

Appendix A: Analysis, responses and preferred approach to pollution, plus summaries of representations received

ISSUE: POLLUTION AND PROTECTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Total representations: 36	
Object: 10	Support: 26

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 84 – General Pollution Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General statements in support of a policy option on pollution; • Some comments that one overarching policy dealing with pollution is sufficient; • Other comments in support of detailed policies as well especially as PPS23 and PPS24 have been lost; • One preferred approach would be that a general policy on pollution be supported by SPD Guidance on the individual issues of air quality, noise and contaminated land; • Light pollution is a growing menace; • Noise pollution from air conditioning units is increasing; • Additional recent damage to the health of people living near major roads from extra development needs to be recognised; • ‘External lighting’ should include internal lighting that is visible externally; • This policy needs to extend to residential boats; • This policy should extend to odour issues; • Policy should include protection and enhancement of agricultural and good quality soils.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

This option will help protect against pollution and should contribute positively to identified issues relating to health, well being, and water resources. This option is also likely to improve the quality of the environment more generally across the city while maintaining a safe environment for residents and visitors, in terms of minimum levels of illumination, for example.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Environmental Protection Act 1990 as amended
- Cambridge City Council Contaminated Land database and historic maps/aerial photographs

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 4/13 - Pollution and Amenity

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The planning system's role in pollution control is to ensure that proposed development is suitable for a particular area of land bearing in mind existing or potential pollution of that land. It also has to consider whether a proposed development is likely to give rise to additional sources of pollution that would impact on the local environment, amenity and public health. The National Planning Policy Framework recognises the role that planning has to play in preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, water or noise pollution or land instability. In addition, planning has a role to play in ensuring the remediation and mitigation of despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.

The purpose of policy option 84 was to develop an overarching policy dealing with all forms of pollution, which would sit within a development principles section of the Local Plan. The policy would set out criteria, which proposals that might cause pollution would need to meet for permission to be granted. As more detailed policies in relation to contaminated land, water quality, air pollution, noise, visual and light pollution will be included in the Local Plan, it is considered these policies would provide sufficient coverage of pollution from all sources.

One respondent felt that a general policy on pollution matters would be sufficient, with further specific guidance contained in a Supplementary Planning Document. While a single policy would be a simpler approach, the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that Supplementary Planning Documents should only be used where they can help applicants make successful applications or aid infrastructure delivery. They should not be used to add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development, and given that measures to remediate and mitigate pollution matters will have a financial implication for developments, these matters should be dealt with through policy.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is not to pursue Option 84 as it is considered appropriate to develop a range of different policies covering different aspects of pollution.

ISSUE: AIR QUALITY

Total representations: 30

Object: 3

Support: 27

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 85 – Air Quality Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative approach would be that a general policy on pollution be supported by SPD Guidance on the individual issues of air quality, noise and contaminated land;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns raised over deterioration of air quality resulting from congestion, better planning of road layouts and junctions would be beneficial; • Concerns raised over damage to health of those residents living near major roads; • Concerns raised over current air quality.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

By preventing developments that would have potential adverse effect on air quality or result in impacts on their users due to the AQMA, this option should help contribute to improved community health and well being benefits. This option is likely to have a positive effect in the City Centre in helping mitigate any further deterioration in air quality in the existing AQMA. This option’s proposal that developments with the potential to cause an AQMA to be declared should not be permitted may help to reduce the risk of a further worsening in the city’s air quality.

KEY EVIDENCE

-
- Cambridge City Council (2009) Air Quality Action Plan
- Cambridge City Council (2008) Air Quality in Cambridge. Developers Guide
- Data from air quality monitoring points across the city.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 4/14 - Air Quality Management Areas

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The Local Plan will seek to ensure that Cambridge develops in the most sustainable way possible. This means delivering our social and economic aspirations with compromising the environmental limits of the city for current and future generations. It will be important to ensure that new development proposals do not lead to a worsening of air quality, both in the Air Quality Management Area and the city as a whole. The primary local impacts on air quality in Cambridge are from road transport, with a contribution from domestic, commercial and industrial heating sources. Given the current Air Quality Management Area and the forecast growth of the City, the development management process – specifically using local planning policy – is a key tool in protecting and enhancing Air Quality. Indeed, it is a specified statutory process for achieving and maintaining air quality objectives where needed.

Air pollution in parts of Cambridge currently breaches EU limit values for Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2). The City Council has a statutory duty to reduce relevant pollutant levels and plan to meet the EU Limit values through the Air Quality Action Plan. The Joint Air Quality Action Plan (with Huntingdonshire and South Cambridgeshire District Councils and Cambridgeshire County Council) in 2009 incorporates measures for improvement of and protection from poor air quality using the development

management system.

There is a strong message throughout the National Planning Policy Framework that air quality is an important factor in the quality of life, health and well-being and so is a key aspect of sustainable development supporting the need for a planning policy. Planning Policies are specifically mentioned. The Taylor review of Government Planning Practice Guidance which was undertaken in 2012, following the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework, recommends that new planning guidance is needed for several pollution topics including air quality as “important issues on which Government could set standards in order to ensure appropriate development.” It is therefore important that an air quality planning policy is produced to provide sufficient detail to enable the planning authority and developers to achieve the quality of life and protection of human health aims enshrined in the National Planning Policy Framework both in the interim and when this guidance is available. It is clear from the responses that air quality issues are of concern; specific issues raised will be made more explicit in the forthcoming Submission Draft Local Plan.

The recommendation is to pursue Option 85 and ensure that Air Quality Policy in the Local Plan requires that the health impacts of new developments on current and future residents can be addressed. A detailed and specific Air Quality Policy will explicitly provide future protection from poor air quality. This approach is strongly supported by the consultation responses. The policy will provide the key local approaches to reduce ambient levels of atmospheric pollutants, to minimise long-term health risk to new and existing residents from poor air quality, to minimise adverse effects of transport, domestic and industrial emissions on people and the environment and to promote a safe and healthy environment, minimising the impacts of development upon the environment. Without local policy, there will be no clear direction for developers, leading to uncertainty and inconsistency in the development management process and an increase in planning appeals. It will be difficult to carry on with the measures in the Air Quality Action Plan. With a local policy, there will be continuity of air quality regulation and ongoing compliance with the measures in the statutory Air Quality Action Plan (local authorities are required to demonstrate that they are working towards improvements in air quality to avoid the threat of judicial review; further, there will be local legitimacy and certainty within the local policy and most importantly, there will be no deterioration in air quality and an improvement in air quality in the long term.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 85 and ensure that Air Quality Policy in the Local Plan requires that the health impacts of new developments on current and future residents can be addressed. A detailed and specific Air Quality Policy will explicitly provide future protection from poor air quality. This approach is strongly supported by the consultation responses.

ISSUE: NOISE

Total representations: 10	
Object: 2	Support: 8

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES
Option 86 - Noise Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Several general statements of support for a noise pollution policy;• Several mentions of noise pollution caused by the airport including the suggestion that a separate mention should be made of aviation noise;• Several mentions made of traffic generated noise including that noise reduction measures should include reduction from existing sources of noise (e.g. traffic from the M11);• The A14 upgrade would surely have a detrimental effect on noise;• Several concerns over existing noise sources, such as industrial, small plant, licensed premises including rock festivals and vehicle noise. Suggestion that Policy should look at existing industrial sources of noise;• Sound insulation needs to be improved in modern properties

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

No additional options have been suggested.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

By reducing and mitigating the noise impacts of new developments and/or locating in consideration of noise sensitive receptors this option will secure good quality development within Cambridge which will help to maintain and enhance local amenity, as well as being cost effective for businesses. This will contribute positively to the health and well being of people both working and living in Cambridge.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Environmental Protection Act 1990 as amended.
- National Planning Policy Framework (2012) Paragraphs 17, 109, 110, 120 and 123 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment)
- Cambridge City Council (2007). Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
- External Review of Government Planning Practise Guidance, Taylor Review (2012)

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 4/13 (Pollution and Amenity)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The National Planning Policy Framework states at paragraph 6 that the purpose of the planning system is to “contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.” It goes on to describe an environmental role as one of the three dimensions to sustainable development and highlights that minimising pollution is an important part of this role. Paragraph 17 lists the core planning principles. These include that planning should “always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupiers of land and buildings.” Thus leading to better places for people to live. Paragraph 109, in relation to conserving and enhancing the natural environment, explains that the planning system should prevent “both new and existing development from contributing to, or being put at, unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution.” Paragraph 123, then goes on to describe four main aims for planning policies concerning noise. There is a strong message throughout the National Planning Policy Framework that noise is an important factor in the quality of life, health and well-being and so is a key aspect of sustainable development supporting the need for a planning policy.

The Taylor review of Government Planning Practice Guidance which was undertaken in 2012, following the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework, recommends that new planning guidance be provided for several pollution topics including noise as “important issues on which Government could set standards in order to ensure appropriate development.” It is therefore important that a noise planning policy is produced to enable the planning authority and developers to achieve the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework both in the interim and when this guidance is available.

With regard to alternative legislative controls, detriment to the amenity is a much lower level of effect than that required to establish a statutory noise nuisance under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. In addition, the nuisance powers are limited to noise from premises and cannot therefore be used to protect residents from traffic or aviation noise for example. As the aim of the planning system is protection of the amenity the nuisance powers given to Local Authorities cannot therefore be accepted as a suitable alternative and hence a planning policy on noise is required.

There were several respondents concerned over aircraft and traffic noise as well as noise from existing development. The impact of aircraft and traffic noise cannot be dealt with by other legislative controls such as the Environmental Protection Act. It is therefore necessary for future development to be controlled and protected via the planning process. The planning process cannot deal with noise from existing developments retrospectively, this is controlled under the nuisance powers of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 which does not afford the same level of protection of amenity, thus supporting the need for a planning policy on noise to ensure future developments accord with the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework. Whilst specific reference can be made to aircraft noise in the policy on noise pollution, the policy option on Cambridge Airport - Aviation Development (Option 198) also makes reference to the need to maintain the amenity of residents.

In relation to road traffic noise, this is primarily the responsibility of the Highways Agency. Although the A14 is not within the city boundary, the Highways Agency will consult with the Council and any increase in noise and proposed mitigation measures affecting residents will be taken into consideration during the planning process.

The Local Plan and policies can only deal with proposed future development and licensing issues have to be dealt with under the relevant licensing regime. Noise issues from existing sites are controlled by the statutory nuisance procedures under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The Local Plan and policies cannot deal with this retrospectively. In relation to music festivals, this type of event is regulated via the Licensing Regime and the statutory nuisance provisions of the Environmental Protection Act.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 86. A detailed and specific policy is necessary to prevent both new and existing development from either giving rise to or being subjected to unacceptable levels of noise. There is strong support given in both the National Planning Policy Framework and the responses to this approach.

ISSUE: CONTAMINATED LAND

Total representations: 20

Objections: 3

Supports: 17

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES
Option 87: Contaminated land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong support for development of this policy; • Alternative approach would be that a general policy on pollution be supported by SPD Guidance on the individual issues of contaminated land, air quality and noise; • The need for more stringent control of radioactive waste around the city was expressed. Concern about emissions from radioactive material in the City was also raised; • Preference was expressed of undertaking remediation in a single phase rather than in a phased manner (When required) in phased developments; • Comment expressed about local residents not being adequately consulted on any possible remediation works in their area; • New development should not give rise to pollution; • This option needs to be amended to assume that all brownfield sites could be adversely affected by contamination and a detailed assessment should be undertaken on each occasion;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option should include more stringent control of radioactive waste around the city; • Do not build houses on contaminated land. Parkland should be the preferred option.
--	---

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

No additional options have been suggested.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

This option looks to ensure that new developments are appropriate, given potential sensitivities to adverse effects from pollution, and also that the site is suitable for its new use. It is likely that this will provide health benefits through avoided contact with pollutants.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Environmental Protection Act 1990 as amended;
- Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part IIA –Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance (2012);
- External Review of Government Planning Practice Guidance, Taylor Review (2012);
- Cambridge City Council Contaminated Land Strategy (2009);
- Cambridge City Council Contaminated Land in Cambridge. Developers Guide (2009);
- Contaminated Land Database; Historic Maps; Aerial Photographs.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 4/13 - Pollution and Amenity

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Land contamination is a material consideration for the purposes of planning. It is important to ensure that proposed developments are situated on land that will be safe and suitable for the proposed use. There will be situations where remediation works will be required to make land safe prior to being developed; for example if a site’s previous use was a petrol station, there will be a need to ensure that no residual fuel in storage tanks or in the soil itself is left on-site as it may cause a health hazard for future users. In some instances, the level and type of contamination of land may make it unsuitable for certain types of development, for example recently closed landfill sites are considered to be unsuitable for residential development.

As part of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (as amended), the Part II A regime focuses ‘on land which has been contaminated in the past’. The regime was not introduced in order to address contamination issues arising during the redevelopment of land. This approach is reinforced in the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part II legislation which states that ‘Part IIA is one of the main policy measures used to deal with the historic legacy of contaminated land’ and that ‘the role of the town and country planning and building control regimes is ensuring that land is made suitable for any new use, as planning permission is given for that new

use.'

The Taylor 2012 review identified that there are 'A number of policy areas, mainly from the introduction of the Localism Act and the National Planning Policy Framework, where there are gaps in the present guidance' and concludes that 'Guidance is needed on noise, air, land, water and light pollution, important issues on which Government could set standards in order to ensure appropriate development'. Despite the Taylor review clearly identifying a gap in the existing guidance for contaminated land, there is currently no clear commitment/indication that this gap will be addressed at the national level. It is therefore of great importance that this gap is addressed at a local level.

The adoption of a policy at a local level is supported by paragraph 121 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that 'Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that:

- 1) the site is suitable for its new use taking account of ground conditions and land instability, including from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, pollution arising from previous uses and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation or impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation;
- 2) 2) After remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990'.

This approach is also reinforced by the Environmental Protection Act 1990 which states that 'Land contamination, or the possibility of it, is a material consideration for the purposes of town and county planning. This means that a planning authority has to consider the potential impacts of contamination both when it is developing plans and when it is considering individual applications for planning permission'.

The Interim Sustainability Appraisal has also recognised that the adoption of this policy can ensure that new developments are appropriate; given potential sensitivities to adverse effects from pollution, and also that the site is suitable for its new use. Strong support was also expressed in the representations for a policy that would 'prevent new developments from contributing to pollution', which is an integral part of the National Planning Policy Framework.

As such one option for the new local plan would be to develop a detailed policy dealing with contamination, incorporating key elements of guidance previously contained in PPS23. The policy could be supported by a Supplementary Planning Document, which could set out some of the finer detail to help provide certainty for developers.

The principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraphs 109-111, 120 and 121, demonstrate why contaminated land is important and what criteria the new developments should meet with respect to land pollution. The implementation of Option 87 will build further on the principles of the National

Planning Policy Framework by providing guidance on how these principles will be met, reference to technical material and acceptable practises will be included. This approach is supported by the National Planning Policy Framework in paragraph 8, which states that ‘the planning system should play an active role in guiding development to sustainable solutions’. Ultimately, this policy will enable owners, land developers and any other interested parties to demonstrate how a development is ‘suitable for its new use’ and have ‘minimised impact to the local environment’, which lie at the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 87. A detailed and specific Contaminated Land Policy should ensure that new development is appropriate and that the site is suitable for its new use. This approach is strongly supported by the consultation responses.

ISSUE: LIGHT POLLUTION

Total representations: 11	
Object: 4	Support:7

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES
Option 88 - Light Pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirement for a need assessment, site survey and modelled levels of light spill should not be required for all types of development as this would be unnecessarily onerous and costly for small developments. The requirement should only apply to major development, development with floodlighting or in countryside locations; • Concerns with protection of the night sky: Street lights should go off at 2am; • New lighting should be low energy; • All cycle routes in urban areas should be lit with normal street lighting; • The policy should give consideration to energy saving, impact on biodiversity but also public safety and crime prevention; • Concerns with the protection of amenity: 'External lighting' should include internal lighting that is visible externally (stairwells); • Concerns with safety and crime prevention • Particularly important in the western part of the city, because of the impact on observatories; • A preferred approach would be to include a general policy on pollution matters with guidance on individual issues within SPD guidance; • There should be an additional requirement for an ecological assessment of the impact of any proposed

	<p>lighting scheme;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should take account of heritage street lighting and the lighting character of an area; • Need for retrospective action • Support a policy that protects wildlife and wild spaces like Stourbridge Common and Ditton Lane • Important when considering location of sports facilities • Need to design lighting to be effective with minimal spillage as well as being attractive • The levels of street lighting is already minimal; • There should be an additional requirement for an ecological assessment of the impact of any proposed lighting scheme.
--	--

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

An alternative option would be to include a general policy on pollution matters with guidance on individual issues within SPD guidance.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

By requiring applicants to demonstrate that they have minimised their contribution to light pollution, this option helps to reduce the adverse effects of light pollution, including light spillage. It also maintains appropriate levels for a safe and accessible environment, and helps contribute to local amenity and improved safety. Specific reference to minimising the impact of light on wildlife and the wider landscape should help address key issues relating to Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure issues and Cambridge’s Landscape and setting.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Cambridge City Council (2007). Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 4/15 - Lighting

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Paragraph 125 of the National Planning Policy Framework specifically mentions that planning policies and decisions should aim to “limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.” Although light has now been brought into the Statutory Nuisance provisions of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, this does not protect to the same standard as detriment to the amenity and neither does it extend to protecting intrinsically dark areas or wildlife. As the aim of the planning system is protection of the amenity, intrinsically dark area and wild life the nuisance powers given to Local Authorities cannot therefore be accepted as a suitable alternative and hence a planning policy on light is required.

The policy will cover issues, including:

- Safety and crime prevention;
- Impact on biodiversity;
- Impact on amenity;
- Impact on the wider landscape, particularly for sites on the edge of Cambridge.

A needs assessment, site survey and modelled levels of light spill will be required for major development, development with floodlighting or in countryside locations as these forms of development could contribute significantly to light pollution. Ecological assessment of the development site may be needed in some instances, where there are species, which are particularly sensitive to light. For developments that include cycle routes over private land, the standard of lighting will be expected to be commensurate with lighting on the public highway, where appropriate. Lighting to cycle routes on the highway is regulated by the Highways Authority, Cambridgeshire County Council.

Whilst respondents suggested that a single general policy represented a simpler approach, it would not have sufficient detail to address the full range of issues pertaining to pollution. The use of a range of different policies which clearly set out the requirements expected of developers would allow greater certainty through the development process. This could impact positively on the cost of development and the likelihood of development coming forward.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 88. A detailed and specific policy is necessary to limit the impact of light pollution on residential amenity, wildlife and landscape as well as promoting public safety and the prevention of crime.

APPENDIX A - ANALYSIS, RESPONSES AND PREFERRED APPROACH TO POLLUTION PLUS SUMMARIES OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **8.43**

17910 Object

Summary:

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **8.44**

17104 Object

Summary:

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

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 84 - General pollution policy**

9343 Object

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 84 - General pollution policy

10978 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 84 - General pollution policy

16492 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 84 - General pollution policy

17779 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.42

6995 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.42

7110 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.42

8472 Support

Summary:

yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.42

9344 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

10149 Support

Summary:

yes, air conditioning causes noise pollution and is increasing.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

10619 Support

Summary:

The Wildlife Trust supports the inclusion of relevant pollution prevention policies

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

10705 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

10818 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

11759 Support

Summary:

yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

12114 Object

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

12979 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.42**

13624 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment Question 8.42

14032 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment Question 8.42

15016 Support

Summary:

Yes, support.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment Question 8.42

15250 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment Question 8.42

16496 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment Question 8.42

17425 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment Question 8.42

17907 Support

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment Question 8.42

18187 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.43**

9187 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.43**

9346 Object

Summary:

Clarify final bullet point.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.43**

11761 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.43**

15021 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.43**

17426 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.43**

18097 Object

Summary:

See extract 4 of submission relating to groundwater.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.43**

18190 Object

Summary:

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.44

17427 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.44

17802 Object

Summary:

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

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.44

17911 Object

Summary:

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.44

18192 Object

Summary:

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

8.46

15023 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

8.46

16498 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 85 - Air quality policy

9347 Support

Summary:

Yes.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 85 - Air quality policy

16499 Support

Summary:

Broadly support.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 85 - Air quality policy

17781 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.45

6996 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.45

8473 Support

Summary:

yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.45

9348 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.45

10819 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.45

11762 Support

Summary:

yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.45
--	----------------------

12116 Object**Summary:**

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.45
--	----------------------

13124 Support**Summary:**

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.45
--	----------------------

14034 Support**Summary:**

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.45
--	----------------------

15026 Support**Summary:**

Yes, support.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.45
--	----------------------

15252 Support**Summary:**

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.45
--	----------------------

16501 Support**Summary:**

Yes.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.45
--	----------------------

17428 Support**Summary:**

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.45**

17909 Support

Summary:

Pollution - don't build housing next to M11/A14. This is risky for young children - research shows an increased rate of asthma and in older vulnerable adults with respiratory conditions higher level of illness.

Open green space that is natural and uncluttered by non-natural items, that has natural restful sounds and peaceful space and biodiversity are shown to offer benefits great for mental health. Research shows that sound and air pollution greatly increase stress in humans.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.45**

17913 Support

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.45**

18194 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.46**

9188 Support

Summary:

Pollution by contractors' vehicles and plant also needs to be addressed

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.46**

10706 Support

Summary:

This option needs to cover the current air quality in the city, not simply that for developments, but it cannot be properly addressed without consideration of road and traffic matters such as the enforcement of standards for vehicles, particularly buses.

This is urgent as the current position is that air quality does not meet the AQMA standards in many Cambridge locations. If this pollution is not tackled urgently it will degrade the appearance and structure of our historic Heritage Assets.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.46**

11764 Support

Summary:

Pollution by contractors' vehicles and plant also needs to be addressed.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.46**

15029 Support

Summary:

The policy needs to extend to residential boats moored inside the City boundaries.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.46**

17430 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.46**

17914 Object

Summary:

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.46**

18195 Object

Summary:

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.46**

18365 Support

Summary:

South Cambridgeshire District Council is consulting on whether its new Local Plan should include a policy that requires proposals for development that have the potential to contribute significant emissions to the local area to prepare and implement a site-based Low Emissions Strategy or Low Emissions Scheme (see Issue 96). In view of the close relationship between the two districts, and in particular in relation to city edge sites, there may be merit in taking a coordinated approach to this issue and the Council would be willing to work with the City Council on this.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.47**

6924 Support

Summary:

yes; if you follow Malmo's example and run buses (and taxis) on gas the air quality issue will be solved. This will require political commitment, but is simple readily available technology that can even save money.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.47**

17431 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.47**

17915 Object

Summary:

No

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Question 8.47

18198 Object

Summary:

No

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Option 86 - Noise policy

7686 Support

Summary:

The airport is a large contributor to noise pollution in the south of the city.

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Option 86 - Noise policy

9349 Support

Summary:

Yes

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Option 86 - Noise policy

10640 Object

Summary:

Separate mention should be made of aviation noise. Advice is currently included in the Air Transport White Paper (December 2003) and is currently under discussion in the Draft Aviation Policy Framework (July 2012).

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Option 86 - Noise policy

11589 Object

Summary:

Need to make sure that noise reduction measures include reduction of noise from existing sources of noise e.g. traffic noise from M11. Please consider how City Council can through policy assist in obtaining reduction in traffic noise by use of specially developed road surfaces

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Option 86 - Noise policy

11649 Support

Summary:

I am very glad to see that the issue of noise pollution is recognised in this report. So often it is neglected. I support efforts to reduce noise impacts that might arise from the construction and use of new developments. Also the airport is a large contributor to noise pollution in the city.

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Option 86 - Noise policy

12510 Support

Summary:

I am very supportive of a noise policy, which should apply to the road traffic as well as other sources of noise such as light industrial.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Option 86 - Noise policy
--	---------------------------------

14341 Support

Summary:

It's good to be considering noise pollution. We suffer a lot of noise from the airport

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Option 86 - Noise policy
--	---------------------------------

15253 Support

Summary:

Recent sources of noise nuisance reported in Chesterton have been small generators, late night motor cyclists and air-conditioning units placed close to houses and flats. Persistent low-level hum can actually be more disturbing than a louder well-defined noise.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Option 86 - Noise policy
--	---------------------------------

16749 Support

Summary:

Development of a detailed policy aimed at reducing and mitigating noise impacts that might arise from the construction of and use of new development. This should also agree noise controls on existing industrial and other major sources of noise.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Option 86 - Noise policy
--	---------------------------------

17782 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.48
--	----------------------

6997 Support

Summary:

Yes, definitely - and there are some surprising sources of noise around the city, for example Haggis Farm at the time of "Rock Festivals", whose noise permeates right into the Western part of the city at times when people are trying to sleep.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.48
--	----------------------

8474 Support

Summary:

yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.48
--	----------------------

9350 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.48
--	----------------------

10820 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.48
--	----------------------

11768 Support

Summary:

on balance, yes to a policy

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.48
--	----------------------

12511 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.48
--	----------------------

14036 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.48
--	----------------------

14343 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.48
--	----------------------

14355 Support

Summary:

Noise is the worst aspect of city life. Unfortunately much noise comes from vehicles and apart from declaring car free zones there is little recourse available.

As for noisy operations, the paper recycling site on Mercers Row is a bad example, starting up as early as 5:30am and operating on Sundays. It would be helpful if retrospective action could be taken.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.48
--	----------------------

15030 Support

Summary:

Yes, support.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.48
--	----------------------

16502 Support

Summary:

Yes. I support Option 86 on this.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.48

17116 Support

Summary:

The four parishes of Barton, Coton, Grantchester and Madingley have submitted a vision document to the South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City Council, entitled "A Quarter to Six Quadrant". This sets out in detail how the QTSQ part of Cambridge could contribute to Cambridge's green infrastructure, ensuring that the total development of Cambridge and District is developed in a sustainable manner. It also sets out the importance of noise reduction measures in the area, in particular from traffic, from the M11. These measures have not been addressed since M11 was built in 1980, and should be in 2016-31 period.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.48

17916 Support

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.48

18200 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.49

9189 Support

Summary:

Noise pollution can be partially controlled by licensing policy, e.g. no "disco" music after midnight except on Friday and Saturday evenings when the limit should be 2 am. In any case, there should be no such music before noon.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.49

11770 Object (W/drawn 2012-10-30)

Summary:

Noise pollution can be partially controlled by licensing policy, e.g. no loud or disco music before and after certain specified times (these would vary according to location)

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.49

11934 Support

Summary:

There should be a policy of trying to eliminate noise at source. This includes things like (car) door slamming, hooting and car alarms that can often blight residential areas.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.49

12261 Support

Summary:

One area which is currently ignored in noise production is within the development after completion. A significant reason why many "empty nesters" might not want to live in higher-density accommodation is the very poor sound proofing of modern properties. Not only can loud music be heard, but also normal volume TV and the shutting of doors and even cupboards. This comment links with those concerning build quality. Thermal insulation is required of modern properties. To make the dwellings really attractive, then significantly improved sound insulation should be a requirement.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.49**

12513 Support

Summary:

What will be the impact of the A14 upgrade on this policy? This will surely have a detrimental effect on noise in many of the northern fringes?

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.49**

15031 Support

Summary:

The policy needs to extend to residential boats moored inside the City boundaries.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.49**

17547 Support

Summary:

There should be a much stricter attitude to loud noise.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.49**

17917 Support

Summary:

Yes - Hours of work that building and construction work can be carried out, specifically at weekends

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.49**

18202 Object

Summary:

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.49**

18271 Support

Summary:

There is a substantial problem of noise nuisance and anti-social behaviour in the neighbourhood that comes from two sources - night clubs and late-night alcohol outlets..

Both of these are sources of public nuisance to all who reside in the city centre as well as to shopkeepers who frequently have to clear the footways in front of their premises of vomit, urine and litter. The customers of these establishments normally take taxis home at closing time creating severe noise disturbance for residents through most of the night.

One option for consideration is a Council surcharge on such premises that do business after evening hours in order to discourage late night opening, and provide funding for late night street wardens and police.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.50**

9191 Support**Summary:**

Some developments such as sports venues may be inseparable from an element of noise, but conditions should be imposed restricting such use, e/g. only on Saturday afternons and perhaps not more than one evening per week. If this cannot be achieved through planning conditions, then licensing powers should be used.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.50**

17918 Object**Summary:**

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.50**

18205 Object**Summary:**

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 87 - Contaminated land policy**

9351 Support**Summary:**

yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 87 - Contaminated land policy**

15254 Support**Summary:**

Pollution from new developments should not be acceptable the technology for cleaning solid, liquid and gaseous emissions has been well-established for many years. Research into prior uses, often as simple as coming and talking to local people, can identify potential hazards at an early stage and avoid the necessity of remedial work during construction has happened with the redevelopment of the Meadowcroft site in Chesterton.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Option 87 - Contaminated land policy**

17783 Support**Summary:**

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.51**

8475 Support**Summary:**

yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.51**

9352 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.51**

11771 Support

Summary:

yes to a policy

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.51**

12118 Object

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.51**

14038 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.51**

15035 Support

Summary:

Yes, support.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.51**

16503 Support

Summary:

Yes.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.51**

17919 Support

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.51**

18208 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.52

9192 Support

Summary:

There should be a presumption that all brownfield sites are liable to be contaminated and a detailed assessment should be required in every case. Where remediation is required on phased developments it should be a condition that the whole site is remediated at the outset, not on a phased basis.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.52

11772 Support

Summary:

There should be a presumption that all brownfield sites are liable to be contaminated and a detailed assessment should be required in every case. Where remediation is required on phased developments it should be a condition that the whole site is remediated at the outset, not on a phased basis.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.52

14040 Support

Summary:

While I am uncomfortable with the idea of building housing on contaminated land, I am struck by the success by which parkland has been built on factory land. A great example of this is the Olympic Park in Stratford. Such an approach would be an excellent approach to dealing with contaminated land.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.52

17920 Support

Summary:

Ensuring that local residents of the areas affected are given the opportunity to object & that the measure taken to decontaminate the area is clear. The issues experienced by the local residents of the 'Harrow' site in Hauxton are unacceptable.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.52

18096 Support

Summary:

There should be a future plan for more stringent control of radioactive waste around the City. Sites central and around Cambridge still release emissions of radioactive material. This should not be permitted in a City environment.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.52

18210 Support (W/drawn 2012-10-30)

Summary:

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.53

17921 Object

Summary:

No

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Question 8.53

18212 Object

Summary:

No

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

8.52

9889 Support

Summary:

There are areas of Cambridge e.g. on the western fringe where there are still dark skies. These need to be protected by policies against light pollution. In addition to prevent negative impact on residential amenity

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Option 88 - Light pollution policy

7687 Object

Summary:

Vital.

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Option 88 - Light pollution policy

9353 Support

Summary:

Yes

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Option 88 - Light pollution policy

9580 Support

Summary:

Light pollution is a serious form of pollution throughout the city. It is a pity that retrospective action cannot be taken against some of the worst offenders.

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Option 88 - Light pollution policy

10257 Object

Summary:

there are areas of Cambridge e.g. on the western fringe where there are still relatively dark skies. These and other parts of the city need to be protected by policies against light pollution for this reason and also to prevent negative impact on residential amenity

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Option 88 - Light pollution policy

10982 Object

Summary:

Notwithstanding Bidwells' representation to Option 84, if Option 88 is adopted, Bidwells considers that the requirement for a Need Assessment, Site Survey and modelled levels of light spill, should not be required for all types of development as this would be unnecessarily onerous and costly for small developments. The requirement should only apply to major development, development with floodlighting, or in countryside locations.

Response to Option 84:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 88 - Light pollution policy

12461 Support

Summary:

Look at the blaze at night in satellite photos. We should do all we can to reduce it. Street lights should go off by 2am at the latest.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 88 - Light pollution policy

12515 Support

Summary:

All new lighting should be low energy in my opinion.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 88 - Light pollution policy

14351 Support

Summary:

yes, this is a big problem. There is a lot of light pollution around Addenbrookes development, for instance

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 88 - Light pollution policy

14704 Object

Summary:

All cycle routes in urban areas should be lit with normal street lighting. Across green spaces we would also want routes lit, preferably with low level lights such as those at the Leisure Park. The narrow width of many paths can cause unnecessary conflict so a formalisation of the widths is called for and attention paid to sweeping paths and maintenance of the shrubbery nearby so that the full width of the path may be used. White lines along the edge of paths, and at the side, can also be very helpful.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 88 - Light pollution policy

15413 Support

Summary:

Yes, a detailed light pollution policy is required that reduces "spillage", saves energy, and reduces negative impacts on biodiversity, while giving consideration to public safety and crime prevention.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Option 88 - Light pollution policy

17785 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.54
--	----------------------

6998 Object

Summary:

Yes, particularly in the Western part of the city, because of the impact on the various observatories. I'm not sure that the policy entitled Option 88 is really restrictive enough in this particular regard.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.54
--	----------------------

8476 Support

Summary:

yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.54
--	----------------------

9354 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.54
--	----------------------

9799 Support

Summary:

We would support a light policy that protects wild spaces in Cambridge from light pollution - i.e., Stourbridge Common and Ditton Meadows.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.54
--	----------------------

9892 Support

Summary:

to minimise light pollution, the erosion of the dark sky where it exists, to protect amenity and avoid wasting energy

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.54
--	----------------------

10259 Object

Summary:

there are areas of Cambridge e.g. on the western fringe where there are still relatively dark skies. These and other parts of the city need to be protected by policies against light pollution. In addition to prevent negative impact on residential amenity

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.54
--	----------------------

10621 Support

Summary:

The Wildlife Trust supports the inclusion of a policy seeking to reduce and minimise light pollution as set out above.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.54
--	----------------------

11774 Support

Summary:

yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

11975 Support

Summary:

Agreed. A policy is necessary. Lighting along the guided busway which was, I think, limited so as to minimize pollution is now being challenged. This policy would also be important when considering locations for eg sports facilities.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

12119 Object

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

12516 Support

Summary:

Yes, and it will contribute to increasing city wildlife at night e.g. bats, as well as reducing our carbon footprint.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

12980 Support

Summary:

yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

14042 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

15037 Support

Summary:

Yes, support.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment **Question 8.54**

15255 Support

Summary:

Yes. All public lighting should direct light to where it is actually needed and minimise light pollution that has denied most city dwellers the beauty of the clear night sky. In the City the globe lamps and candles are two examples of needless spreading of light from lamps designed to look pretty rather than being efficient sources of illumination for pedestrians.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.54
--	----------------------

16511 Support

Summary:

Yes.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.54
--	----------------------

16860 Support

Summary:

Yes there is a need for a policy on light pollution

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.54
--	----------------------

17118 Support

Summary:

We fully support the development of a light pollution policy. We note that recent developments, in particular in sports facilities, have not taken adequate consideration of light pollution, and we recommend that these be rectified.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.54
--	----------------------

17922 Support

Summary:

Yes - as suggested

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.54
--	----------------------

18213 Support

Summary:

Yes

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.55
--	----------------------

9193 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.55
--	----------------------

9893 Support

Summary:

But there should be an additional requirement for an ecological assessment of the impact of a lighting scheme on the natural environment

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment	Question 8.55
--	----------------------

10261 Support

Summary:

there should be an additional requirement for an ecological assessment of the impact of any proposed lighting scheme on the natural environment

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.55

11497 Support

Summary:

The County Council's PFI for street lighting appears to be a very broad-brush, one-size-fits-all approach. It should take more notice of local conditions, both for retaining heritage street lighting and the lighting character of an area (and thus its pollution).

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.55

11775 Support

Summary:

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

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.55

12265 Support

Summary:

What is missing is any mention of safety from collision for pedestrians and cyclists. Also, designing out crime. So, more efficient use of the light (better design) is important. Please consider safety!

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.55

16512 Support

Summary:

The present levels of street lighting are already 'minimum' - the levels of lighting in St John's Street, for instance, are abysmal.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.55

16863 Support

Summary:

The policy covering the issue of stray light must state that any lighting required by new development must not have any effect (light intrusion) into neighbouring properties.

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.55

17923 Object

Summary:

No

8 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic & Natural Environment

Question 8.55

18215 Object

Summary:

No

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Question 8.56

17924 Object

Summary:

No

**8 - Conserving and Enhancing the
Historic & Natural Environment**

Question 8.56

18216 Objec

Summary:

No
