed at protecting leisure facilities, but agree that a tighter definition of 'leisure' is required to avoid ambiguity at application stage. Assuming that the policy will relate to significant indoor sports facilities such as sports halls and swimming pools, we support the need for the applicant to demonstrate a lack of need if any facility is to be lost without suitable replacement provision. Sport England has several planning tools which can help assess need with regard to significant indoor sports facilities (ie, halls and pools) and is happy to assist this process where applicable.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 168 - Protection of existing leisure facilities

12781 Support

Summary:

Strongly agree.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 168 - Protection of existing leisure facilities

13661 Support

Summary:

We support Option 168.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 168 - Protection of existing leisure facilities

13858 Object

Summary:

Where a building was designed for a specific use and where that use is no longer viable /practical it is unrealistic to expect the use to be replaced elsewhere or for the building to be extensively marketed for a similar use if it can be demonstrated that there are alternative uses that would be compliant in planning policy terms.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.11

7237 Support

Summary:

There should be an area-wide needs survey, addressing also journey length, availability of public transport and accessibility for all ages.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.11

9095 Support

Summary:

Yes, certainly.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.11

11868 Object

Summary:

We support both options - 168 and 178 - but have a major query.

As there is a separate option for cultural facilities, theatres should not be included in a description of leisure facilities as this is misleading.

Either these two options should be combined, or the description for Leisure Facilities excludes any cultural facilities such as theatres and the Fitzwilliam etc.

The question of economic viability may apply to leisure facilities, but does not carry the same weight for cultural facilities as many of these are supported by external funding.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.11**

13183 Support**Summary:**

Yes if only to keep the existing facilities available.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.11**

13291 Support**Summary:**

Absolutely there needs to be a policy. Without the protection of policies, there would be high buildings of 1 and 2 bed flats with no outside space built on every spare inch that a developer could buy with no concern for environment, culture, health, leisure or anything on a timescale longer than it takes to sell the bedspace. The only way to keep Cambridge lovely and to manage the growth is to have strong policies, fully enforced. On the other hand, should the real drive be to reduce cost of properties, allow the developers free rein.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.11**

13824 Support**Summary:**

The current Local Plan works well. It has proved vital to have clear criteria for leisure provision on new developments.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.11**

14258 Support**Summary:**

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.11**

15102 Support**Summary:**

Yes, support.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.11**

15399 Support**Summary:**

Agree the need for a policy but I suspect the gains to be made from exploiting leisure facilitation space are such as to make delays whilst going through the motions of compliance with this policy acceptable. There should be a very strong presumption against the loss of such facilities and they should all be listed on the Register of Community Assets.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.11**

15867 Object**Summary:**

We would support the protection of existing leisure and community facilities and development of new facilities (options 168, 169 and 170) but consider that the options are unambitious in their scope. The approach to viability is a narrow market led approach which fails to consider the wider social and recreational needs of a community or accessibility of public transport.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.11**

18075 Support**Summary:**

Yes - as suggested.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.12**

7238 Support**Summary:**

Assessment should also include importance of social amenity value to an existing area.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.12**

9096 Object**Summary:**

Needs stringent criteria and a thorough consultation with all existing users and potential users of the leisure facility in its existing location.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.12**

9479 Support**Summary:**

Firm evidence of a diminished need for such facilities, not just in Cambridge but more widely (compare changing patterns of cinema attendance over time).

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.12**

13188 Support**Summary:**

Option 168 seems to cover all the ground.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.12**

13864 Object**Summary:**

The extensive marketing and other onerous criteria will be a disincentive to bringing unused space back into use. The assessment needs to include a review of the history of the site and building which would help to explain the reasons for an applicant's proposal to seek an alternative use. For example gaps in occupancy, short term occupancy, difficulties in conversion or adaption, marketing more than a year previously, compatibility with adjoining uses, difficulties of location etc.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.12**

14262 Support**Summary:**

Views of local resident's groups to be canvassed on whether a designated leisure facility could be lost.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.12**

18077 Object

Summary:

The frequency of how often the facility is currently used. Whether the numbers are low as a result of poor dated facilities that require updating or replacement?

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.13

7239 Support

Summary:

There need to be Community Asset Registers.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.13

9097 Object

Summary:

Add the need to provide new leisure facilities in existing built up areas; equal importance to be given to existing and new areas.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.13

13868 Object

Summary:

No recognition that alternative uses may outweigh retention of the leisure facility in terms of public benefit.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.13

18079 Object

Summary:

The frequency of how often the facility is currently used. Whether the numbers are low a result of poor dated facilities that require updating or replacement?

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.14

9483 Support

Summary:

Investigate with the universities, colleges and schools the possibility of greater use of sporting and other facilities by the wider community - the village college model.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.14

13296 Support

Summary:

Agree with Mr Clifton's comment. University and Council really ought to be working together a little more.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

11.24

11519 Support

Summary:

Yes - I object to the levels of planned growth, but if we have to have them then we need more leisure facilities, more green space, more trees - in short, more amenities or we need not grow and spend our money on nuturing and upgrading our existing amenities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	11.25
--	--------------

9098 Support

Summary:

Contributions to support the new facilities are essential, as is the need to increase the capacity of existing facilities to prevent overload.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	11.25
--	--------------

11145 Object

Summary:

Local need should not be defined by landowners and developers. Local opinions should take priority. Any new football stadium should not be on green belt land. Leisure facilities should not adversely impact on local communities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	Option 169 - New leisure facilities
--	--

8952 Object

Summary:

Cambridge is already well served with leisure facilities, your information says that we have more than the national average for sports halls. Improving accessibility to facilities should be through changes in transport and not through relocation of the facility itself. Consideration must be given to the effect on the new site of the relocated facility not just on the effect on the city centre.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	Option 169 - New leisure facilities
--	--

9099 Object

Summary:

Support but clarify what is included in this option i.e. which types of leisure facilities are included and which kinds of ownership (public or private). We are not clear about the difference between recreational, leisure and community facilities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	Option 169 - New leisure facilities
--	--

12783 Support

Summary:

Agree

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	Option 169 - New leisure facilities
--	--

13665 Support

Summary:

We support the aim of Option 169 and the suggested criteria to be used to assess new leisure facilities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	Option 169 - New leisure facilities
--	--

15400 Support

Summary:

Agree and they should involve local people in their design and subsequent management to develop real roots within the community and get real support for it.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	Option 169 - New leisure facilities
--	--

16770 Support

Summary:

Support Option 169 - New leisure facilities
This option would allow for the development of a policy of supporting new leisure facilities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.15

9100 Support

Summary:

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.15

12716 Support

Summary:

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.15

13193 Support

Summary:

With more new housing and an expanding population both in and around the City, we need a policy along these lines.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.15

14263 Support

Summary:

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.15

15104 Support

Summary:

Yes, support.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.15

15868 Object

Summary:

We would support the protection of existing leisure and community facilities and development of new facilities (options 168, 169 and 170) but consider that the options are unambitious in their scope. The approach to viability is a narrow market led approach which fails to consider the wider social and recreational needs of a community or accessibility of public transport.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.15

16600 Support

Summary:

Yes. Agree with the option 169.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.15**

18080 Support**Summary:**

Yes - as suggested.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.16**

7240 Support**Summary:**

Consideration must be given to colocation of facilities, eg in schools, and how to ensure community use and access. New facilities should be included in Community Asset Registers.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.16**

9480 Support**Summary:**

Careful assessment of the long-term viability of the relevant activity. (Where are the skateboard parks and tenpin bowling alleys of yesteryear?)

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.16**

11874 Object**Summary:**

Sport England supports a policy that requires new leisure facilities (including sports facilities) but would suggest that an additional bullet point is included which requires the facilities to be built to appropriate design guidelines, in order that they are fit for purpose. We especially support the policy reference to securing community use of sports facilities built on educational sites, as such facilities can make a significant contribution to community needs in a city like Cambridge, and could lead to greater social integration between University colleges and the local community.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.16**

16602 Object**Summary:**

No clear definition of 'leisure facilities'. What would these consist of?

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.16**

18083 Support**Summary:**

No

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**11.27**

16582 Object**Summary:**

A specific policy needed to provide the planning criteria to assess proposals for new public houses and separate from Option 176 'New Community Facilities'.

The policy should establish a strong presumption in favour of approval proposals for the creation of new public houses within areas where there is a need in pursuance of delivering sustainable development.

The 'need' for new public houses will be determined by accessibility to alternative public houses and local community support.

The local planning authority can restrict any permitted change of use of new pubs under the Use Classes Order.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	11.28
--	--------------

9101 Object

Summary:

In general support strongly; versatile facilities are crucial. However, needs more emphasis on venues for use by various age groups for community activities including clubs and societies, common interest groups, clubs for gardening, photography, foreign language conversation, choirs, bridge, scouts, painting, exercise, crafts, discussion, book groups, and townswomen's guild...and so on. Specify that meeting spaces of different sizes are needed.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	11.28
--	--------------

16603 Support

Summary:

I strongly agree with this paragraph, particularly the last sentence.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	11.30
--	--------------

9103 Support

Summary:

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	Question 11.18
--	-----------------------

7241 Object

Summary:

They should include sport and leisure facilities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	Question 11.18
--	-----------------------

9104 Object

Summary:

No, we are not clear about the distinction between community facilities and leisure facilities. We do not understand why the colleges and universities are not included because many of their facilities can be hired for community use.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	Question 11.18
--	-----------------------

10272 Object

Summary:

No. This definition of community facilities seems very confused. It includes both facilities supporting group activities such as schools, childcare, libraries and church halls, and also services for individuals such as dentists and medical centres. Dentists are necessary services but don't contribute to community life and are not visited so often.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities	Question 11.18
--	-----------------------

11191 Object

Summary:

The definition is not clear. The Trumpington stadium planners claim the scheme is for a community stadium - because the definition of community is so vague. A community facility should benefit its local community.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.18**

13199 Support**Summary:**

broadly support but see answer to 11.19

(Rep Id 13207: in our area good use is made of the local scout hut which is let out when not used by the owner and is available for the local community to use. Maybe the phrase 'private halls such as scout and guide huts' could be added)

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.18**

13935 Object**Summary:**

Support inclusion of pubs as community facilities, this is in line with NPPF Para 70, and they are an important meeting point / hub particularly in context of the recent reduction in pubs.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.18**

14265 Support**Summary:**

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.18**

15105 Support**Summary:**

Yes, support.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.18**

15409 Support**Summary:**

Community facilities are those used by the generality of the community. I think it is right to exclude educational establishments per se but they may control what are recognised community facilities if in community ownership or control and those facilities should be brought within the ambit of the policy on community facilities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.18**

15641 Object**Summary:**

If it is a question of protecting them, and providing high quality new ones, then highways (public roads, streets, paths) and private places made open to public access should also be considered community facilities.

Used on foot or bicycle they are free of charge, and can provide considerable healthy recreation, entertainment and social benefit in their use. We recommend the Council to include in its policies the enhancement its streets, roads and paths for these uses. This means reversing the damage they have suffered in recent years, and returning them to being places for people, not motor vehicles.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.18**

16604 Support**Summary:**

Yes, as far as it goes.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.18**

17969 Object**Summary:**

No. Public houses perform various community functions, but these are entirely dependent on a commercially viable business. They should not be categorised together with public services such as hospitals, libraries and emergency services, or other community facilities. A public house is a business, reliant on being commercially viable, not a typical local community facility.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.18**

18085 Support**Summary:**

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.19**

9105 Object**Summary:**

The document does not give sufficient emphasis for meeting places of various sizes for local residents. Needs an option with more emphasis on making good shortfall in existing communities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.19**

10278 Object**Summary:**

Community kitchens (where communal meals may be prepared and consumed), swap shops, free shops, tool libraries, not-for-profit community run cafes - should all be included. Also, local shops and pubs should be included. People go to the dentist or doctor occasionally but they need to go shopping several times a week. Shops can also contribute to the community - at least as much as dentists!

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.19**

12948 Object**Summary:**

Does 'some education facilities' include schools, as inclusion of schools etc has implications for our Newtown community which already has a surfeit of these, many of which are growing or being overdeveloped. We strongly urge that balanced development suited to LOCAL needs of defined communities should be required by the Local Plan.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.19**

13207 Object**Summary:**

In our area good use is made of the local scout hut which is let out when not used by the owner and is available for the local community to use. Maybe the phrase 'private halls such as scout and guide huts' could be added.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.19**

13221 Support**Summary:**

There is a real lack of affordable community dance space in the city. Dance as a practice has documented health and well-being benefits and should be encouraged. Communal food kitchen and dining spaces would be welcome, as food activities help build and strengthen communities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.19**

15106 Support**Summary:**

Boat clubs need to be added (membership organisations).

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.19**

15642 Support**Summary:**

Yes, see 11.18 re highways and other spaces open to public access.

(Rep Id 15641: Highways (public roads, streets, paths) and private places made open to public access should also be considered community facilities.

Used on foot or bicycle they are free of charge, and can provide considerable healthy recreation, entertainment and social benefit in their use. We recommend the Council to include in its policies the enhancement its streets, roads and paths for these uses. This means reversing the damage they have suffered in recent years, and returning them to being places for people, not motor vehicles.)

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.19**

16606 Object**Summary:**

Could add: clubs, societies, an area for religious worship (should be flexible to cater for many faiths), cafes, pubs, large halls, small halls - fitted with kitchens and toilets. Flexibility and good design are paramount needs.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.19**

18087 Support**Summary:**

No

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.20**

18089 Support**Summary:**

None

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**11.31**

12786 Support**Summary:**

Very strongly agree.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 170 - Protection of existing community facilities**

12787 Support**Summary:**

Strongly agree.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 170 - Protection of existing community facilities**

15411 Support**Summary:**

Agree

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 170 - Protection of existing community facilities**

16607 Support**Summary:**

Support

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 170 - Protection of existing community facilities**

16659 Object**Summary:**

The Local Plan needs to plan positively for the provision and use of community facilities. Any policy must not only deal with protection of facilities, where appropriate, but also enable new provision to be made across the city.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.21**

7242 Support**Summary:**

Pressure on public and private sector over next few years is likely to lead to loss of community based facilities and services (especially libraries but also others including nursing/care homes). The City should emulate South Cambs, which is preparing a list of community facilities across the district which will be circulated to each parish for comment and then used to create their Community Asset register and linked into the new Local Plan.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.21**

9107 Support**Summary:**

Yes. There is most certainly a need. The importance of delay in delivery is small relative to the long term gains.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.21**

13209 Support**Summary:**

Important to do all we can to protect existing facilities and to make more imaginative use of them if they are under threat.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.21**

13865 Support**Summary:**

The bureaucracy may be cumbersome, but community facilities do need protection.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.21**

13944 Support

Summary:

Particularly with the pressure to increase housing, community facilities are needed to provide a good quality of life for existing residents, need to be protected by planning policy.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.21

14269 Support

Summary:

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.21

15108 Support

Summary:

Yes, support.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.21

15869 Object

Summary:

We would support the protection of existing leisure and community facilities and development of new facilities (options 168, 169 and 170) but consider that the options are unambitious in their scope. The approach to viability is a narrow market led approach which fails to consider the wider social and recreational needs of a community or accessibility of public transport.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.21

16608 Support

Summary:

Yes.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.21

16660 Object

Summary:

The Local Plan needs to plan positively for the provision and use of community facilities. Any policy must not only deal with protection of facilities, where appropriate, but also enable new provision to be made across the city.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.21

18091 Support

Summary:

Yes - as suggested.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.22

7243 Support

Summary:

The approach taken to acceptability of loss is essentially narrow market-led but assessment should also include importance of social amenity value to an existing area. There is no mention of a Community Asset Register or criteria for inclusion on a register. The current emphasis on pubs should not lead to other community facilities under threat being missed.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.22

12950 Object

Summary:

Nothing on the balance and densification of particular facilities eg schools in Newtown; document needs a policy that takes account of local community needs and pressures - not just city wide.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.22

13218 Object

Summary:

stronger encouragement is needed to help communities identify community assets (as called for in the Localism Act). A clearly identified list of such assets (facilities) would help the proposed policy to be rigorously applied.

We should consider extending the period for marketing to 18 or even 24 months - this may vary during the life of the local plan but to give a longer period will give greater protection.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.22

15870 Object

Summary:

There is concern about implementation where commuted sums are accepted. E.g. the Vie Development led to a significant loss of open space and sporting facilities which were previously available to local residents at the former Pye Factory. Section 106 money, which was believed to have been allocated to provide replacement, and to improve Logan's Meadow and Chesterton Recreation Ground have not been forthcoming. The planning officer's recommendations in the recent planning application relating to the Cambridge City Football ground are not consistent with the proposals now being put forward. Policies are all very well, but fine words butter no parsnips.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.22

16661 Object

Summary:

The Local Plan needs to plan positively for the provision and use of community facilities. Any policy must not only deal with protection of facilities, where appropriate, but also enable new provision to be made across the city.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.22

17501 Support

Summary:

Stronger protection of existing community facilities and stronger provision of additional community facilities needed.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.22

18092 Object

Summary:

Yes - Ensuring that local residents who reach the current facility by foot or bike, can use the new facility without having to change their transport option and that the opening times remain the same as the previous facility.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.23**

7868 Support**Summary:**

I don't know of any, several alternatives have already been ruled out.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.23**

15871 Support**Summary:**

Clear reference must be made in the Local Plan to the Register of Community Assets, it should be included as an annex and updated regularly.
the definition of community facilities under 11.29/11.30 should be broadened to encompass the Register of Community Assets which will also give flexibility to the definition and greater protection through the lengthy plan period.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.23**

16662 Object**Summary:**

The Local Plan needs to plan positively for the provision and use of community facilities. Any policy must not only deal with protection of facilities, where appropriate, but also enable new provision to be made across the city.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**11.33**

16932 Support**Summary:**

Public houses are vital to the vitality of the high street. Where there is a successful pub, more people are drawn to the surrounding area and will use the local facilities.
The change of use for pubs needs to be stopped.
Independent publicans generally are more enterprising and run profitable and popular pubs.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**11.35**

9108 Support**Summary:**

Yes.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 171 - Public Houses: Market led approach**

7216 Object**Summary:**

This would mean that Public Houses were still protected under NPPF Paragraph 70 from redevelopment but with no clear means by which a developer could establish that the premises were not viable as a pub business.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 171 - Public Houses: Market led approach**

8954 Support**Summary:**

Let the market dictate what happens with pubs.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 171 - Public Houses: Market led approach**

12795 Support**Summary:**

I would have to agree with this. If it is truly a viable business then it would not be up for closure. It is a sad reality, but agree that trying to protect some public houses would be futile.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 171 - Public Houses: Market led approach**

13395 Object**Summary:**

Public houses represent an important community facility, we have lost more than 20 in recent years.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 171 - Public Houses: Market led approach**

14885 Object**Summary:**

Object

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 171 - Public Houses: Market led approach**

16016 Support**Summary:**

Until the brewery companies stop charging the hardworking tenants unfair rents the city will gradually lose all the pubs. The freehold land is worth far more to the brewer for redevelopment. These old pubs should be listed to save them.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 171 - Public Houses: Market led approach**

16599 Object**Summary:**

Loss of public houses due to:

Fundamental imbalances between supply and demand;
Changes to social habits and leisure uses; and
Alcohol duties.

The marketing a pub (to assess pub viability) fails to reflect pub viability.

Better evidence from failed tenancies over a period of years.

Change of use sought when pub is unviable, when the business cannot compete.

Public Houses (not charities) remain market and profit-led.

Marketing should not be required for a change of use.

A market-led approach would allow non-viable pubs to improve local environment and provide housing.

A reduction in pubs would make those remaining more viable.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 171 - Public Houses: Market led approach**

16768 Object**Summary:**

There is a real danger that pressure for residential uses leads public house owners to sell up: The Argyle, The Jubilee have suffered this fate. The Flying Pig survived such a threat.

The pubs around Mill Road are a key asset.

A policy is needed even if market forces, property rights etc may ultimately pull in other directions. Paradoxically, with more residential accommodation, pubs such as the Pig and Derby are likely to become more economically viable. Another policy the council might consider is waiver of business rates on pubs outside the town centre to ensure viability for community uses.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 171 - Public Houses: Market led approach**

16934 Object

Summary:

I object to this approach. Pubs need to be given the chance to be viable. Market led forces can be variable. Trends change and any good pub will change with them to meet the new demands. Large pub companies do not have the ability to react to new trends as quickly as the independents. Also pubs often close because the landlord is not a good one. This should not be seen as being an excuse to close a pub completely and allow it to be redeveloped. New landlords need to be given the chance.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 172 - Protection for all Public Houses

7217 Object

Summary:

NPPF Paragraph 70 protects former Pubs, even those that have converted to Restaurant A4 Use or have closed, from redevelopment and recent Planning Inspectorate decisions would appear to back this view. Under this Option there would be no clear means by which a developer could establish that the premises were not viable as a pub business.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 172 - Protection for all Public Houses

11520 Support

Summary:

Some kind of protection is needed - whether gov't subsidy for conversion to housing/shop/restaurant not sure.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 172 - Protection for all Public Houses

15194 Object

Summary:

This policy is good in principle but needs to consider the prudent option of places of worship as an alternative to public houses. They would not represent a higher value use. This would reflect PPS 1 '..taking into account the needs of all the community, including...relating to...religion.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 172 - Protection for all Public Houses

15442 Object

Summary:

The blanket protection of all public houses is completely unbalanced, and does not consider some of the other factors resulting in the closure of pubs in any reasonable way. It is inappropriate to ignore overwhelming market factors, which could result in land being sterilised and more suitable alternative uses not being considered. To fail to provide a flexible framework, and acknowledge competing demands of Cambridge's resources is in conflict with the NPPF.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 172 - Protection for all Public Houses

16017 Support

Summary:

Until the brewery companies stop charging the hardworking tenants unfair rents the city will gradually lose all the pubs. The freehold land is worth far more to the brewer for redevelopment. These old pubs should be listed to save them.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 172 - Protection for all Public Houses

16621 Object

Summary:

This option would not be a true reflection of current market trends and would lead to an increase in disused pubs which may never reopen. Ensuring no conversions to 'higher value uses' only is draconian, would not accord with the principles of sustainable development and would certainly not encourage economic growth and foster entrepreneurial spirit.

Planning must serve the public interest and this policy is entirely unreasonable and disregards individual circumstances and true market realities of supply and demand.

This policy would lead to blight of streetscenes and significantly contribute to rundown neighbourhoods.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 172 - Protection for all Public Houses**

16771 Object**Summary:**

There is a real danger that pressure for residential uses leads public house owners to sell up: The Argyle, The Jubilee have suffered this fate. The Flying Pig survived such a threat.

The pubs around Mill Road are a key asset.

A policy is needed even if market forces, property rights etc may ultimately pull in other directions. Paradoxically, with more residential accommodation, pubs such as the Pig and Derby are likely to become more economically viable. Another policy the council might consider is waiver of business rates on pubs outside the town centre to ensure viability for community uses.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 172 - Protection for all Public Houses**

16939 Object**Summary:**

This approach may not guarantee complete protection of public houses because they could simply become a restaurant before changing into an alternative use. In a declining market the policy would potentially be too restrictive, as genuinely redundant public houses could remain empty affecting an area's vitality and vibrancy.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 172 - Protection for all Public Houses**

16971 Support**Summary:**

At the moment districts such as Chesterton High Street are losing public houses to residential development and are in danger of becoming residential wastelands. Some protection needs to be given to places, such as the Haymakers and the Green Dragon otherwise, if these are eventually converted into housing, Chesterton High Street takes one more step to becoming a very isolated place. The other options provide too much freedom for these spaces to be converted into housing and offices, but Chesterton High Street just seems to need a community meeting place that's obvious and open to all.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 173 - Safeguarding Public Houses**

7218 Support**Summary:**

A clear means by which a developer can objectively establish that a pub business is not viable is needed to ensure that a quick profit is not made at the expense of the community a pub serves. Note that many owners of Public Houses own others in the same area and so are reluctant to sell a business to a potential rival. They should be forced to market the pub if they do not wish to continue running it as a business. This option also potentially guards against any deliberate 'running down' of a business by the owners.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 173 - Safeguarding Public Houses**

7837 Support**Summary:**

The remaining public houses that we still have should be protected from redevelopment or we will lose them. Loss is motivated by greed with companies deliberately failing the present business by placing inappropriate tenants or similar in situ. High profits are obtained from change of use to extremely high residential prices.

If there were policies in place ensuring that change of use to residential would be refused this would ensure that suitable tenants would be required to make a profitable business. There are still very successful public houses which shows that it is possible to make them profitable.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 173 - Safeguarding Public Houses**

11847 Support**Summary:**

As a fairly regular pub user, I believe the the importance to our community of these local public houses cannot be overstated. When a pub shuts down, or is converted, something disappears from the heart of the community.

Reasons for closing pubs vary, but in rather too many cases it appears to be unreasonably high rents or inflated tenancy terms imposed by either uncaring property owners or share holder - driven national breweries.

Option 173 offers a much needed safeguard against unwelcome closures and unsuitable conversions of our pubs.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 173 - Safeguarding Public Houses**

12570 Support**Summary:**

Independent assessment of a pub's viability is a good idea. Greene King seem to have turned from brewers into property developers.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 173 - Safeguarding Public Houses**

13410 Support**Summary:**

Public houses are a significant community facility especially in a densely populated area, they are important social spaces for many residents.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 173 - Safeguarding Public Houses**

14541 Object**Summary:**

Comment: The Penny Ferry Pub is not included in the list to be safeguarded, this should be reconsidered.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 173 - Safeguarding Public Houses**

14896 Support**Summary:**

Support

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 173 - Safeguarding Public Houses**

15423 Object**Summary:**

Strongly support this and the proposed Planning Policy Guidance. The designation of the Penny Ferry is incorrect. It is an important riverside site that ought to be safeguarded if there is to be a real chance of widening the appeal of the north bank of the river.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 173 - Safeguarding Public Houses**

15435 Support**Summary:**

I would like to support the comments made by Cambridge Past Present and Future [A clear means by which a developer can objectively establish that a pub business is not viable is needed to ensure that a quick profit is not made at the expense of the community a pub serves. They should be forced to market the pub if they do not wish to continue running it as a business.] . It would be good to see the council, as far as it is able, making it possible for community groups to run them.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 173 - Safeguarding Public Houses**

15443 Object**Summary:**

We have a number of serious reservations regarding how this might be implemented and the general approach. We question whether the assumption that there is a shortage of public houses in Cambridge based on a simple bench marking with other towns/cities carried out in the IPPG. The policy framework must be flexible enough to acknowledge redevelopment opportunities and the associated benefits that may accrue, particularly where pubs have not been valued. We are concerned that the policy approach will become overly restrictive and must be flexible to reflect economic realities, and the value/benefits of alternative issues.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 173 - Safeguarding Public Houses**

15508 Object**Summary:**

We object to Option 173 as a "one size fits all" policy to protect public houses is simply inappropriate. It is equally not reasonable to require public houses to be redeveloped for other community uses or for A Class purposes, and alternative uses, e.g. housing or student accommodation must equally be considered.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 173 - Safeguarding Public Houses**

16018 Support**Summary:**

Until the brewery companies stop charging the hardworking tenants unfair rents the city will gradually lose all the pubs. The freehold land is worth far more to the brewer for redevelopment. These old pubs should be listed to save them.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 173 - Safeguarding Public Houses**

16053 Support**Summary:**

The option represents an excellent solution to an increasing problem. Too many pubs are closing for reasons that are often somewhat tenuous or with little concern over the impact on the community. Landowners and certain large brewers need to be controlled in the ways suggested in the option.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 173 - Safeguarding Public Houses**

16642 Object**Summary:**

Over burdensome and inflexible marketing conditions including consultation. Protecting all public houses is also contrary to the NPPF (para 70). Suggest liaison with the local authority; consult the local community in exceptional circumstances. 12 month timeframe is unjustified and not compliant with the Localism Act 2011. 6 months marketing more appropriate.

The 'diversification options' need clarification, including the evidence required. A more proportionate approach include less onerous criteria for change of uses in an urban area with alternative pubs in reasonable walking distance. 400m distance is unsound; 800m in Manual for Streets more appropriate.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 173 - Safeguarding Public Houses**

16772 Support**Summary:**

A presumption in favour of maintenance is a good idea, with serious evidence of lack of viability a pre-requisite to permission to change use. Local involvement is a good idea: there are a growing number of pubs nationwide that have been "rescued" by local support and financing.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 173 - Safeguarding Public Houses**

16940 Support**Summary:**

I agree with this approach. It gives the best protection for public houses. It prevents the easy redevelopment of pubs for housing, but allows totally unviable and unloved pubs to be redeveloped in a way that communities will be happy with.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.24**

7130 Support

Summary:

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.24

9109 Support

Summary:

Yes.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.24

10173 Support

Summary:

We feel there is a need for a policy because pubs play a significant role in the life of residents and visitors to Cambridge.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.24

10999 Support

Summary:

There is a clear need to support the cultural vibrancy of Cambridge, particularly in areas outside the centre.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.24

11208 Support

Summary:

Pubs are an important cultural facet of the city and a clear policy is needed to ensure their survival.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.24

11370 Support

Summary:

Support

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.24

11870 Support

Summary:

We suggest this may be a development management issue, but the Theatres Trust has a particular interest in pubs as there are very many in the UK that provide additional venues for a range of performance spaces, from new plays and dance to live music and especially comedy which can make a vibrant contribution to the evening economy, in particular for university students. We would support any option that helps pubs become more flexible in their leisure offer for the 21st century, notwithstanding landlords' rent increases.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.24

12951 Support

Summary:

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.24

13224 Support

Summary:

Given recent publicity on this matter, this is clearly an issue of considerable public concern so a policy is needed.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.24

13734 Object

Summary:

No.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.24

13958 Support

Summary:

With the recent number of pub sites sold to developers, there is clearly a need to protect them. Well-run pubs are valuable community meeting places; pub gardens and open spaces on pub sites are also valuable community amenities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.24

14276 Support

Summary:

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.24

15109 Support

Summary:

Yes, support.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.24

15419 Support

Summary:

Yes. 171 is not the right approach as it does not deal with the reality that it is very easy to run a pub into the ground by appointing a well-meaning but incompetent manager or tenant.

Using a pub as a restaurant does not stop it being a pub if I read the recent decision on The Plough at Shepreth correctly. The restaurant use is a permitted development of the pub which remains the established planning use of the premises. It is only the development industry that benefits from failure to recognise this.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.24

16549 Support

Summary:

Yes, the need to protect valuable community facilities such as public houses is recognised in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Clarification of the steps required before a change of use application is welcomed however any policy should be more indicative of current market trends (see other representations).

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.24

16736 Object

Summary:

Referred to in Section 6 of our earlier document.

It is very difficult to see how the City Council could manage public houses, and encourage people to visit them, better than the landlords can themselves.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.24

16864 Support

Summary:

Yes - support.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.24

16941 Support

Summary:

11.24 Is there a need for a policy addressing this issue? Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.24

17502 Support

Summary:

Pubs - safeguarding policy needed but has to be deliverable and watertight, and focus on pubs that the community values. We also support the interim planning guidance on pubs, and protection for other valued community assets.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.24

17973 Object

Summary:

Policies should reflect the social and economic factors that have led in recent years to a national decline in the number of public houses with volatile customer demand and brand awareness.

Public houses no longer dominate the beer drinking market or form the heart of most communities and is dependent on a commercially viable retail business, which should be the key factor in developing related planning policies.

These policies should be based not on a protectionist stance, but on encouraging pub diversification and sustaining the development of clusters of entertainment facilities in the city centre and city centre margins.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.24

18093 Support

Summary:

Yes a policy is most necessary.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

7015 Support

Summary:

I think that here there is no need for specific intervention, and therefore I favour Option 171. However, there is a need to address excessive alcohol consumption in young people, as has been nationally recognised. The council should (perhaps in some other documents) be considering how it can address this issue also.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

7131 Support

Summary:

I choose Option 173.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

7464 Support

Summary:

I support option 171. Market forces should dictate what happens to pubs. If there is no demand for a specific pub there are plenty of others. The council should give consideration to enforcing stricter opening hours and to reducing anti-social behavior and public nuisance caused by the easy availability of cheap booze.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

9110 Support

Summary:

Option 173

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

9487 Support

Summary:

Option 173. The others might be unenforceable in practice.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

10174 Support

Summary:

We prefer Option 172, see comment 11.24 (below)
There is a policy need; pubs play a significant role in the life of residents and visitors to Cambridge. Option 171 will leave pubs vulnerable to the dictates of money.
We support Option 172, giving a certain amount of protection to pubs thus protecting this life style to a certain extent. Pubs have been instrumental in fostering the germination of new ideas (eg discovery of DNA), and industrial innovation (eg designing the BBC micro for Acorn). Thus the existence of pubs and the way they are used enhances job creation in Cambridge.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

10387 Support

Summary:

173

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

10687 Support

Summary:

Option 173

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

11009 Support

Summary:

Public houses that are still viable seem nevertheless to be under threat. There should be clear mechanisms by which they can 'fight their corner' in the face of development proposals.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

11375 Support

Summary:

Option 173 sounds appealing. The key is to prevent 'gaming' of the system by pub companies - for example, increasing the prices in the pub or permitting anti-social behaviour, watching the patronage fall, and then declaring that the pub is unviable. The test for conversion should be stringent and not easy to pass.

The 'workaround' in Option 172 would be to apply the same tests to restaurants wishing to convert to residential accommodation as to pubs. Since pubs and restaurants are difficult to distinguish some cases, this would seem to block that loophole.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

12067 Support

Summary:

Option 173, but it should be sufficiently flexible to allow the public house to expend / divert into other community facilities eg incorporate a coffee shop, local store, sub-post-office etc.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

12952 Support

Summary:

Prefer Option 173. Safeguarding Public Houses. This prevents the possibility of pubs being turned into restaurants and then into residential accommodation, all of which would need a planning permission for change of use. Especially for the two Newtown pubs.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

13228 Object

Summary:

Option 173 is strongly preferred

While there is public concern, we do need to recognise changing social habits, several of which militate against pub use and one suspects the loss of pubs will continue. But a policy along the lines of 173 would mean that pubs are protected to the extent that time is allowed for fuller consideration of possible alternatives to closing before we allow market forces to prevail if the possible alternatives prove unviable.

Again as with point 11.22 the marketing period has to be 18 or even 24 months.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

13945 Support

Summary:

Option 173

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

14277 Support

Summary:

Option 173

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

14422 Support

Summary:

Option 173. Chesterton has lost too many pubs in recent years. The Penny Ferry is on a cliff edge when clearly its riverside location should make it highly viable for the right enterprise.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

15110 Support

Summary:

Option 173.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

15872 Object

Summary:

Support option 173 however the narrow market-led approach to viability fails to take account of the wider social and community role public houses can play. Any consideration of alternative public houses should be on an area wide basis and encompass how many public houses there are or have been lost in an area (defined by ward but flexible over boundaries) over at least the previous 5 years.

The Penny Ferry should be included in the list in Appendix I: it has been prematurely excluded because of one successful planning appeal but Conservation Area consent to demolish has since been refused.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

16560 Support

Summary:

The preferred option would be to allow a market-led approach where unprofitable pubs in areas of adequate accessibility to alternatives - where the day-to-day needs of residents remains unaffected - are allowed to change use without having to provide evidence of marketing. Increasing the flexibility of Option 173 may also achieve a workable balance between regulation and true market trends, if the comments (see representations for option 173) are realised and alterations to the policy are made accordingly.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

16866 Support

Summary:

Our preference is for Option 173.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

16942 Support

Summary:

11.25 Which of the options do you prefer? Option 173

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

17975 Object

Summary:

Option is 171 with reservations.

Unfair and unbalanced picture of public house closures given in Option.

A policy for further planning interventions should be based on proper consultation with owners and operators, that encourage variety and diversification.

Option 173 requires evidence that there is no longer a need for the public house in question. The evidence required is both complex and voluminous. Charles Wells already have their own Code of Practice on business development and diversification and a transparent disposals process, which could be used as a basis for model reports to be used in making planning applications.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.25

18094 Support

Summary:

Option 173 - Too many pubs are turned into accommodation, they form an important part of local communities and local centres. This policy would ensure that should the pub not be viable, an alternative A class use would be enforced which will keep the contribution to the community.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.26

7219 Object

Summary:

We are concerned at the provisions that allow for Public Houses to 'replaced on site' or 'relocated to an alternative or equally accessible site'. These provisions fail to recognise that the history, fabric, position and layout of a Public House are often an important contribution to its success as a community hub. Therefore, It is essential these provisions are qualified by the clause 'and it can be demonstrated that the replacement facility will be of equal or greater value to the community it serves'.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.26

11023 Support

Summary:

There seems to be a focus on development of new public houses premises in option 173. There should be clear consideration of viable premises where the owners have no desire for re-development. Such premises should have the right to remain, ensuring diversity in the provision of leisure facilities throughout Cambridge.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.26

13960 Object

Summary:

Pressure must be put on breweries not to use the justification of falling sales to push for change of use/demolition. The Penny Ferry decision is a good precedent re opposing demolition.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.26

14542 Support

Summary:

I don't think the plan should be overly prescriptive and dictate that all that will be acceptable on a pub or ex-pub site is a pub.

The council should adopt a policy inviting and encouraging innovative proposals for development; and ought look favourably on those which retain an element of community facility (even if that's perhaps a facility for say the small business community).

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.26

15111 Support

Summary:

Community use should include re-use as a membership-based boat club.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.26**

16576 Object**Summary:**

A preferred option should reflect the individual circumstance of each business and locality, allowing sufficient flexibility to allow the change of use of public houses subject to a criteria based approach.

Relevant evidence to demonstrate a public house is no longer needed will come from a six month marketing of the facility for alternative public house or community reuse.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.26**

16943 Object**Summary:**

11.26 Are there any points which have been missed and you feel should be added (perhaps even an entirely new option)?

The issue of public house gardens has not been addressed at all. Historically these were often a place of greener, adding to green corridors in the city. However since the introduction of the no smoking ban in pubs, many of these have been almost entirely enclosed - almost rooms, but are still considered gardens/outside so that the smokers have somewhere to go to smoke. I feel that there is a need to address this in planning.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.26**

17978 Object**Summary:**

Paragraph 21 of the NPPF emphasises the dynamic and changing nature of business. Getting a proposal through the planning system is getting more difficult and prolonged. The government's recent consultation paper on streamlining information requirements for planning applications says these should be proportionate to the nature and scale of development proposals. Option 173 contains an additional information requirement that is totally disproportionate. Consultation with the industry before publication of both the IPPG and the Issues and Options Report, as carried out in preparing the Cambridge Hotels Futures Report, would have ensured options that were properly grounded and less burdensome.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.26**

18095 Support**Summary:**

No

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.27**

11027 Support**Summary:**

Option 173 must be enhanced to provide protection for existing, viable public houses.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.27**

16572 Object**Summary:**

"Proposals for the change of use or redevelopment of public houses will not be approved unless one or more of the four criteria are met:

- The facility is replaced on site; or
 - The facility is relocated to an alternative but equally accessible site; or
 - There is adequate accessibility to alternative facilities within a reasonable walking distance of 800m; or
 - The facility could be lost only if it can be demonstrated there is no longer a need for the public house in the area."
-

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.27**

16944 Object

Summary:

11.27 Are there any other reasonable alternatives that should be considered at this stage?

The planning needs to address the possibility of these restaurants (that were pubs) reverting to pubs or other similar amenity if they are no longer required as restaurants. This should take priority over redevelopment into housing.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.27

17981 Object

Summary:

Public house related policies should adopt a positive stance based on the following principles:

- flexibility in responding to economic and social change
- encouraging diversification within the city centre and city centre fringe
- encourage local communities, through neighbourhood plans or other initiatives, to set up community pubs.

Our alternative policy categorises public houses according to location as follows:

- city centre and edge of centre clusters
- other locations.

In most circumstances diversification and marketing reports would be required as part of a planning application, based on a model agreed between the industry and the LPA.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 174 - Extend the safeguarding option (no. 173) to former Public Houses

7315 Support

Summary:

This should be adopted as well as Option 173 in order that the Local Plan complies with NPPF Paragraph 70 and recent Planning Inspectorate Appeal decisions that demonstrate how this is to be applied.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 174 - Extend the safeguarding option (no. 173) to former Public Houses

11521 Support

Summary:

Yes - some valuable spaces have been left off.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 174 - Extend the safeguarding option (no. 173) to former Public Houses

14898 Support

Summary:

Support

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 174 - Extend the safeguarding option (no. 173) to former Public Houses

15424 Support

Summary:

Agree

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 174 - Extend the safeguarding option (no. 173) to former Public Houses

15454 Object

Summary:

To try and capture properties that may have been out of pub use for a very considerable time, is disproportionate policy response, and represents undue interference with an individual's property rights, and without any justification whatsoever. The NPPF is silent on this issue. Such an approach is completely unbalanced, and at odds with NPPF.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 174 - Extend the safeguarding option (no. 173) to former Public Houses**

16019 Support**Summary:**

Until the brewery companies stop charging the hardworking tenants unfair rents the city will gradually lose all the pubs. The freehold land is worth far more to the brewer for redevelopment. These old pubs should be listed to save them.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 174 - Extend the safeguarding option (no. 173) to former Public Houses**

16055 Support**Summary:**

yes - add this to Option 173 making it fully comprehensive.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 174 - Extend the safeguarding option (no. 173) to former Public Houses**

16774 Support**Summary:**

Support.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 174 - Extend the safeguarding option (no. 173) to former Public Houses**

16945 Support**Summary:**

I support this option. Pubs are local amenities and former pubs can be returned to such or similar if they become available. Communities change and it is important that the amenities for them keep in line with their needs.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**11.39**

15427 Object**Summary:**

I think this is actually wrong in law. As stated above the restaurant use is a permitted use of the pub and depended entirely upon it being a pub in the first place. The pub use remains even if it is not in actual use as such. This was established in the course of obtaining planning consent for is now the Dolphin at St Ives.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 175 - Allow the flexible re-use of Public Houses**

7316 Support**Summary:**

A former Public House, identified as such and in use as a community facility, should be able to revert back into a Public House without the need to submit a Planning Application.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 175 - Allow the flexible re-use of Public Houses**

10457 Support**Summary:**

Flexibility and common sense are usually better than prescription policies.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 175 - Allow the flexible re-use of Public Houses**

15430 Support

Summary:

This would act as a strong brake on them 'leaking' away into other uses.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 175 - Allow the flexible re-use of Public Houses

16020 Support

Summary:

Until the brewery companies stop charging the hardworking tenants unfair rents the city will gradually lose all the pubs. The freehold land is worth far more to the brewer for redevelopment. These old pubs should be listed to save them.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 175 - Allow the flexible re-use of Public Houses

16776 Support

Summary:

Support

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.28

9111 Support

Summary:

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.28

11376 Support

Summary:

Support

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.28

12954 Support

Summary:

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.28

13235 Support

Summary:

Probably a good idea to add this subject to the basic policy as set out in 173.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.28

13732 Object

Summary:

No.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.28**

13963 Support**Summary:**

The change to restaurant use seems a loophole in planning law, which is used by developers who wish to change to housing use - thus this policy is needed.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.28**

14279 Support**Summary:**

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.28**

16947 Support**Summary:**

11.28 Is there a need for a policy addressing this issue? Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.28**

17983 Object**Summary:**

This could only apply if there are significant changes to current economic and social trends. Any changes outside Class A require planning permission; therefore control is already there. Options 174 and 175 are unclear, confusing and unnecessary. Adequate control exists at present.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.28**

18115 Support**Summary:**

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.29**

9489 Support**Summary:**

Option 174

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.29**

10689 Support**Summary:**

Option 174

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.29**

10832 Support

Summary:

Option 175

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.29

11378 Support

Summary:

I would support either option that safeguards existing pubs (and those pubs that close between the decision of a policy and that policy coming into effect).

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.29

12956 Object

Summary:

Both options, they are complementary and not alternatives.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.29

13238 Object

Summary:

Could we not apply both 174 and 175; they do not seem to be mutually exclusive and both have merits.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.29

13967 Support

Summary:

Option 175

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.29

14281 Support

Summary:

Option 174

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.29

15873 Support

Summary:

We support options 174 & 175.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.29

17986 Object

Summary:

Since we think no policy is needed, neither option is preferred.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.29**

18116 Support**Summary:**Option 174

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.30**

12861 Support**Summary:**

We need to protect all public houses. They are a vital community resource for locals and residents. No change of use of public houses should be allowed, and nor should any development of pubs into housing. Where the pub company/owner cannot sustain the business, this must be offered to other companies/the community. But whatever happens, we must retain pubs as pubs.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.30**

16948 Object**Summary:**

11.30 Are there any points which have been missed and you feel should be added (perhaps even an entirely new option)?

Only the issue of pub gardens mentioned above.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.30**

17987 Object**Summary:**No

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.30**

18117 Support**Summary:**No

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.31**

17988 Object**Summary:**No

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.31**

18118 Support**Summary:**No

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**11.40**

18439 Support

Summary:

Regarding paragraphs 11.40-11.42, the latest County Council policy for the delivery of a 21st Century Library Service recognises the importance of developing community hubs where library services can be provided in shared buildings in partnership with other services, education for example. These can include other Council and voluntary sector information and advice services, health services, adult learning services and children's centres and commercial partners such as the Post Office. This pattern of provision provides the best opportunity to deliver a wide range of complementary services and facilities, including community meeting spaces, to meet the needs of the growing communities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

11.41

16609 Support

Summary:

Last paragraph: There are very few existing community facilities in the Histon Road area, so additional ones would be very welcome.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

11.41

18440 Support

Summary:

Regarding paragraphs 11.40-11.42, the latest County Council policy for the delivery of a 21st Century Library Service recognises the importance of developing community hubs where library services can be provided in shared buildings in partnership with other services, education for example. These can include other Council and voluntary sector information and advice services, health services, adult learning services and children's centres and commercial partners such as the Post Office. This pattern of provision provides the best opportunity to deliver a wide range of complementary services and facilities, including community meeting spaces, to meet the needs of the growing communities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

11.42

18441 Support

Summary:

Regarding paragraphs 11.40 -11.42, the latest County Council policy for the delivery of a 21st Century Library Service recognises the importance of developing community hubs where library services can be provided in shared buildings in partnership with other services, education for example. These can include other Council and voluntary sector information and advice services, health services, adult learning services and children's centres and commercial partners such as the Post Office. This pattern of provision provides the best opportunity to deliver a wide range of complementary services and facilities, including community meeting spaces, to meet the needs of the growing communities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 176 - New community facilities

14713 Object

Summary:

Current hospice provision in Cambridge is outdated and inadequate

New hospice required.

Hospice would be sustainable in terms of flexibility of usage going forwards to meet changing end of life care, and represent exemplar energy efficiency.

Location of a new hospice in Southern Fringe would free up a valuable brownfield site in middle of Cambridge.

Relocation of hospice from the city centre to outskirts of Cambridge would have a beneficial impact on traffic in Mill Road.

A new hospice would provide additional high quality jobs.

New exemplar hospice would be befitting as Cambridge known for innovation and healthcare excellence.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Option 176 - New community facilities

15196 Support

Summary:

I strongly agree with the section that outline that shared facilities are not always possible due to conflicting demands and needs. This is a commendable approach that avoids the idea that all religions are able to meet in shared facilities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 176 - New community facilities**

15935 Support**Summary:**

Does the city need a new sixth form college? Yes, in a word, if those who teach at Hills and Long Road are to be believed. And yes, it should be in the north-west of the city.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 176 - New community facilities**

18437 Support**Summary:**

Options 176 and 177 are complementary as new community facilities can be in shared buildings where information services and meeting facilities can be provided.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 177 - The provision of community facilities through new development**

11717 Support**Summary:**

There is a shortfall in the provision for climbing in Cambridge. A recent survey showed that there is considerable support for a LEAD CLIMBING WALL in Cambridge from local clubs and climbers generally - see attached notes and letters. Nationally climbing is one of several sports which are increasing in popularity. Indoor lead climbing is likely to become an Olympic sport in 2020 and Cambridge should be in the forefront of providing the right facilities for this.

Lead Climbing is a particularly good activity for all ages and abilities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 177 - The provision of community facilities through new development**

18438 Support**Summary:**

Options 176 and 177 are complementary as new community facilities can be in shared buildings where information services and meeting facilities can be provided.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.32**

8616 Support**Summary:**

The Trumpington Residents' Association supports Option 176 and 177 which seem to us to be complementary.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.32**

9112 Support**Summary:**

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.32**

13243 Support**Summary:**

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.32**

15112 Support

Summary:

Yes, support.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.32

15432 Support

Summary:

Strongly support but would add that these developments should be community led by engagement with the local community at an early stage.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.32

16610 Support

Summary:

Yes, emphatically.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.32

18119 Support

Summary:

Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.32

18535 Support

Summary:

We support Option 176 and 177 which seem to us to be complementary.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.33

8956 Support

Summary:

Option 176 where there is a local need only.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.33

9113 Object

Summary:

Neither option is satisfactory because there is insufficient attention paid to existing communities where facilities are insufficient. Of the two options 176 is preferable because there is mention of local need. Option 177 involves a requirement to satisfy new demand from new development, which is also essential.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities

Question 11.33

9490 Support

Summary:

Option 177. On-site provision should be the norm.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.33**

13245 Object**Summary:**

Option 177 is preferred - there have to be additional facilities provided in an expanding city and sub region.
NB where one development is taking place this must have regard to any other developments that could and would benefit from a shared and therefore joint facility provision.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.33**

13307 Support**Summary:**

For new developments, option 177.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.33**

15113 Support**Summary:**

No preferred option.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.33**

16611 Support**Summary:**

Option 176 preferred.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.33**

18120 Object**Summary:**

Both options have advantages. Current community facilities should be used for multiple uses and shared with the community, the other option will be necessary and relevant for new development areas where community centres are clearly a requirement when new homes are being built, this should also include multiple use community centres.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.34**

9114 Object**Summary:**

Needs an option with more emphasis on making good shortfall in existing communities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.34**

9968 Support**Summary:**

The Options contain no reference to applications for entirely new Public Houses. NPPF Paragraph 7 states that one of the NPPF's 'dimensions' is "a social role - supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being". The growth of the City's population should require that Public House provision be sustainably increased in line with this. Therefore, Option 177 should make it clear that 'appropriate community facilities' should potentially include Public Houses.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.34**

17110 Object**Summary:**

Housing and infill - this seems to be a perpetual problem - but I beg - whatever your aims and achievements - please understand that within 10 years of the arrival of a newly married couple you will need Secondary School places not just primary school ones - similarly doctors, dentists, healthworkers; all to be balanced by a onward moving university population. By constantly expanding the housing stock and drawing more and more people to Cambridge - we bring with them more and more social and educational needs; perhaps some of the answer lies in the word STOP.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.34**

18121 Support**Summary:**No

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**11.43**

9115 Object**Summary:**

Should not these questions also be asked of groups of residents with other interests?

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**11.44**

15201 Support**Summary:**

Excellent proactive intentions that must be followed through for CCC to glean the needs of several hundred (and growing) members of the Cambs community. Look forward to hearing from you.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**11.44**

15805 Support**Summary:**Survey welcomed.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**11.45**

7049 Support**Summary:**

I welcome this proposal and suggest that the Council adopt a policy supporting the provision of faith facilities in line with the Cambridgeshire Horizons report's recommendations on the subject.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**11.45**

15479 Support**Summary:**

I'm not sure a specific policy is necessary unless there is evidence that lack of a policy is inhibiting faith groups acquiring their own facilities when they reach a point at which it makes sense for them to do so. There is a problem in a very crowded city where it will be difficult to meet the needs of faith that ideally like very extensive areas for their form of worship that are simply not available.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 178 - Support for arts and cultural activities**

9116 Object**Summary:**

We support this option but ask:

What is meant, in the penultimate paragraph by "surrounding area" in terms of location. Too vague.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 178 - Support for arts and cultural activities**

12207 Support**Summary:**

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

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 178 - Support for arts and cultural activities**

13671 Support**Summary:**

We support the aim of Option 178.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 178 - Support for arts and cultural activities**

15487 Support**Summary:**

I support giving due consideration to this need but it does have to be rooted in real demand if any provision is not to become an expensive white elephant. Arts provision does tend to be expensive and the facilities in Cambridge are limited by physical space. I doubt any specific policy would be much use but it will be useful to have the issues identified in the Local Plan that are material considerations if any proposal were to come forward.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 178 - Support for arts and cultural activities**

16612 Object**Summary:**

This seems rather vague. What comprises the 'sub-region'? Locations outside Cambridge presumably wouldn't come under the jurisdiction of the City Council? The last sentence is baffling. What higher values are meant?

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Option 178 - Support for arts and cultural activities**

16972 Object**Summary:**

Though I believe there should be a provision for allowing ex-public houses or other ex-community spaces that are being considered for redevelopment into offices or houses, to be considered for arts/cultural/community spaces first. Once spaces have been turned into houses/offices, it's next to impossible for the community to get them back.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.36**

7244 Support**Summary:**

This should be specifically linked to transport strategy and assessments and done on a Greater Cambridge basis jointly with South Cambs.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.36**

9117 Support**Summary:**Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.36**

11869 Object**Summary:**

We support both options - 168 and 178 - but have a major query.

As there is a separate option for cultural facilities, theatres should not be included in a description of leisure facilities as this is misleading.

Either these two options should be combined, or the description for Leisure Facilities excludes any cultural facilities such as theatres and the Fitzwilliam etc.

The question of economic viability may apply to leisure facilities, but does not carry the same weight for cultural facilities as many of these are supported by external funding.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.36**

12957 Support**Summary:**Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.36**

13253 Support**Summary:**

Just like open spaces and leisure facilities, Arts & Culture are an important part of quality of life issues. Once again we are well endowed with such facilities. but they need protection and we need to consider how they could be further enhanced as the population in the sub region expands. So a policy would be welcomed

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.36**

13310 Support**Summary:**

Obvious need for a strong policy to protect and enhance these vital facilities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.36**

14283 Support**Summary:**Yes

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.36**

14463 Support**Summary:**

Yes- the arts and cultural activities of Cambridge are part of what make it a special place to live. These should be proactively encouraged to promote quality of life for residents and also benefit visitors.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.36**

16614 Support**Summary:**

Yes.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.36**

16867 Support**Summary:**

Yes - support.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.36**

18122 Support**Summary:**

Yes - as suggested.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.37**

9118 Object**Summary:**

Yes, transport to venues, bus services, cycle and car parking need to be considered. Specify the maximum distance from Cambridge city centre that would be suitable.
Need for a theatre larger than the Arts Theatre and with raked seating and an orchestral pit.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.37**

9492 Support**Summary:**

"Proven need" is crucial. In the University and elsewhere, Cambridge has a large number of amateur but highly skilled performers and artists, and the colleges and public halls provide ample facilities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.37**

11722 Support**Summary:**

There is a shortfall in the provision for climbing in Cambridge. A recent survey showed that there is considerable support for a LEAD CLIMBING WALL in Cambridge from local clubs and climbers generally - see attached notes and letters. Nationally climbing is one of several sports which are increasing in popularity. Indoor lead climbing is likely to become an Olympic sport in 2020 and Cambridge should be in the forefront of providing the right facilities for this.
Lead Climbing is a particularly good activity for all ages and abilities.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.37**

12963 Object**Summary:**

Need to consider effectiveness and timetables of any public transport links if not centrally located.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.37**

14465 Support**Summary:**

An arts and cultural centre provides an opportunity to design a world class standard building. This could be an opportunity to set a legacy for the next several decades and beyond and plan for a longer term vision. What public buildings do we want to see in Cambridge from the 2010s remaining in a hundred years?

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.37**

16868 Support**Summary:**

As stated above, we would like to see Romsey being designated as a cultural quarter with supplementary planning guidance allowing the development of live-work units and encouraging low rent studio space for artists and craftspeople, which would both promote employment opportunities and sustainable lifestyles.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.37**

17112 Object**Summary:**

Yes to something other than shopping as the National Pastime for central Cambridge residents; yes to an Ice Rink, a better auditorium - somewhere we can host ballet and dance to a good standard without half the dancers falling off the Corn Exchange stage. Yes to many more outside sports areas, a cycle rink, a host of boules or petanques areas, basket ball hoops, small hardplay surfaces, netball courts - many more free tennis areas.

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.37**

18123 Support**Summary:**

No

11 - Promoting Successful Communities**Question 11.38**

14477 Support**Summary:**

An archive/library/arts and cultural centre was in the original plans for the station development. Would like to see a visionary plan to enable a well designed and internationally recognised building fulfill this function. This would support Cambridge as a city of learning and culture. Culture should be positively encouraged in the plan with a strong vision for design which will leave a legacy into the next century. Many other towns/cities have or are building new archives centres and or related arts centres. In a university town we need an innovative arts and archive centre/s.
