

Appendix B: Analysis, responses and preferred approach to housing, plus summaries of representations received

OPTIONS 90 – 94 ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND 95, 96, 147 AND 148 ON STUDENT ACCOMMODATION WILL BE CONSIDERED AT A FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB COMMITTEE. THESE OPTIONS WILL BE FINALISED FOLLOWING RECEIPT OF FINAL VIABILITY TESTING DATA.

ISSUE: TENURE MIX

Total representations: 41	
Object:	
Option 97: 9	Option 98: 6
Support:	
Option 97: 8	Option 98: 18

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 97 – Specified Tenure Mix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The minimum of 75% of the 40% to be housing for rent should be retained; This would place added constraints on the market.
Option 98 – Tenure mix specified through the SHMA and Affordable Housing SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tenure mix should not be set out in the Local Plan since flexibility is required to take account of changes in housing requirements and also other factors such as funding provision and Central Government specifications.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Given current issues surrounding the balance of tenures required, such as the introduction of new Affordable Rents and fundamental reforms to the welfare system (which will affect the ability of tenants on low incomes to access different sizes, types and tenures of housing), maintaining the current approach set out in option 98 would enable flexibility to adapt to any future changes in housing requirements. This may have significant positive effects on community and well-being, as it would continue to encourage mixed communities and social cohesion. Adopting option 97, whilst making the Council's position on tenure requirements clear, would potentially become out of date as local circumstances change. The Housing Strategy and Affordable Housing SPD could be used to ensure advice on tenure requirements is clearly set out. The Council could however, consider including wording to clarify the definition of Affordable Housing, relative to the revised national definition, to include affordable rent.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Cambridge City Council (2008) Affordable Housing SPD;
- Cambridge City Council (2012) Housing Strategy 2012 -2015.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

Not applicable

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE
--

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Council encourages a mix of tenures to be provided as part of new development. With high levels of need for rented housing identified through the housing register, the Council currently resolves to achieve that 75% of the Affordable Housing on qualifying sites should be Social Rented Housing and 25% Intermediate Housing. The national definition of Affordable Housing was revised in June 2011 and a new tenure type was added - Affordable Rent - which is a form of rented rather than intermediate housing. Affordable Rents are not subject to the same prescriptive rent control as Social Rented Housing and Affordable Rents can be set by the Registered Provider at up to 80% of local market rents. Under current guidance, with very few exceptions, all new Government grant for rented Affordable Housing allocated by the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) from April 2011 to March 2015 will require new housing to be let at Affordable Rents rather than Social Rents. It is also noted that HCA grant will not be available for new Affordable Housing delivered under S106 planning agreements.

Research undertaken by the University of Cambridge's Department of Land Economy on behalf of the Council in March 2011 has shown that at 80% of local market rent, Affordable Rents would not be "affordable" to the majority of households who cannot afford lower quartile market housing. The Council has therefore negotiated with the HCA to limit Affordable Rents to approximately 65% of local market rent. Coupled with fundamental reforms to the welfare system, it is too early to fully assess the impact of the introduction of new Affordable Rents on the ability of tenants on low incomes to access different sizes, types and tenures of housing.

Work on the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Council's Housing Strategy has identified that there is a growing group of people unlikely to be able to access Social or Affordable Rented homes, but who are also unable to afford to purchase on the open market. Intermediate housing can help to provide for people in this group.

The Issues and Options report set out two options on tenure mix. The first option (97) suggested the inclusion of a policy setting out the tenure requirements. The disadvantages of this approach were that this would be difficult to assess with any degree of accuracy, and would potentially become out of date as local circumstances change. The second option (98) promoted greater flexibility, by setting out a general policy which stated the need to consider tenure mix and referencing the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document.

This second approach in Option 98 follows best practice to meet a full spectrum of affordable need and was supported by a significant percentage of respondents to

the two options. It allows the Council to adapt to changes in housing requirements as a new Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document will be produced to reflect, complement and provide additional detail on the policies in the new Local Plan. Whilst the Council has considered various tenure mixes as a part of its viability testing of Affordable Housing percentages and thresholds, this work could also inform the development of the Council's approach to precise tenure mix within the new Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document, subject to defined affordability triggers.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 98, which allows for the tenure mix on sites to be guided by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document.

ISSUE: EMPLOYMENT RELATED HOUSING

Total representations: 38

Object: 14

Support: 24

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
<p>Option 99: Employment related housing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 99 could help prevent new housing simply being taken by London commuters; • Encourages local working; • What happens when a person in employment related housing leaves the employer?; • Many people prefer to live away from their work; • Opposed to the creation of enclaves; • There is clearly a need for affordable housing provision, but there is a lack of evidence that locally specific circumstances exist to require employment related housing; • It is important to explore the possibility of specific institutions and employers providing housing specifically for their staff, particularly for the University and its colleges; • It would need to ensure that low paid employees were not excluded from this housing; • It should be secondary to enforcing the provision of affordable housing; • Disincentive to economic development and growth; • Need to specify key worker housing; • Should not negate need for affordable housing; • College employees should be included if housing is provided by University of Cambridge; • A percentage of affordable housing should be given over to key workers and University and College workers

	should be included on a list of key workers.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT
By supporting the provision of housing, this option could have a significant positive impact by helping deliver more housing in Cambridge, and by supporting vital services that can influence health and well-being. Economic effects could also be significantly positive, as the housing needs of institutions who contribute to the Cambridge high technology economy can be addressed specifically. Provision of key workers in more central locations may reduce the use of the private car in some instances. The city centre will potentially gain significantly benefits as extra housing provision may allow it to capitalise on opportunities for growing business sectors. Housing support for key staff may also assist employers in the wider city, contributing to reducing deprivation in the North, South and East Cambridge areas.

KEY EVIDENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge City Council (2008) Affordable Housing SPD; • The Cambridge Sub-region Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2008 and updates). • Cambridge City Council (2009) Advice Note – Deleted Local Plan Policies • University of Cambridge (2011) North West Cambridge Key Worker Housing Statement • University of Cambridge (2008) Housing Needs Study (submitted as part of the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan examination)

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED
Not applicable

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE
<p>This option sets out the development of a specific policy, which encourages the provision of key worker housing for specific institutions in Cambridge. Generally, this option was supported by respondents, in particular the University of Cambridge and the Bursars’ Committee.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 50) requires local planning authorities to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities by planning for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community. This could include provision for key workers associated with a range of institutions within Cambridge.</p> <p>Policy 5/6 of the Cambridge Local Plan set out the requirement for proposals for employment development, which impact on the demand for affordable housing, to provide affordable housing on-site; contributions towards off-site housing or by</p>

means of key worker housing provision. This policy was deleted after application to the Secretary of State to save the policies of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 because it was recognised at the Examination in Public for the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the East of England that there was an absence of convincing evidence that specific local circumstances existed to justify the imposition of the requirement. The key difference between the deleted policy 5/6 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and option 99 of the Issues and Options report is in the positivity of wording. Deleted Policy 5/6 was worded in a more negative manner, requiring mitigation of impacts on Affordable Housing Provision as a result of new employment development, whilst option 99 seeks to encourage key worker housing provision for specific institutions within the city, who have an established need for housing for their employees. Direct action by local institutions may help alleviate the existing pressures of the housing market in Cambridge as it could take a number of people out of the private rented sector.

Due to the high level of housing need in Cambridge and the need to support the economy and the delivery of vital services, it is important to allow scope for institutions to provide housing for their staff. The provision would not need to be within the employment site itself. Around 40% of workers are employed in the public sector and in higher education in Cambridge. The higher education sector has faced challenges in both recruiting and retaining staff. The University of Cambridge has sought to address this issue by providing 50% of the housing at their North West Cambridge site for University and College staff. Evidence of their need was provided in their Housing Needs Study (2008) as a part of the process of developing and adopting the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan and in their Key Worker Needs Statement (2011), which formed part of the subsequent approval of the outline planning application 11/1114/OUT. The University's Housing Needs Study includes a survey of University and College Staff, covering household characteristics, housing circumstances and incomes across all staff groups (Academic, Contract Research, Administrative/Clerical, Technical and Manual). It then sets out the housing needs for University staff, based upon current and projected levels of recruitment. The University's Housing Needs Study identifies housing needs across all University staff groups.

It is considered that the option should be developed into a policy which sets out a criteria based approach. The criteria should include the role that the institution plays in the local economy; the extent of housing need for existing staff and the issues of recruitment and retention and the allocations policy for the key worker housing.

In order to allow any provision of key worker housing, the applicant would need to demonstrate that there is a proven need for key worker housing that cannot be met by the housing market and that, in the absence of this new housing provision, the provision of their business/services would suffer. It is expected that any schemes to come forward under this policy approach would be for 100% housing for the eligible institution or employer, tied into a S106 agreement. The planning application for key worker housing would be required to have an allocations policy identifying the

range of key workers within their institution. This allocations policy would also form part of a S106 agreement.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 99 and to bring forward a criteria based policy, which sets out the need to establish the role that the institution has in the local economy; the level of need for existing staff and for recruitment and retention and the need for an allocations policy for the key worker housing.

ISSUE: HOUSING MIX – SIZE AND TYPE

Total representations: 82	
Object:	
Option 100: 10	Option 101: 12
Support:	
Option 100: 29	Option 101: 31

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 100: Housing mix – General policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 100 is preferable to Option 101 as it would allow local circumstances, needs and the housing market to determine the appropriate mix on each site; • Support, but need to avoid high density and very tall buildings; • Strong vision for an area is needed, developed in close consultation with residents.
Option 101: Housing mix –specific levels policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support, but need to encourage 3 bed dwellings or more for families; • Support more provision suitable for the elderly; • Support, but need minimum unit sizes; • Support provision of housing cooperatives; • Support, but need to avoid high density and very tall buildings; • Option 100 is preferable to Option 101 as it would allow local circumstances, needs and the housing market to determine the appropriate mix on each site; • It would lead to poor design; • The detail in the policy is critical – the character of the site and area, the market and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment are vital; • General approach is supported, with the mix in developments determined at the point of planning permission, responding to the market, local need and viability; • Should ensure adequate unit sizes, including provision of sufficient 3 bed + units; • The types of accommodation on sites depends on

	<p>location. It would be preferable to retain flexibility;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mix of housing must not lead to high density or high rise; • There is a need to understand who needs what size dwelling in Cambridge; • Mix is a key lever for affordable housing; • Properties should be based on size, not number of bedrooms; • Need for more family housing; • Need for housing for the elderly; • Occupancy levels are important; • Space standards are vital.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Maintaining the current approach set out in option 100 would enable flexibility to adapt to any future changes in housing requirements through the SHMA. This may have a positive effect on community and well-being, as it would continue to encourage mixed and balanced communities with social cohesion. A general policy allows for factors such as the character of an area, site characteristics, and the market and housing need to be taken in account when determining the appropriate housing mix for a site. Whilst enabling the Council's to exercise more control over the mix of housing sizes and types to be achieved on sites providing new housing, option 101 is much less flexible and would therefore potentially become out of date as local circumstances change. The Housing Strategy and Affordable Housing SPD could be used to set out requirements for housing mix.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Policy 5/10 Dwelling Mix

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Cambridge City Council (2008) Affordable Housing SPD;
- The Cambridge Sub-region Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2008 and updates).

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 50), it is important that new residential development provides a good mix of size and type of dwellings to meet a range of needs. Development of a mix of different dwelling sizes, types and tenures will assist in the creation and maintenance of mixed, inclusive and sustainable communities. Two options were put forward for consultation on housing mix, including option 100, which suggested a general policy on housing mix with more detailed advice provided through the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Council's new Affordable Housing Supplementary

Planning Document, whilst Option 101 suggested setting specific levels within the policy itself.

The level of support from respondents was very similar for both options, although many respondents emphasised issues, which these options do not address, such as the overall density of the development or the need for housing for the elderly. It is considered that maintaining the current approach set out in option 100 would enable flexibility to adapt to any future changes in circumstances in the wider economy and in the local housing market. This is noted in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Issues and Options Report and recognises that updates to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document can reflect and allow for changes in local housing need more frequently and more regularly than through formal plan-making. The sub-regional Strategic Housing Market Assessment is currently being updated and it is proposed that the Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document is updated to reflect and complement the new Local Plan. Consideration should also be given to the need to express the housing mix across all tenures and whether to differentiate between houses and flats. The dwelling size would be measured by the number of bedrooms provided.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommended approach is to pursue option 100, which would involve the development of a policy, which sets out the need to have a mix of housing within new development. Evidence to support decisions on housing mix would be available through the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and more detailed advice would be included in the Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document.

OPTIONS 102 – 110 ON DENSITY AND RESIDENTIAL SPACE STANDARDS HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED AT EARLIER DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEES ON 6 AND 13 DECEMBER 2012.

ISSUE: LIFETIME HOMES

Total representations: 73		
Object:		
Option 111: 2	Option 112: 2	Option 113: 3
Support:		
Option 111: 21	Option 112: 23	Option 113: 22

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 111: Lifetimes Homes standard applied to all development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All new homes should be designed for safe and comfortable movement in and around them. If Cambridge were to adopt a Housing Design standard that required specific justification for raised thresholds, steps or narrow doorways, most of the Lifetime Homes criteria would become the norm, and people would not be excluded from parts of their own or their friends' houses

	<p>by mobility problems;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new homes should include the provisions of lifetime homes as the costs are modest and it will only have the effect of slightly increasing the area of the dwelling; • Options 111 and 113 impose a requirement for 100% Lifetime Homes and a proportion of housing to meet Wheelchair Housing Design Standards, which would result in an unnecessarily adverse impact on the viability of the development, and would increase the challenge of successfully developing constrained sites. The requirement for Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Housing Design Standards should reflect local needs and the characteristics of a site; • Option 112 would be more appropriate, although additional flexibility should be incorporated to ensure that viability is not adversely affected, by including the wording "unless not viable"; • Space needs are greater not only for physically disabled people but for people with other forms of disability e.g. learning disability, for example when they require a carer or carers all the time or for most of the time. Autistic people may not be able to go out very often because of the lack of adequate support and it has been known for some time that many disabled children (including autistic children) need extra room at home so that they can play; • It should be a mandatory assessment with a system of awards; • Fiscal incentives should be introduced to make attractive to many of those living in larger houses (e.g. single occupation of family homes) to downsize/smartsize, freeing up accommodation to those who have families.
<p>Option 112: A proportion of new homes to meet Lifetime Homes standard</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 112 would be more appropriate than Option 111, although additional flexibility should be incorporated to ensure that viability is not adversely affected, by including the wording "unless not viable"; • With changing demographics and health needs and with the aim of helping people to continue to live independently, we should aspire to design homes that are as flexible as possible; • All new housing should be built to Lifetime Homes standard; • Support a combination of 112 and 113, say 10% wheelchair housing design standard and a further 15% to Lifetime Home standard. This would improve our performance on this issue (an important one given our ageing population and historical failure to anywhere near meet the needs of the disabled), while not imposing too

	<p>high a standard for developers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Option 112 if the proportion of new homes to meet Lifetime Homes Standards is increased from 15%;
<p>Option 113: A proportion of new homes that meet the Wheelchair Housing Design Standard</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are increasing numbers of disabled and elderly people; • Needs can change very swiftly, so housing should be adaptable to suit those changing needs; • Options 111 and 113 impose a requirement for 100% Lifetime Homes and a proportion of housing to meet Wheelchair Housing Design Standards, which would result in an unnecessarily adverse impact on the viability of the development, and would increase the challenge of successfully developing constrained sites. The requirement for Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Housing Design Standards should reflect local needs and the characteristics of a site; • Option 112 would be more appropriate, although additional flexibility should be incorporated to ensure that viability is not adversely affected, by including the wording "unless not viable"; • Support a combination of 112 and 113, say 10% wheelchair housing design standard and a further 15% to Lifetime Home standard. This would improve our performance on this issue (an important one given our ageing population and historical failure to anywhere near meet the needs of the disabled), while not imposing too high a standard for developers.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No alternative options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

All Options would contribute towards addressing the pressing need to ensure the design and size of new homes meet the current and future needs of Cambridge's population, which is of growing importance as people live into older age, with higher rates of disability, as older people survive longer e.g. following a stroke or CHD. While the Government's strategy requires all new housing built with public funding to meet the Lifetime Home standard it is for Cambridge to decide to what extent this standard should apply to new private housing development. Option 111 would achieve a significant increase in the supply of more flexible and adaptable housing, providing increased choice of housing, regardless of age or disability. However, the Lifetime Homes standards may reduce viability and so reduce the volume of housing delivered.

Option 112 will maintain current rates of Lifetime Homes, increasing overall supply to meet the needs of older and disabled people. There is a risk that developers' decisions on the size and location of the Lifetime Homes standards could reduce open market housing options e.g. for families with disabled household members seeking a larger house, if it is mainly 1 or 2 bed apartments built to Lifetime Home Standards. Likewise, there is a risk that, without specifying otherwise, developers could meet their obligation entirely within Affordable Housing type housing. This would fail to improve choice for older and disabled people seeking housing within the market sector.

Option 113 would help deliver greater housing choices to wheel chair users. The 10% requirement adopted in London provides a benchmark guide for the proportion needed. The option would be strengthened by stating that provision should be across a range of house sizes, to meet the needs of a range of households of differing sizes with one or more wheelchair using household members. This option (113), alongside a policy requiring a higher proportion of Lifetime Home Standards, would enhance the range of housing suited for an ageing population and the specific needs of older and disabled people. A combined policy would need to be clear on whether the Wheelchair provision should be on top of Lifetime Home requirements or within Lifetime Home Standards requirements.

KEY EVIDENCE

- www.lifetimehomes.org.uk;
- Habinteg (2006). Wheelchair Housing Design Standard (Second Edition);
- Cambridge City Council (2009) Developing Affordable Housing Policy Guide.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 5/9 Housing for People with Disabilities

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Current building regulations require new developments to have a minimum standard of accessibility to and into the entrance level of a building. However, these minimum statutory standards provide only limited usability within the home for a disabled person.

The Lifetime Homes Standard (November 2011) is a widely used national standard, which uses technical advice to ensure that the spaces and features in and around new homes can readily meet the needs of most people, including those with reduced mobility. The Government's strategy requires all new housing built with public funding to meet the Lifetime Home standard by 2011. In London, the London Plan requires 10% of all new homes to be built to be easily adaptable to become fully wheelchair accessible. Having homes built to the sixteen points of the Lifetime Homes Standard helps to ensure that housing suits householders' needs and changing circumstances. Each design feature adds to the comfort and convenience of the home and supports the changing needs of individuals and families at different stages of life.

However, as noted by the Lifetime Homes website, whilst Lifetime Homes can accommodate or adapt to the needs of many wheelchair users, the standard does not match the enhanced accessibility provided by a property constructed to the Wheelchair Housing Design Standard. The Council's current Affordable Housing Policy Guide requires at least 2% of new Affordable Housing to be fully wheelchair accessible, and a further 8% to meet other specialist needs as required. It also requires all new Affordable Homes to be built to the Lifetime Homes standard as a minimum. In the Council's Housing Strategy 2012 – 2015, the Council aims to review its requirements around the Lifetime Homes Standard for new Affordable Homes, the percentage of wheelchair accessible homes on new developments, and to consider how it can ensure that new homes are designed in a way that disabled adaptations can easily be fitted in the future if required. The Council also confirms that it will continue to identify the need for specialist housing for people with physical and/or sensory disabilities, and explore, in the longer term, how better use can be made of the private sector in helping disabled people to access appropriate housing.

Requiring all new housing development to meet the Lifetime Homes Standard and the Wheelchair Housing Design Standard would help to provide a flexible and adaptable supply of housing to suit the needs and changing circumstances of all members of the community. Whilst option 111 sets out the requirement for all homes to be built to Lifetime Homes standards, such an approach may be overly prescriptive and may place unreasonable costs on the development industry undermining the viability of development. Whilst the internal requirements of Lifetime Homes are fairly straightforward to achieve and relate well to other standards such as the London Plan and Homes and Communities Agency's residential space standards, the external space standards can be more difficult to achieve on all sites, particularly in relation to parking layout and level access. Viability testing of residential development in setting the draft Community Infrastructure Levy charges has factored in Lifetime Homes.

Setting a percentage approach (Option 112) would on the other hand require Development Management officers to ascertain which dwellings were meeting Lifetime Homes and whether this complied with the policy. As Lifetime Homes

design standards can be incorporated into development at an early stage and are already required for all Affordable Housing delivered in the city, it is considered appropriate to set out a requirement for all homes to comply with Lifetime Homes standards.

In setting the need for all dwellings to meet Lifetime Homes Standard, it should be noted that this policy will cover those Lifetime Homes criteria which are not addressed by building regulations, as the Council would wish to avoid duplication. Furthermore, some flexibility will need to be applied in relation to the parking element of Lifetime Homes, as rigid application particularly in high density settings can result in poor urban design. The expectation will be that all homes are designed with the potential to be altered in the future for the changing needs of their occupants.

In relation to the Wheelchair Housing Design standard, it is considered that market and Affordable Housing should be considered in the same manner, subject to viability. It is proposed that a percentage of all housing, split between market and Affordable Housing should be provided as housing which could be adapted to suit the needs of wheelchair users, dependent on the findings of the update to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Joint Needs Assessment work. Whilst dwellings, particularly market housing, may not accommodate a wheelchair user in the first instance, the capacity should be there within the city's housing stock.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH
The recommendation is to pursue Options 111 and 113 to set out a requirement for all homes to comply with those Lifetime Homes criteria which are not addressed by building regulations a percentage of all housing, split between market and Affordable Housing should be provided as housing which could be adapted to suit the needs of wheelchair users, dependent on the findings of the update to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Joint Needs Assessment work.

ISSUE: SMALL SCALE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND INFILL DEVELOPMENT IN REAR GARDENS

Total representations: 128	
Object:	
Option 114: 14	Option 115: 7
Support:	
Option 114: 49	Option 115: 58

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 114: Criteria based policy for small scale residential development and infill development in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measured policy option which does not preclude development where appropriate and design standards are high; • Option 114 is preferable to Option 115, which does not provide sufficient flexibility to consider local circumstances for infill development in rear gardens.

the rear of gardens	<p>Option 114 provides adequate criteria to ensure such development is appropriate;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The option helps provide additional housing with a variety of designs to enhance the city’s landscape; • It reduces the pressure on Green Belt land; • Gardens are a precious commodity and a defining quality to areas; • Loss of amenity space coupled with problems posed by flooding make this option unwise; • Deterioration of quality of life.
Option 115: Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection should be given to gardens with mature trees; • Gardens are vital for biodiversity; • Gardens are a precious commodity and a defining quality to areas; • Gardens are an important part of reducing flood risk; • Very specific local circumstances could support this approach; • There is a presumption against development of gardens; • Deterioration of quality of life; Whilst welcoming a tougher policy stance on infill development in rear gardens, this should not preclude redevelopment on derelict sites; • Option 114 is preferable to Option 115, which does not provide sufficient flexibility to consider local circumstances for infill development in rear gardens. Option 114 provides adequate criteria to ensure such development is appropriate; • This option does not result in a balanced approach; • The amount of green space in residential areas needs addressing; • Need to restrict infill in existing areas of high density development.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
<p>One respondent suggested that there should be a hierarchy to 'sites' based on back gardens. If the garden is too large then sub-division into garden and allotment should be the first consideration. If there is a general agreement in an area that their gardens are too large amalgamation to provide public open space or amenity, e.g. tennis courts, should be the next consideration. This would preserve the benefit of green space within the city without making demands on infrastructure. Another respondent suggested a combination of both options, whilst another respondent suggested that permitted development rights needed to be restricted so that buildings in back gardens cannot become residential accommodation.</p>	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Option 114 is likely to help increase delivery of much-needed new housing in Cambridge. However, this is likely, depending on location, to be at the cost of biodiversity and green infrastructure, flood risk including climate change adaptation, and landscape. However, in areas of existing low density development or where existing buildings are demolished, this policy could potentially achieve new housing without compromising sustainable communities. Potential adverse effects of this option would be most acutely felt in areas already experiencing significant pressure on green space within the urban area. This option is likely to increase pressures on levels of personal car use, including pressures on car parking,

Option 114 should consider requiring any infill developments to be car free and provide adequate provision for cycle parking in line with that proposed in options 192 and 195, except in exceptional circumstances (e.g. to enable provision for dedicated car parking for a wheelchair accessible home).

The option to restrict infill development (115) would potentially restrict the potential delivery of much needed housing, although the wording to require 'very specific local circumstances' suggests this option would be developed to minimise its application. It would help contribute positively to addressing many sustainability issues relating to biodiversity and green infrastructure and maintaining local townscape. This option (115) would still support development. The extent to which option 115 would affect Transport, Flood Risk, Climate Change and particular areas is uncertain due to lack of detail.

KEY EVIDENCE

- National Planning Policy Framework (2012);
- Cambridge City Council Conservation Area Appraisals (various dates) – provide contextual information.
- Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006
- Cambridge City Council Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document (June 2007)
- Cambridge City Council Nature Conservation Strategy (November 2006)

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

-

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

In recent years, the issue of garden development (sometimes known as 'garden grabbing') has become a contentious issue. The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 53) states that "Local planning authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area." Additionally, the definition of previously developed land within the National Planning Policy Framework excludes private residential gardens.

In many cases, though, development on garden land may be regarded as entirely appropriate and there are many clear, definable benefits to such development. They

reduce the need to extend development out into the Green Belt and the wider countryside, create new homes without the need for significant additional infrastructure provision, provide better utilisation of land in areas where people no longer require large gardens due to changing lifestyles, and they may provide small sites appropriate for local developers who employ local people. For these reasons, garden land development may add to housing stock in ways that are sustainable and which meet identified local housing need.

There are also many arguments against developing on gardens. They may lead to increased building mass, loss of character, increased population density and a gradual associated increase in demand on local infrastructure. Environmentally, garden development can result in a loss of green space and paving over gardens; a reduction in habitats and biodiversity; and an increased risk of flash flooding due to increased run off.

Whilst new residential development is welcomed in addressing housing need, the development of existing gardens or curtilages needs to be handled carefully in order to avoid creating developments, which adversely affect the amenities of local residents and the character of the area. It is considered that there is a need to have a measured policy approach, which does not preclude development, where appropriate. As such, given the mixed character, density and form of existing residential development within the city, it is appropriate to take forward a criteria based approach, which would allow flexibility to consider local circumstances.

This policy approach would cover sites where:

- an existing house is retained and new dwellings are erected in the garden area or curtilage;
- the existing buildings are demolished and the plot(s) sub-divided in order to make way for further residential development.

Reference would not merely be made to infill development within rear gardens, as this type of development can affect the whole curtilage of a property.

The proposed criteria based policy would be positively worded and would include criteria on the following issues:

- The character and appearance of the area;
- Form and density of the proposed development;
- Amenities of neighbouring properties;
- Provision of adequate amenity space, vehicular access arrangements and parking spaces for the proposed and existing properties;
- Effect on the comprehensive development of the wider area.

In terms of alternative options, there was a suggestion that there should be a hierarchy to 'sites' based on back gardens, which could lead to large gardens being subdivided and used for public open space or amenity. Due to the challenges of land assembly, this approach will not be pursued through the Local Plan Review. In relation to restricting permitted development rights in order to prevent buildings in back gardens from becoming residential accommodation, this cannot be undertaken

through the Local Plan Review process. It would need to result from either national changes to permitted development rights or through the introduction of an Article 4 direction.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 114, which comprises a criteria-based policy for infill development affecting gardens. Option 115 will not be pursued as it is considered to be too restrictive.

ISSUE: HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO)

Total representations: 43

Object: 20

Support: 23

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 116: Criteria based policy for HMOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for a policy was largely supported by respondents. Particular reference was made to the need for a cap on the number of HMOs in a given area. • The designation of three storeys seems out of date with so many houses having loft conversions; • Inhabitants of large HMOs are often transient and some landlords do not keep their properties in a good state of repair; • Would like to see specific policy that deters the conversion of large family homes to HMOs; • There should be a requirement for all licensed HMOs to lodge contact details for their owners and managers with local police or on the City Council website, so neighbours can have immediate access in cases of anti-social behaviour or emergencies; • Restrictions on car ownership and parking permits should be considered; • Many small houses in Romsey don't count as HMOs due to being on two storeys, but are overcrowded and provide poor living conditions; • Largest properties need improved regulation, without limiting the contribution that flexible shared housing makes to local housing provision; • There should be a review and improvement plan for the private rented sector. • Car parking is often a vexed issue with HMOs, so it is welcome to see it covered in the criteria; • Where respondents objected, it was based on the impact that restrictive criteria on HMOs could have on the Cambridge housing market; and upon the difficulty of enforcing such a policy. A number of Colleges and Anglia

	<p>Ruskin University responded in objection due to the impact restrictions could have on students' access to housing. HMOs are an essential sector of the housing stock at the lower end of the housing market. A positive approach should be taken to provision. Para 9.67 states 20% of HMOs are occupied by students. Therefore HMO policy should link in to a supportive policy for the provision of new student accommodation as the demand for both types of housing increases;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HMOs are an important part of the housing market in Cambridge. Cost of housing prices many young people out of the market. There is a shortage of affordable housing and 8,210 people on the Council's waiting list. HMOs play an important role in meeting housing needs and enabling workers who cannot afford to buy to live in the city close to where they work. Restrictions on HMOs will worsen affordability and push rents up; • There is the need to consider cumulative impact of HMOs in a given area, as they impact on availability of family housing and weaken the sense of community in a locality; • The threshold for converting small housing units to HMO should be lowered.
--	---

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

It was suggested that policy should be developed which deterred large family homes from being converted into HMOs. Additionally, it was suggested that area-based policy should be developed to protect family homes in the Mill Road and Glisson Road/Newtown Conservation Area from conversion to HMO. One respondent suggested that the number of HMOs allowed in a given area should be subject to a cap.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Option 116 is likely to contribute positively to Communities and Well Being issues helping provide additional accommodation while ensuring criteria to minimise the potential adverse impacts on neighbouring residential amenity. Option 116's criteria based policy for HMOs would enable HMOs to continue to address a proportion of the affordable housing needs of students, young people and small households reliant on welfare for housing, including those affected by welfare reform challenges to affordability. Criteria should enable actual and perceived threats to amenity to be managed. Where high concentrations of HMOs in an area arise, the option 116 may be inadequate to address these amenity concerns.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Cambridge City Council (2009). Private Sector Housing Condition Survey;
- National HMO Lobby (2008). Balanced communities and studentification: Problems and solutions;
- Strategic Housing Market Assessment;

- Circular 08/2010 Changes to Planning Regulations for Dwellinghouses and Houses in Multiple Occupation;
- Census 2011.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

-

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

In planning terms, HMOs are split into two different use classes, based on the number of occupants:

- A small HMO - this is a shared dwelling house which is occupied by between 3 and 6 unrelated individuals who share basic amenities such as a kitchen or bathroom. This falls into Use Class C4 under the Town and Country Planning Uses Classes Order (2010).
- A larger HMO – this is when there are more than six unrelated individuals sharing basic amenities such as a kitchen or bathroom. This falls into the sui generis class under the Town and Country Planning Uses Classes Order (2010).

All HMOs must meet certain standards of amenity and fire safety.

The change in approach to HMOs stems from amendments made to the Use Classes Order and the General Permitted Development Order on 6 April 2010 to introduce a new class C4: Houses in Multiple Occupation. Initially, the changes made in April 2010 meant that planning permission would be required for any change from a single household dwelling to either a small or a large HMO. However, on 1 October 2010, further changes were made to the General Permitted Development Order, which permitted changes of use to a C4 HMO without the need for planning permission.

The Government's Circular 08/2010 sets out the Government's formal guidance on dealing with HMOs through the planning system. It recognises in paragraph 2 that a high concentration of shared homes can sometimes give rise to problems, especially if too many properties in one area are let to short term tenants with little stake in the local community. The National Planning Policy Framework does not make specific reference to HMOs, but does assert that local planning authorities should identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand (paragraph 50).

According to the Council's Private Sector House Condition Survey 2009¹, there are approximately 5,000 HMOs in the city, making up some 12.6% of the housing stock compared with the national average of just over 2%. Just over 1,000 of these are thought to be occupied by students. Petersfield, Market and Romsey Wards have the greatest number of HMOs in the city due to their central location, which is

¹ Cambridge City Council House Condition Survey 2009: <http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/ccm/content/housing/housing-strategy-and-research/housing-research.en>

popular with students and young professionals.

HMOs form an important part of the housing market in Cambridge. With high house prices and private rents, and a relatively young population, HMOs add to the housing mix and play an important role in meeting a wide range of housing needs, and in helping to prevent homelessness. Cambridge has a high level of private renting at 26.2% of total housing stock in the city², which enables the market to offer the greater flexibility required to meet the very high levels of turnover in the city. A significant proportion of the private rented sector is given over to housing students, and this has acted as a force in driving buy-to-let in the city, with associated implications for the general availability and price of accommodation. Students at the two universities make up approximately 22% of the city's population. Overall, there were 18,243 full-time students enrolled at the University of Cambridge in 2011, including 11,948 undergraduates, and 8,911 students at Anglia Ruskin University in Cambridge, including 7,636 undergraduates. Within the University of Cambridge, Colleges aim to house all of their undergraduates and 90% of their postgraduates. Whilst Anglia Ruskin University has been increasing its stock of student accommodation in recent years, many students remain dependent upon the private rented sector.

Whilst there are a significant number of HMOs inhabited by students, there is also a demand for this type of accommodation from young professionals and economic migrants. HMO accommodation may be subject to further pressures as reforms to the welfare system take effect, particularly amongst under 35s who will no longer be entitled to claim Local Housing Allowance (a form of Housing Benefit) at the single-room rate.

Unfortunately, HMOs are also associated with issues that affect the neighbourhood, which can occur because of poor management of properties. Concentrations of poorly managed HMOs can change the nature of an area, impacting on community cohesion. The conversion of family-size dwellings to HMOs also reduces opportunities for families to buy or rent houses, potentially contributing to the high cost of housing in the city. It is recognised that issues can sometimes arise if there are high concentrations of this type of accommodation. Issues can include:

- Additional need for car and cycle parking provision;
- Inadequate bin storage space with associated difficulties for refuse collection;
- Anti-social behaviour and the consequential impact on other residents and the local community where properties are poorly managed; and
- Poor internal conditions such as poor amenities and overcrowding, which can often have an adverse impact on the health, safety and welfare of occupiers and neighbours.

Given the potential issues associated with HMOs, it is considered reasonable to include an option outlining the factors that need to be taken into consideration

² Census 2011

when making decisions on relevant planning applications. Given that HMOs will generally accommodate a greater number of adults than an equivalent sized family dwelling, it is considered important to set out specific criteria in the HMO policy to require full consideration of these aspects of development, when creating an HMO. This approach does not restrict or limit HMOs in a specific geographical area and is consistent with national guidance and the current approach set out in the 2006 Local Plan.

Conversely, setting out a policy with a presumption against further HMO development is not considered to represent a sustainable approach as it does not provide sufficient local flexibility in tenure and household composition. Whilst there may be concerns that over-concentrations of HMOs lead to unbalanced and transient local populations, and can give rise to problems for communities, the adoption of areas of restraint for HMOs or use of a threshold based policy would require a significant evidence base, which would require consistent updating. Restrictive approaches could have a negative impact on the local housing market and could also prove difficult to enforce. Whilst a case could potentially be made for introducing a cap on the number of HMOs in a given area, there is a lack of evidence to prove the need for a cap. Such an evidence base would be costly to produce and would need to be maintained. Given that the broad thrust of the Plan welcomes the vitality and vibrancy that the students and workers involved in universities and the knowledge-based economy brings to Cambridge, on balance it is considered that the case for introducing a cap has not been made.

In order to allow further development of HMOs, where the quality of the HMO itself is appropriate and there is no adverse impact on neighbourhood amenity, it is considered appropriate to develop a criteria based approach for HMOs in tandem with policies supporting the delivery of appropriately located purpose-built student accommodation and addressing the conversion of large properties (Option 118). It should be noted that new HMOs may not be eligible for parking permits in areas of the city where controlled parking zones are in place. In those areas of the city, without controlled parking zones, the Council would not be able to restrict the number of vehicles associated with an HMO.

The criteria based approach would include the following criteria:

- Consideration of potential impact on the residential amenity of the local area including noise from concentrations of these uses;
- Suitability of the building or site including any outbuildings and whether appropriate bin storage, cycle and car parking and drying areas can be provided;
- Proximity to bus stops, pedestrian and cycle routes, and shops and other local services; and
- Appropriate management arrangements are in place in order to reduce anti-social behaviour and any adverse impact on local residents.

This policy would only apply where an application for planning permission is required

for a large HMO (sui generis).

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 116, which sets out a criteria based approach, recognising the contribution that HMOs make to the overall supply of housing in Cambridge.

ISSUE: SPECIALIST HOUSING

Total representations: 27

Object: 6

Support: 21

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 117: Specialist Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support for the principle of the option;• Support for large, high quality retirement homes;• Need for bungalows for the elderly;• Housing cooperatives should be given more consideration;• Need to separate specialist housing from affordable housing categories;• Residents of specialist housing should have good access to safe and secure open space. It is important to health and well-being;• Whilst supporting the need for a policy, caution should be exercised in specifying amenity space requirements for accommodation for the elderly;• Specialist accommodation should be available within communities so that people can remain within their existing community even if they require more care;• Any policy relating to specialist housing must take into account the market's ability to deliver such provision and other site-specific demands;• Specialist housing should be close to a local centre.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
No additional options have been suggested.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

This Option will positively contribute to addressing key issues identified in the Communities and Well being Topic. In particular, it will support the provision of accommodation for the existing and future population, including older people, disabled people, including those with learning or mental health conditions and those in poor health. Specific consideration to the proposal's provision of suitable and safe amenity space and its proximity to local shops, services and community facilities should support residents' well being and provide easy access to sustainable forms of transport. However, there is a risk that these criteria, if imposed inflexibly, could be used as a means of resisting location of specialist housing in neighbourhoods, restricting options for the location of such provision unfairly, especially where the intended usage is to house particular groups, e.g. young people on remand, people with mental health conditions.

KEY EVIDENCE

- Cambridgeshire County Council (2011). The Supporting People Commissioning Strategy 2011-2015;
- Cambridgeshire County Council (2011). Commissioning Strategy for Extra Care Sheltered Housing in Cambridgeshire 2011-15.
- Cambridge City Council (2012) Housing Strategy 2012 - 2015
- Cambridge City Council, Older People's Housing Strategy 2009 - 2014

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 5/7 Supported Housing/Housing in Multiple Occupation

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

One of the objectives in the Council's Housing Strategy is to ensure that housing meets the needs of people who are at a disadvantage, and supported housing, in a range of tenures, adds to the mix and range of housing to meet a variety of needs. It is therefore important that the Local Plan accommodates the provision of housing that may be designed in a particular way or has a staff office or staff night-time facilities when staff are needed to support the people who are living in the housing. This housing can often demand a larger plot or building 'footprint' and is often termed as 'supported housing', although in some cases, such as fully wheelchair accessible housing, the person living in the property may not need support to live independently. Such housing should be provided across the city, as opposed to being concentrated in certain areas, to help to enable people moving into such accommodation to remain in their local area and to create and maintain balanced communities.

Specialist housing can be developed with particular groups of people in mind such as older people (including the frail elderly and those with dementia), people with physical and sensory disabilities, those with learning difficulties or acquired brain injury, young people at risk, people with alcohol or drug dependency, those requiring refuge from harassment and violence, and others who may, for a variety of reasons, be excluded from the local community. People with the need for specialist housing contribute to the community in many ways, but for some their ability to participate

fully in society is hampered by poor or inappropriate housing, which affects their physical or mental health, or their ability to get out and about.

Specialist housing is intended to enable people to live as independently as possible, but is designed so that support can be provided to them (and often to others in the wider community) from on-site. Examples may range from a small scheme of cluster flats with additional facilities for support staff, to much larger extra care schemes enabling older and disabled people to live in their own self-contained accommodation but with care and support on-site. Where possible, such housing should be designed flexibly so that it can be adapted to meet alternative housing uses as needs change in the future.

Although some groups will continue to require specialist housing, this needs to be balanced with the current general direction of travel for health and social care commissioning, which includes enabling and supporting people to remain in their own homes, and being able to retain their independence for as long as possible. This is reflected in the Cambridgeshire Supporting People Commissioning Strategy, which aims to reduce the amount of adult social care funded services in specialist accommodation, in favour of supporting people in their own homes where possible.

Extra care housing for older people is an example where local health and social care commissioners remain supportive of specially designed housing. Extra Care provides self-contained housing, but with other facilities provided on-site where people can receive care and support but still retain their independence, as opposed to residential care homes where occupants do not have their own tenure or 'own front door'. The Cambridgeshire Extra Care Commissioning Strategy 2011 (2011 – 2015) outlines the extra care housing priorities for Cambridgeshire. A current issue for local health and social care commissioners is where private market care homes for older people may achieve planning approval without reference to the demands they will place on local care and health revenue budgets.

The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the importance of planning for a mix of housing to meet different groups in the community. However, the location of provision needs careful consideration and should be in accordance with locally identified need. On this basis, only one reasonable option was considered appropriate for inclusion in the Issues and Options consultation in Summer 2012. This option's approach would allow for development of a policy relating to all types of specialist housing, including extra care provision for older people, to be developed. There was support for the principle of the option. Specific reference will be made in the criteria to the need for residents of specialist housing to have good access to safe and secure open space for their health and well-being and need for such provision to be in close proximity to local services. This promotes the need for specialist housing to form part of sustainable, mixed and balanced communities. With particular reference to older people, in Cambridge, over a third of people aged 60 plus have no access to a car, and this percentage increases with age, so the need for good public transport, local amenities and welcoming neighbourhoods is significant.

In combination with other relevant policies within the Local Plan, when assessing the suitability for supported care housing and care homes, the following should be taken into consideration:

- The location of such provision, including the proximity of the site to public transport facilities, the provision of a safe, accessible and secure environment and the convenience of the site's location in relation to local shops, services and community facilities;
- The location of such provision in relation to other similar accommodation;
- The provision of an adequate level of amenity space which is safe and suitable; and
- There is evidence of demonstrable need in accordance with the Council's Housing Strategy, Cambridgeshire County Council and local health commissioning strategies and, where appropriate, the Extra Care Commissioning Strategy for Cambridgeshire and its successor documents.

This option allows specific proposals to come forward in accordance with local need.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 117 on specialist housing, which would set out a criteria based approach to the delivery of all types of specialist housing.

ISSUE: OTHER OPPORTUNITIES TO PROVIDE NEW HOUSING

Total representations: 16

Object: 3

Support: 13

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 118: Opportunities for providing new housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option was supported by all respondents to this issue. Concern was raised that it should be designed to avoid short-term thinking and to ensure that opportunistic development does not result in a skewing of the overall housing mix in a given area; • Emphasis should be less on the need to create new units of accommodation and more on the need to retain the existing variety of stock suitable for different household sizes; • There should always be the presumption particularly for buildings of historic interest and in conservation areas that any conversion returns the house or building to its original use; • Identify empty houses to be repaired and brought back into use (perhaps using council loans to be paid back once a house is let or sold); • Identify derelict sites on residential streets, which could

	<p>be used for small amounts of housing (e.g. the old tapes shop on Gwydir Street);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Older buildings and those not in use should be renovated to address housing needs before there are schemes for large scale housing developments that lack community infrastructure.
--	---

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

No additional options have been suggested.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

This option cannot be effectively appraised as it is not an option per se, but an option on whether there should be a policy or not. It is assumed that this Policy would aim to maximise the provision of new housing while ensuring it does not lead to the loss of family accommodation; and that any proposal is built to Decent Homes Standards and Housing Health and Safety Rating System, and would not lead to overcrowding. In this case this option would help ensure the size and design of new homes are appropriate to the existing and future population and reduce housing pressure on other land uses, such as open space; thus helping to contribute positively to the Communities and Well Being Issues. The extent to which this option would affect different areas in Cambridge is uncertain.

KEY EVIDENCE

- National Planning Policy Framework (2012)
- The Cambridge Sub-region Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2008 and updates).
- Cambridge City Council (2012) Housing Strategy 2012 – 2015.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 5/2 Conversion of Large Properties;
- Policy 5/3 Housing Lost to Other Uses;
- Policy 5/4 Loss of Housing.

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Given the need for housing in Cambridge, it will be important for the Local Plan to ensure that opportunities to provide new housing are explored and that the risk of losing housing to other uses is minimised. Whilst it is not the role of the Local Plan to bring empty homes back into use, their importance has been recognised by the Council. According to the Council’s Housing Strategy (2012 – 15), the number of homes in the City which have been empty for more than 6 months at any one time has remained fairly steady over recent years at around 70. Although the number of long-term empty homes in Cambridge is well below the national average, dealing with empty homes was identified as a high priority by respondents to the Housing Strategy; and with such pressure on housing in and around Cambridge, the Council needs to continue to prioritise bringing long-term empty homes back into use.

Whilst the sub-division of large properties into additional dwellings makes a useful

contribution towards the overall housing need in the city, it can lead to the loss of family accommodation and in some cases, a loss of historic character. There is a need to ensure that any proposals would result in satisfactory living environment, without overcrowding, and that the quality of Cambridge's historic environment is preserved and enhanced. Ensuring satisfactory living arrangements is a factor when considering the retention or redevelopment of existing housing along with any opportunities to return appropriate buildings back to their original housing use. Whilst it is important to retain existing housing wherever possible, this needs to be balanced against other objectives and priorities, including the need for other uses and the National Planning Policy Framework's requirements for flexibility and responsiveness to changing economic circumstances.

In some cases, it will be appropriate to replace poorly designed housing or housing that is no longer cost-effective to repair and maintain with housing that meets modern standards of design, layout and energy efficiency. The current Local Plan includes policies relating to the conversion of large properties and the loss of housing. In accordance with national guidance, it is considered reasonable to continue with this approach on the basis that it is the most appropriate way of ensuring that opportunities to provide new housing are explored and suitable living environments are achieved. This approach has been supported by respondents to the Issues and Options consultation.

Pursuing this option would allow for the development of a series of policies which address the conversion of large properties and the loss of housing to other uses. This approach is consistent with national guidance and helps to maximise opportunities to increase housing supply in Cambridge to meet need. However, a balanced approach must be taken and consideration given to the needs of other uses.

In relation to the conversion of large properties to a greater number of smaller units, a criteria based approach should set out the need for the development to have a satisfactory standard of amenity for its occupiers and neighbouring properties; consideration of the impact on on-street parking and the character of the area; and refuse and cycle storage.

In terms of loss of housing to other uses, this will be permitted, where it can be demonstrated that the property is not suitable for habitation and is not capable of restoration; it is a subsidiary part of a non-residential property and has no separate access or potential for separate access; the accommodation will be replaced by an equivalent amount of residential floorspace in the new development; it is necessary for the provision of community facilities in Cambridge; it is a Listed building which would be better safeguarded by change of use.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue criteria based policies addressing the conversion of large properties and the loss of housing to other uses.

ISSUE: PROVISION FOR GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS

Total representations: 89	
Object: 51	Support: 38

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 119: Criteria based policy for the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gypsies and Travellers are the largest minority group comprising 1% of the population in our region, yet the Council suggests only 1 pitch is required between 2011-2031. The Cambridge Sub-Region Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTANA) 2011) seriously underestimates the need for permanent pitches in Cambridgeshire. The Assessment was carried out by the local authorities themselves as a technical exercise; • The gradient of inequalities may be steeper than reported here. The recent inequalities report from the DCLG includes the following statement in relation to life expectancy "...a recent study stated that the general population were living up to 50% longer than Gypsies and Travellers"; • Wording should be more careful on whether Gypsies and Travellers travel; • There is a need for Travellers to have better access to education; • This does not sufficiently recognise the extent to which Travellers have been forced into Council accommodation against their wishes and in a way which erodes their culture, and nor does it reflect the detrimental effects of being forced into council housing; • A significant part of the demand for new pitches is from Gypsies and Travellers moving from bricks and mortar into private sites. The numbers seriously underestimate the numbers involved; • Needs to be independent consultation with the Traveller community; • Consideration should be given to a transit site near Addenbrooke's; • Need to continue working with South Cambridgeshire to progress pitch provision. • The requirement that 'There should not be an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents or the appearance or character of the surrounding area.' allows for prejudice to determine objections by other residents; • The approach to Traveller sites should be as similar as

	<p>possible to that for housing;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of residential amenity is paramount; • Green Belt land should not be used for Traveller site provision. • Specific site allocations must be made; • Support planning permission for pitches at the existing Smithy Fen site in Cottenham; • Improve current sites and improve transport links to these sites; • Large sites should be possible to allow the Traveller community to thrive in large, mutually supportive, extended family groupings. Amenity blocks and provision for chalets as well as trailers and caravans are all necessary. Without permission for sufficient amenity blocks, proper sanitation will not be possible leading to inhumane living circumstances; • The Council could substantially enhance the prospects for traveller development through a policy to connect the Fen to Cowley Road, providing more direct connection to the trunk road network for heavy vehicles. Given the presence of the railway sidings this is likely to be along the northern boundary of Network Rail's land; • Spend grant funding on provision of new permanent sites with proper amenities; • Provide sites on brownfield uncontaminated sites; • Take on ideas from other existing sites where there is high quality internal and external landscaping to improve amenity for both traveller and settled communities. <p>Sites identified within the urban area during consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land off Coldham's Lane; • A transit site near to Addenbrooke's; <p>Sites identified within the Cambridge Green Belt during consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas on the edge of the city should be set aside for new provision; • A transit site near to Addenbrooke's; • Area adjacent to the new station at Northern Fringe East; • South Cambridgeshire or elsewhere in the county; • Beside Babraham Road Park and Ride site.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
<p>Respondents raised the need for site allocations to be made for Gypsy and Traveller provision.</p>	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

This option is likely to lead to positive effects on a number of Sustainability Topics. The option's specific reference to provision of site(s) within easy access to local services and play and residential amenity spaces should help contribute positively to addressing a number of the Community and Well-Being issues. Recognition of flood risk, site contamination and noise would also help address Community and Well Being issues and ensure account for the potential environmental, economic and social cost of flooding both now and in the future. Including criteria to protect local amenity through appropriate landscaping should help maintain and/or improve the appearance and character of the local area. The extent to which this option would affect different areas of Cambridge would depend on site specific proposals. However, these criteria should be applied in a manner and to a degree that is consistent with that for other forms of new accommodation, to avoid unreasonably discriminating against Gypsies and Travellers in the allocation of new sites, given the significant need for accommodation and the health and well-being costs arising from existing under-provision.

KEY EVIDENCE

- CLG (2012). Planning policy for traveller sites;
- Cambridgeshire County Council (2006). Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment;
- Cambridgeshire County Council (2011). Cambridge Sub-regional Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTANA);
- Cambridge City Council (2012). Cambridge Local Plan Towards 2031: Technical Background Document. Gypsy and Traveller Provision in Cambridge – Site Assessment;
- Cambridge City Council (2012) Housing Strategy 2012-2015.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 5/8 Travellers

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

In March 2012, the Government released national guidance on planning for Gypsy and Traveller sites. The guidance requires that councils set pitch targets to address the likely need, working collaboratively with neighbouring authorities. The guidance has a requirement to maintain a five-year supply of specific deliverable sites against their locally set targets and requires councils to develop criteria based policies to guide site allocations and planning applications for Gypsies and Travellers. There are currently no authorised Gypsy and Traveller sites in Cambridge although there are a number in South Cambridgeshire, some of which are on the edge of the city. There are no unauthorised sites in Cambridge, but small groups of Gypsies and Travellers do sometimes stop by the roadside or on other land in the city whilst passing through or wanting to access services. In 2011, a review of the 2006 Cambridge Sub-Regional Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment was undertaken. For Cambridge, it identified that one permanent pitch was needed between 2011 and 2031. This is related to the natural growth of Gypsies and Traveller family groups

identified as already in Cambridge. In addition to this, there is a need to consider transit or emerging stopping provision for Gypsies and Travellers in the Cambridge area.

Land supply in Cambridge remains limited and there are a number of competing demands. Given the juxtaposition of the built up area alongside the tight administrative boundary, it is difficult to find land that is suitable for site provision. In order to help with this process, the Council needs to develop an appropriate policy in the Local Plan to guide the location of Gypsy and Travellers sites as well as identifying a site or sites suitable for provision. The Council is continuing to work with South Cambridgeshire District Council to identify suitable land.

In accordance with national guidance, one option (119) was put forward for consideration. This option set out the criteria to guide the location of sites for Gypsy and Traveller provision. The criteria outlined are based on previous national guidance, and good practice guidance along with the current requirements sets out in the National Planning Policy Framework. This option would allow for the development of a criteria based policy to guide the location of permanent, transit and emergency stopping provision for Gypsy and Traveller sites in Cambridge. This will include the following criteria:

- The site should be accessible to local services by public transport, on foot or by cycle;
- There should be safe and convenient vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access to the site;
- The site should provide an acceptable living environment and the health and safety including the public health of the residents should not be put at risk. Factors to be taken into account include flood risk, site contamination, air quality and noise;
- There should not be an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents or the appearance or character of the surrounding area. The site should respect the scale of the surrounding area and appropriate boundary treatment and landscaping should be capable of being provided;
- Whether the needs of the residents of the sites could be met without putting undue pressure on local services;
- There should be adequate space for vehicle parking, turning and servicing, storage, play and residential amenity; and
- The site should be served or capable of being served by all necessary utilities including mains water, electricity, drainage and sanitation.

This approach is consistent with national guidance and allows for the needs of Gypsies and Travellers to be taken into consideration along with other factors including consideration of amenity of nearby residents. Without such an approach, the Council would not have an appropriate policy to assess any future proposals. It is considered that this criteria based approach should be taken forward.

In order to make provision for Gypsy and Travellers in Cambridge and find an

appropriate site, or sites, the Council has used the criteria listed in option 119 to guide the assessment of potential sites across the city. This approach is set out in the Gypsy and Traveller Provision in Cambridge – Site Assessment Process 2012. This document sets out relevant background to Gypsy and Traveller provision both nationally and locally, explains the methodology developed and includes information on all the sites that have been assessed as part of this process. This approach is consistent with the detailed approach the Council has taken to preparing the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and has resulted in a thorough assessment of land across the city.

The assessment did not identify any appropriate sites within the built up area of Cambridge for Gypsy and Traveller provision. The assessment did not look at land within the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge on the basis that previous national guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework consider that Gypsy and Travellers' sites are inappropriate development in the Green Belt and should only be approved in very special circumstances. Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, only through the plan making process, and if to meet Travellers' needs sites should be allocated for Travellers only. The Issues and Options consultation asked whether the Council should consider sites within the Green Belt for Gypsy and Traveller provision. Whilst many respondents supported the need for pitch provision, concern was expressed about the potential for provision of sites for Gypsies and Travellers within the Green Belt.

Due to the interrelationship with land in South Cambridgeshire, the City Council remains committed to working in partnership with South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council in order to provide appropriate provision in suitable locations. It was noted that respondents were concerned about transport access to existing sites, with the potential to improve the connections between Fen Road and Cowley Road. This issue will be discussed with Cambridgeshire County Council, the highways authority.

A number of sites were identified within the urban area and in the Cambridge Green Belt during consultation. These sites include:

- Land off Coldham's Lane;
- A transit site near to Addenbrooke's;
- Area adjacent to the new station at Northern Fringe East;
- Beside Babraham Road Park and Ride site.

Land off Coldham's Lane adjacent to Cherry Hinton's lakes is heavily contaminated due to its recent history as a landfill site. This site is not considered suitable for use as a Gypsy and Traveller site. In relation to the sites in the Green Belt, the Council has carried out a broad appraisal of the inner Green Belt boundary areas in the context of recent land releases, and how those releases have affected the revised inner Green Belt boundary. This appraisal was undertaken in May 2012 and sits alongside the Local Plan - Towards 2031 Issues and Options Report (June 2012).

There is a need to consider whether any further development sites in the Cambridge Green Belt should deliver Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision. South Cambridgeshire's Issues and Options 1 consultation in 2012 included consultation on provision of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation. During consultation, South Cambridgeshire District Council asked whether the Local Plan should require site provision for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in all new settlements, and other allocated and windfall developments of at least 500 homes. Given the interdependence of the two authorities, a similar approach could be considered for the city, where within the criteria-based policy, it could state that any allocated or windfall development sites of at least 500 homes would be required to bring forward Gypsy and Traveller site provision in line with locally identified needs. Artificial subdivision of sites to avoid making provision of pitches for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation would not be permitted.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue Option 119, which will set out the criteria to guide the location of sites for Gypsy and Traveller provision. The criteria outlined are based on previous national guidance, and good practice guidance along with the current requirements sets out in the National Planning Policy Framework and planning policy for traveller sites. This option would allow for the development of a criteria based policy to guide the location of permanent, transit and emergency stopping provision for Gypsy and Traveller sites in Cambridge. Given the ongoing need for pitches, Members are also asked to consider whether a policy should be developed that states that any allocated or windfall development sites of at least 500 homes would be required to bring forward Gypsy and Traveller site provision in line with locally identified needs. This could also state that any artificial subdivision of sites to avoid making provision of pitches for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation will not be permitted.

ISSUE: RESIDENTIAL MOORINGS

Total representations: 43	
Object: 14	Support: 29

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 120: Residential moorings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of respondents supported the need to identify areas for new moorings, despite having concerns about the reality of their development and potential for knock-on impacts in a given area. Reference was made to marina provision. Concern was raised that moorings should be provided within the city boundary with standards enforced, equivalent to those which would be required of land dwellings. For example, coal and diesel should not be burned emitting fumes at one to two metre height. • Many respondents supported the need for residential moorings;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New residential moorings should not be at the expense of short-stay tourist moorings; • New residential moorings should not be to the detriment of the riverscape; • Need to consider impact on parking in a locality; • Need to consider amenity of local residents; • Risk of air and water pollution. <p>Sites identified for residential moorings during consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fen Ditton; • Land to the west of the River Cam off Fen Road; • Land to the south-east of Clayhithe Bridge, Waterbeach; • North side of the River Cam, near Fen Road; • Further mooring on the south side of the river on Stourbridge Common.
--	---

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Respondents raised the need for site allocations to be made for residential moorings provision.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Residential moorings have the potential to make a limited contribution to increased housing supply, and when coupled with this option to ensure adequate services, access, and the protection of amenity, should contribute positively to communities and well-being. Criteria to ensure that the ecological value of waterways is maintained should positively influence biodiversity and protect water quality. Flood risk management of moorings will bring benefits, potentially helping to address flood risk issues in North and South Cambridge.

KEY EVIDENCE

- British Waterways (2011). Guidance for Development of new Residential Mooring Sites (England and Wales);
- Cambridge City Council (2006). River Mooring Policy.
- Cambridge City Council, Report to Community Services Scrutiny Committee 12/01/2011 on Riverside – Riparian Ownership and Mooring
- Cambridge City Council, Report to Community Development and Leisure Scrutiny Committee 24/03/2005 on River Moorings
- Cambridge City Council, Report to Community Services Scrutiny Committee 18/01/2007 on Review of Moorings Policy

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Part of Policy 3/9 Watercourses and Other Bodies of Water

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the requirement in paragraph 50 to deliver a wide choice of quality homes and to create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. Whilst representing a very small percentage of housing provision within Cambridge and only being suitable for the needs and housing expectations of a small sector of the population, residential moorings contribute both to the diversity of the city and to the supply of different forms of housing.

The Conservators of the River Cam are the statutory navigation authority, responsible for the maintenance of navigation of the River Cam from the Mill Pond, Silver Street to Bottisham Lock. Working with the Conservators and other stakeholders, the Council is responsible for the management of residential and visitor moorings on the River Cam and has set out its approach to this issue through the development of a moorings management policy. The existing Moorings Policy was initially approved by the Executive Councillor for Community Development and Leisure in March 2005 and was subsequently reviewed in 2006/2007. Within this Moorings Policy, the Council sets fees for residential and visitor mooring licences. The licensing process sets out the Council's expectations in terms of standards of riverworthiness, behaviour and occupancy. This is linked with the Conservators of the River Cam's navigation licensing process.

There is currently calculated to be space on the River Cam within the city for some 70 licensed boats to be moored with sufficient space between moored vessels. This is based on the capacity of the river having been calculated on the amount of available riverbank divided by the average length of a vessel (70ft or 21.34 metres) and an assessment made of the space needed by other river users to access the river. The overall figure of 70 boats includes allowance for 15 wide-beam boats of 2.15 metres or more. Only limited areas of the Cam are suitable for the mooring of boats of this size.

Over the course of the last two decades, the city has seen a gradual increase in the number of boatowners wishing to live permanently on the River Cam and the number of visitors spending time on the city's waterways. A change in mooring management policy in the 1990s gave rise to additional opportunities for residential mooring at Midsummer Common, Stourbridge Common and Jesus Green. Current mooring sites are shown on the Council's Boat Mooring Map (available via Google on the Council's website).

Existing areas for permanent residential moorings include Area B where mooring is permitted for 75 metres on Jubilee Gardens upstream of the weir; Area D2 adjacent to Jesus Green, Areas E1, G and H adjacent to Midsummer Common; and Areas K2 and M adjacent to Stourbridge Common.

Visitors wishing to moor a boat in Cambridge are subject to a maximum 48-hour stay, and are not permitted to return within seven days of leaving. Areas for visitor

moorings are marked with green markers and lines on the Council's Boat Mooring Map. These areas include Area C adjacent to Chesterton Road and Area E2 adjacent to Midsummer Common, outside the Fort St George public house.

Areas for temporary mooring are marked with yellow markers and lines on the Council's Boat Mooring Map. These areas include Area D1 where temporary mooring is permitted for up to two hours from 10am to 4pm upstream of the pump out, and Area K1 where temporary mooring is permitted for up to two hours from 8am to 6pm upstream of the pump out.

Areas where no mooring is permitted are marked with red markers and lines on the Council's Boat Mooring Map. These areas include Area A where no mooring is permitted upstream of the lock and includes 36 metres downstream of the lock. Visiting punts can stay for up to one hour. In Areas F, J, L and N, no mooring is permitted at all.

New residential moorings require planning permission and need access to adequate services including water supply, electricity, and disposal facilities for sewage and rubbish. Access is also required for emergency vehicles. New moorings should not have a negative impact on the amenity, conservation and ecological value of the river. Mooring facilities are defined as either on-line or off-line. On-line moorings are often merely linear moorings along the riverbank itself, whilst off-line moorings involve boats navigating into a separate engineered basin or larger marina separate from the river.

The majority of respondents supported the need to have a policy on provision of residential moorings and identify areas for new moorings, despite having concerns about the reality of their development and potential for knock-on impacts in a given area. Reference was made to off-line moorings in the form of marina provision. Concern was raised that any mooring provided within the city boundary with should have standards enforced, equivalent to those which would be required of land dwellings. For example, coal and diesel should not be burned emitting fumes at one to two metres in height.

Whilst there is demand for new residential and visitor moorings within Cambridge, it is recognised that there is limited suitable space available in the city. In addition to the need to continue to balance the needs of the long-term residential moorings against those of the short-term visitor moorings, which can support tourism in Cambridge, there is a balance to be struck between maintaining and increasing the number of areas available for residential and visitor moorings and the needs of other users of the river, including commercial operators, anglers, rowers and rowing clubs and other local residents. Notwithstanding the needs of other users of the river, other key issues for the provision of new residential moorings include the need to consider the potential impact on the river itself and the surrounding landscape/townscape; parking levels in the surrounding area; the amenity of other local residents. It is considered that the development of a criteria-based policy for residential moorings would address the potential to deliver further moorings whilst

recognising the need to maintain the quality of the riparian environment and safeguard local amenity. Such a criteria based approach would include reference to the following issues:

- Integration with the local landscape/townscape;
- Provision of appropriate servicing, e.g. water supply and disposal of sewage and refuse;
- Provision of appropriate pedestrian and vehicular access;
- Protection of the surrounding natural and historic environment;
- Proximity to existing services and amenities;
- Safeguarding of local amenity with no adverse effect on neighbouring properties;
- Protection of pedestrian and cycle routes and ongoing navigation of the River Cam.

Many of the sites identified for residential moorings during consultation are not situated within Cambridge's administrative boundary. As such, these sites cannot be allocated for residential moorings provision by Cambridge City Council. Sites put forward in South Cambridgeshire include:

- Fen Ditton;
- Land to the west of the River Cam off Fen Road;
- Land to the south-east of Clayhithe Bridge, Waterbeach.

Within Cambridge's administrative boundary, two sites were put forward for further consideration:

- North side of the River Cam, near Fen Road;
- Further mooring on the south side of the river on Stourbridge Common.

A site of 0.98ha on the northern bank of the River Cam, lying south-east of Fen Road, was allocated in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 for off-river moorings. This site is owned by the Conservators of the River Cam and has not come forward for development since 2006. This site has been consulted on as part of the Issues and Options 2 consultation (Site reference RM1 – Fen Road) for allocation as off-river moorings and lies directly adjacent to Option CF1 – Residential Mooring at Fen Road in South Cambridgeshire's Issues and Options 2, Part 2 consultation.

The provision of further moorings on the southern side of the River Cam at Stourbridge Common was also considered in drawing up sites for consultation as a part of Issues and Options 2 consultation. Officers responsible for managing moorings within the city confirmed that all possible mooring areas are already in use in this location. Further moorings may impact negatively upon the navigation of the river and its heavy recreational use. Consultation on the management of moorings on nearby Riverside is scheduled to take place in the near future, which may impact on the number of moorings available within the city.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue a criteria-based policy for residential moorings, which would include criteria suitable for development management use for both on-line and off-line moorings.

APPENDIX B - ANALYSIS, RESPONSES AND PREFERRED APPROACH TO HOUSING PLUS SUMMARIES OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.21

11416 Object

Summary:

The UK already has a very high share of social rental stock as a % of both total rental stock and total housing stock relative to other European countries and it doesn't seem to be doing the trick (in fact, it probably contributes to difficult housing market). But this is almost too difficult a debate to have at the City level.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 97 - Specified tenure mix

15883 Object

Summary:

It is not considered that a prescribed tenure mix would be appropriate, as this would place added constraints on the market. Any policy should be flexible enough to respond to site specific circumstances (for example, exceptional costs of development). The demand for private rented accommodation in Cambridge is thought to be increasing and this could form part of the solution to meeting Cambridge's affordable housing requirements. Land at Coldham's Lane, Cherry Hinton is available, suitable and deliverable as a new residential development. The proposed remediation strategy and the implementation of a new area of Strategic Open Space could impact upon the viability of the scheme. The policy should recognise the wider regeneration benefits of development and be applied on a flexible basis.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 97 - Specified tenure mix

17442 Support

Summary:

Affordable %s - The policy supporting a minimum of 75% of the 40% to be housing for rent should be retained

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 98 - Tenure mix

13936 Support

Summary:

Tenure mix should not be set out in the Local Plan since flexibility is required to take account of changes in housing requirements and also other factors such as funding provision and Central Government specifications.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.9

9199 Support

Summary:

Perhaps there could also be an overall quota for new student rooms, so they do not substantially reduce the figures arrived at in Options 2 to 5.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.9

17936 Object

Summary:

Yes - The University should consider more cost effective options to house their students, or look to substantially improve the current accommodation so it is more environmentally friendly.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

7691 Support

Summary:

I think there is a need for a policy, but that the 75%/25% mix is not right. More like 50/50 -- the ratio is very important to make it work.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

8109 Support**Summary:**

Policy desirable

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

9471 Support**Summary:**

We agree with this and therefore it is important to look beyond the city boundaries for housing.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

12031 Support**Summary:**

Yes, policy needed

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

13160 Object**Summary:**

There is no need for a policy addressing this issue. A fixed tenure mix does not allow for flexibility within new developments - to respond to site-specific demands and deliver a sustainable mix and tenure of residential uses, creating a mixed and balanced community.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

13285 Object**Summary:**

At present, the Council's Local Plan does not specify a tenure mix for new housing development which our client supports as being the most suitable option for moving forward to allow for full flexibility taking into account the individual circumstances of sites, their surrounding area and local housing needs, and their development viability. This would ensure that the Council complies with NPPF paragraph 21 which states that investment in business should not be overburdened by the combined requirements of planning policy expectations.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

15264 Object**Summary:**

Tenure mix is a nice idea but rent is only part of the equation. Council tax levels vary according to the sale value of properties in any location so a dwelling that would be band B in Arbury or Kings Hedges will be in a higher band up to Band F elsewhere for the same specification

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

15731 Support**Summary:**

We support a policy of both tenure mix and housing mix, in order to provide a variety of housing choice. Any policy would need to be flexible and capable of adjusting to other demands over the plan period. There is no point building homes that cannot be sold or let.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

17937 Support

Summary:

Yes - Option 98 which is the current policy

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

18230 Object

Summary:

We do not feel that there is a need for a new policy addressing this issue, and would support Option 98. Rather, it is better to keep this out of actual policy as it would be too prescriptive and not flexible enough.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.10

18314 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.11

12032 Object

Summary:

All housing needs to be affordable whether it is owned or not owned by the occupier. The relationship between tenure type and housing demand needs a greater range of ways of living. But all the forces on the economy and environment of Cambridge are complex and a fixed plan to last until 2031 will challenge its effectiveness.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.11

13164 Support

Summary:

Option 98 allows for future flexibility to respond to site-specific development needs.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.11

15735 Support

Summary:

The policy should be able to respond to the needs of particular areas where demand may well differ. The need in East Chesterton is to respond to the demand for market and affordable housing which will provide for existing families and developers should be discouraged from aiming to build expensive homes for wealthy incomers or an overreliance on one and two bed properties. Tenure and housing mix should contribute to the overall social and community character of the area.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.11

17938 Support

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.11

18315 Object

Summary:

All housing needs to be affordable whether it is owned or not owned by the occupier. The relationship between tenure type and housing demand needs a greater range of ways of living. But all the forces on the economy and environment of Cambridge are complex and a fixed plan to last until 2031 will challenge its effectiveness.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.12

8110 Support

Summary:

Support 98 as greater flexibility

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.12

9200 Support

Summary:

Option 98 - retains flexibility

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.12

9472 Support

Summary:

Option 98

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.12

12035 Support

Summary:

Option 98 - specified through the SHMA

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.12

14099 Support

Summary:

Option 98

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.12

17939 Support

Summary:

Option 98 which is the current policy in place.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.12

18316 Support

Summary:

Option 98 - specified through the SHMA

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.25

12548 Support**Summary:**

I think that this would potentially prevent Cambridge encouraging out-commuting and becoming a commuter town but the purchase and construction of housing must be seen to be at normal market rates - anything less would be challenged legally?

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 99 - Employment related housing

10426 Object**Summary:**

What happens when a person in employment related housing ceases to be employed in the qualifying posts? This just leads to difficulties and distress. Remember farm labourers cottages.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 99 - Employment related housing

12470 Support**Summary:**

This will go some way to preventing new housing simply being taken by London commuters.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 99 - Employment related housing

12553 Support**Summary:**

I broadly support this but it must be looked into very carefully - some of the emerging issues with the University's North West Cambridge site that are now surfacing (resentment about affordable housing etc) could surface again - but it would help encourage local working and reduce commuting.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 99 - Employment related housing

13001 Object**Summary:**

I don't agree with the idea of employment-related housing - most people want to live some distance from their employers, or at least don't want to be 'owned' by them; and in any case, people do not want to live next door to the people they work with (they probably see enough of them at work!). I also worry that changing key worker definitions could cause problems (everyone's jobs are important and everyone contributes to the economy in some way). Also, why is the 'high tech' economy specified as the area towards which an eligible business would have to contribute?

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 99 - Employment related housing

13907 Object**Summary:**

I strongly oppose this proposed policy. I think it would be divisive and split the city. Employers will gain too much power over too wider an aspect of the lives of their staff, to the detriment of those staff members' freedom.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 99 - Employment related housing

13940 Object

Summary:

There is clearly a need for affordable housing provision, given the extent of demand within the Cambridge area. However, at this stage there remains insufficient information and evidence that there are locally specific circumstances to require the delivery of affordable housing as a result of employment development.

The most appropriate way to address the need for affordable housing in Cambridge is to ensure that the new Local Plan provides sufficient housing to address this issue.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 99 - Employment related housing

15265 Support

Summary:

Specifying who should occupy particular housing should be avoided but there may be some cases where a 'tied cottage' is appropriate.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 99 - Employment related housing

16530 Object

Summary:

Would this requirement restrict the freedom of employers or institutions to provide for their own employees?

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 99 - Employment related housing

16902 Support

Summary:

This policy would complement that above (option 91) in requiring large local employers to secure housing for key workers, and we support it. We also believe that it might encourage larger firms to consider locations other than the city centre as well as their responsibility to the local economy.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.13

12025 Object

Summary:

Yes. Produce a framework and not a plan. Employment and housing need is in a constant state of flux. Monitoring and responding over much shorter time cycles than fixing it until 2031 would be a more robust approach.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.13

18231 Object

Summary:

A suggestion would be to tie in key workers to housing associations.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.13

18317 Object

Summary:

Yes. Produce a framework and not a plan. Employment and housing need is in a constant state of flux. Monitoring and responding over much shorter time cycles than fixing it until 2031 would be a more robust approach.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

7001 Support

Summary:

Yes, there is a need for such a policy - and I would support the policy entitled Option 99.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

9474 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

10726 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

11238 Support

Summary:

We would support such a policy framework as suggested by Option 99 and will expect further consultation with the City Council on this particular issue.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

12044 Support

Summary:

Yes, policy needed.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

12138 Support

Summary:

The University would support a policy encouraging the provision of key worker housing for specific institutions in Cambridge - which should include the University and Colleges as major employers within key employment sectors in the City.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

13003 Object

Summary:

No, I do not believe we need a policy on this.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

14104 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

14388 Support**Summary:**

There are a large number of low-paid key workers who cannot afford to live in Cambridge at the moment. As local transport gets worse (cutting of bus services to the villages) this becomes even more important.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

15740 Object**Summary:**

Option 99 in principal is sensible but would need to contain safeguards to ensure that there is provision for a full range of employees. North west Cambridge for example excludes most low paid workers from the planned university housing and this may well create an enclave which is not beneficial to the City or to a diverse and cohesive community.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

16186 Object**Summary:**

There should be no policy requiring employment development to provide key worker housing.

Having to provide key worker housing will be a disincentive to economic development and growth.

If such a policy is adopted there are very real concerns that businesses will be dissuaded from locating in Cambridge and may look to invest elsewhere, even outside of the UK. If this policy was allowed to develop and therefore to 'bite' on this and other employment sites it might very well deter new business investment into Cambridge and even existing employers from expanding their sites within Cambridge

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

16532 Support**Summary:**

Yes.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

16832 Support**Summary:**

Yes, employers should be required to provide some accommodation for workers by funding and working with registered housing providers. Romsey badly needs affordable three bedroom family houses and properties for the over 60s so that people can move on as they get older. This will help to make the area sustainable. Too much student housing has been built in Romsey since the last local plan.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

16885 Support**Summary:**

There are many areas of the workforce that are essential to the proper operation of the city and as such a policy should be used in seeking to provide affordable accommodation for those workers when and where it is needed.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

17445 Support

Summary:

Key worker housing - this policy should be secondary to enforcing requirements for affordable housing, so that lower paid workers who need affordable local rental accommodation are better protected.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

17940 Support

Summary:

Yes - as suggested.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

18232 Support

Summary:

It would seem sensible in Cambridge with regard to large employers such as the University and Addenbrooke's to adopt a policy such as Option 99.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.14

18318 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

7761 Support

Summary:

May need to specify key worker housing but have an option for opening up to a wider audience after a certain period if not taken up. Key workers are only a tiny proportion of those in housing need.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

9201 Support

Summary:

Should be restricted to those on nationally-agreed salary scales in either higher education, the NHS or the emergency services. Other employees, including the County Council for schools, and both City and County Councils and locally-based central government bodies for their own staff, should have to pay realistic wages and salaries to allow their employees to purchase or rent in the market and to live relatively close to their work.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

12057 Object

Summary:

The North West urban extension will be a good extension to employment led housing. However, we think it was a mistake to allow the University to completely remove the percentage requirement for affordable dwellings. Visiting scholars is not affordable housing; their need should have been taken from the general housing stock not as a substitute for affordable housing. This could have been a valuable contribution to the city's housing need, but it has pushed its burden to other places in the city and compounding the debate as to what is the appropriate percentage of affordable housing in general.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

12850 Object (W/drawn 2012-07-27)

Summary:

It is good that the universities, colleges and other employers are thinking of providing housing for their staff. But it should be noted that although we want to reduce transport costs and travel-to-work time, most people would not actually want to live on the same site as where they work - I believe this is especially true for those who work with children and youngsters. Therefore I would not wish to see staff accommodation being built on-site by any employers in Cambridge - any agreed employment-related accommodation should be elsewhere in Cambridge.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

13002 Object

Summary:

I don't agree with the idea of employment-related housing - most people want to live some distance from their employers, or at least don't want to be 'owned' by them; and in any case, people do not really want to live next door to the people they work with (they probably see enough of them at work!). I also worry that changing key worker definitions could cause problems (everyone's jobs are important and everyone contributes to the economy in some way). Also, why is the 'high tech' economy specified as the area towards which an eligible business would have to contribute?

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

13004 Object

Summary:

It is admirable that the universities, colleges and other employers are thinking of providing housing for their staff. But it should be noted that although we want to reduce transport costs and travel-to-work time, most people would not actually want to live on the same site as where they work; and even if some distance away, they may not want to be 'owned' by their employers. Indeed, I think many people would probably not want to live next to the people they work with. I do not think employment related housing is a good idea.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

14390 Support

Summary:

When considering the University of Cambridge, College employees should not be omitted from this category of key workers.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

16886 Object

Summary:

Land values may well dictate that such proposals do not come forward. We could suggest that this policy is taken a step further to require that a percentage of the overall affordable housing arising from a development, is given over to key workers and that University and College workers should be identified on the list of key workers eligible for affordable housing.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

17599 Object

Summary:

Once a proper analysis is made of WHO is living in Cambridge, then I agree that people who are working in Cambridge and, particularly those on low incomes associated with certain public sector jobs, should be given priority to newly built housing.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

17941 Support

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.15

18319 Object**Summary:**

It is inconceivable to think there is any other type. All housing that is not employment related, but is still needed, is either philanthropic or for economic stability (ie. key worker).

The North West urban extension currently being planned by The University will be a good extension to employment led housing. However, it is unfortunate that The University has been allowed by CCC to completely remove the percentage requirement for affordable dwellings; visiting scholars is not affordable housing. This could have been a valuable contribution to the city's housing need, but it has pushed its burden to other places in the city and compounding the debate as to what is the appropriate percentage of affordable housing in general.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.28

9481 Object**Summary:**

Priority should be given to three bedroom homes for families. We believe that Cambridge already has far too many "luxury" (although small) one and two bedroom apartments. We support development of UNIVERSITY student accommodation as it can release houses for family occupation. We also support the development of high quality, reasonably sized apartments for the elderly, such as the new development by Abbeyfield at Girton, as we believe they would also release existing family houses onto the market.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.28

11055 Support**Summary:**

A mixture is desirable, though I have no views on the precise way this is achieved.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 100 - Housing mix - general policy

6933 Support**Summary:**

Qualified support: it should not stop the development of symmetrical terraces and squares in a mix of tenures.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 100 - Housing mix - general policy

7692 Object**Summary:**

Again, housing mix is very important and very healthy for a city.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 100 - Housing mix - general policy

10986 Support**Summary:**

Bidwells supports the inclusion of Option 100 over Option 101, as it would allow local circumstances, needs and the housing market to determine the appropriate mix on each site, which would more successfully encourage mixed and balanced communities than Option 101, which would prevent flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 100 - Housing mix - general policy

12474 Support

Summary:

Mixed housing where appropriate, rather than a mandatory requirement. It avoids over-rigidity.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 100 - Housing mix - general policy

12562 Object

Summary:

For either policy that is adopted, I would argue that a strong vision for an area is developed in close consultation with the residents so that developers are not left to decide upon the layout, which will invariably be dense and tall.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 100 - Housing mix - general policy

13952 Support

Summary:

The Consortium supports the inclusion of Option 100 over Option 101, as it would allow local circumstances, need and the housing market to determine the appropriate housing mix on a development. Option 100 would successfully encourage a mixed and balanced community when compared to Option 101.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 100 - Housing mix - general policy

14102 Support

Summary:

support

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 100 - Housing mix - general policy

14230 Support

Summary:

Conditional support. Controls should ensure that mixed housing requirements do not lead to very high density and very tall buildings. This could be a danger when the developer is seeking to maximise profits out of the site.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 101 - Housing mix - specific levels policy

6934 Object

Summary:

This would undoubtedly lead to poor design.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 101 - Housing mix - specific levels policy

9951 Support

Summary:

I think we need to encourage 3 bed or more dwellings for families who have not been catered for in many recent developments.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 101 - Housing mix - specific levels policy

10620 Support

Summary:

There is a need for three bedroom family houses and for bungalows for the elderly, many of whom do not like lifts. Both housing types missing from much new development, and makes it difficult for communities to remain 'balanced'.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 101 - Housing mix - specific levels policy

10991 Object

Summary:

Bidwells supports the inclusion of Option 100 over Option 101, as it would allow local circumstances, needs and the housing market to determine the appropriate mix on each site, which would more successfully encourage mixed and balanced communities than Option 101, which would prevent flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 101 - Housing mix - specific levels policy

11619 Support

Summary:

Several new housing development mainly offer 1 to 2 bedrooms, targeted at the buy to let market. This does not help to create communities and does not allow families to settle in the city. This policy should help to revert this. However not only number of bedrooms should be specified, also the minimal sizes for a 3 bedroom house and a bedroom. On the continent we call a bedroom < 5m2 a cupboard

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 101 - Housing mix - specific levels policy

12563 Object

Summary:

For either policy that is adopted, I would argue that a strong vision for an area is developed in close consultation with the residents so that developers are not left to decide upon the layout, which will invariably be dense and tall.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 101 - Housing mix - specific levels policy

12990 Object

Summary:

It's good to have mixed and balanced communities where possible, though we also need to make sure the housing provided meets what is needed. Housing co-operatives generally provide mixed and balanced communities and I would like the Council to explore the options for how and where these could be developed in Cambridge. There are also some housing co-ops for older people and we could also look at building one of these in Cambridge (it could, for example, provide two-bedroom bungalows - allowing for a carer to move in, or family to visit etc). Co-ops also help people retain their independence.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 101 - Housing mix - specific levels policy

13957 Object

Summary:

The Consortium supports the inclusion of Option 100 over Option 101, as it would allow local circumstances, need and the housing market to determine the appropriate housing mix on a development. Option 100 would successfully encourage a mixed and balanced community when compared to Option 101. It is considered that Option 101 would prevent flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 101 - Housing mix - specific levels policy

14243 Support

Summary:

Conditional support. Controls should ensure that mixed housing requirements do not lead to very high density and very tall buildings. This could be a danger when the developer is seeking to maximise profits out of the site.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

8111 Support

Summary:

Need policy.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

9484 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

10727 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

11240 Support

Summary:

We consider that the character of the area, the character of the site itself, the market and the SHMA are critical issues and consider that the approach is basically to continue to use policy 5/10 within the local plan.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

11250 Object

Summary:

The types of accommodation to be provided on sites will vary dependent upon location. We consider it would be preferable to retain flexibility in relation to the types of provision on sites. Sites in the city centre, for example, are likely to be delivered at higher densities in accordance with the character of the area and more likely to see a higher level of apartments, whilst sites on the edge of the urban area may be at lower density and hence include a greater proportion of family homes housing.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

12064 Support

Summary:

Yes, policy needed

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

12092 Support

Summary:

Yes to having a policy.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

13168 Support

Summary:

The University supports a general policy for addressing this issue. The development of a general flexible mix of dwelling sizes and types is important to allow a range and to ensure good design quality can be delivered.

The mix in each particular development should be determined at the time of planning permission, by responding to market demands, housing need, development costs and viability, and the achievement of mixed and balanced communities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

14106 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

15266 Support

Summary:

I support the general policy that there should be a housing mix. Being prescriptive is unlikely to be successful as circumstances can change dramatically between the initial planning stage and actual delivery. The Vie development is an example of a development based mainly on large town houses with some smaller houses and flats that was faced with a town house market at saturation when it came to be built and most of the proposed terraces became blocks of flats. Arguably a better result for the City in terms of the number of units and the final mix.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

16534 Support

Summary:

Yes.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

17446 Support

Summary:

Housing mix - this should ensure adequate home sizes, including sufficient 3 bed+ homes, and provision of spare rooms like much other accommodation in the city already has, and not the bare minimum. Additional rooms are also needed so families can grow, particularly as newly built homes are not built with a view to further extension

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

17942 Support

Summary:

Yes - very important to ensure the mix is correct.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

18234 Support

Summary:

Yes there is a need for a policy addressing this issue.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.17

18320 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

8113 Support

Summary:

Support 101. Would want the majority of homes to be 3 bedroomed (a few more) homes for families. Cambridge already has a large number of one and two bedroomed apartments which are often marketed to encourage 'commuter' occupation. Whilst acknowledging that Cambridge is an attractive place to live for those who work in London, I believe that our first duty is towards those with young families whose work is within the city.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

9202 Support

Summary:

Keep the flexibility of Option 100, but consider Option 101 on larger developments (100 or more dwellings) to require more homes with 3+ bedrooms than at present.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

9485 Support

Summary:

Option 100

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

10729 Support

Summary:

Option 100

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

12077 Object

Summary:

Probably option 100 is preferred to give flexibility. However the more specific Option 101 could be adopted as guidelines rather than policy. This would allow the guidelines to be modified when local demand called for a change. While guidelines may not have the force of policy, we might get the best of both worlds.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

12384 Support

Summary:

Option 101 to apply in all areas. In particular, it is important to allow families to live in the town centre. The current mix is a design for "yuppies".

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

13172 Support

Summary:

The University supports Option 100, a general flexible mix of dwelling sizes and types is important to allow a range and to ensure good design quality can be delivered. The mix in each particular development should be determined at the time of planning permission, reflecting market demands, housing need, development costs and viability, and the achievement of mixed and balanced communities. A specific mix does not afford the level of flexibility that is required.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

13300 Support

Summary:

Our client would encourage the Council to continue with the approach set out in Option 100 which allows for a level of flexibility dependent on the individual circumstances of sites, their surrounding area and local housing needs, and their development viability. As above, this would ensure that the Council complies with NPPF paragraph 21 which states that investment in business should not be over-burdened by the combined requirements of planning policy expectations.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

14110 Support

Summary:

Option 100.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

16536 Support

Summary:

Option 100.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

16752 Support

Summary:

The requirement for developers to provide a large proportion of affordable housing would appear to be a recipe for too high density and too tall buildings on a site. Any policy should be tight enough to ensure that this does not happen, and, possibly, not to require the percentage of affordable housing where this danger is high

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

16835 Support

Summary:

Option 100 is preferred, and Policy 5/10 should be retained and strengthened, so that developers do not bring forward schemes with an inappropriate mix of units, for example at Cromwell Road 90% of the 124 units included 1 & 2 bed flats. This does not create mixed or cohesive communities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

17943 Support

Summary:

Option 101 - Housing mix - Specific levels policy

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

18235 Object

Summary:

It is difficult to choose either policy 100 or 101 to suit all cases. Relying on good design at the moment as Option 100 assumes, is not always going to create a mixed community where a developer is guided by market advice on dwelling size. However, although it would be useful to have some clear steer on market housing provision, option 101 would be too prescriptive on every site.

Preferring some action rather than leaving as is, Option 101 would be preferable.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.18

18321 Support

Summary:

Option 100

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.19

11802 Support

Summary:

Mixed housing developments must not lead to high density or over tall buildings. This leads to no-go estates.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.19

12636 Object

Summary:

Mixed and balanced communities are of course good, but we need to make sure we build the kind of properties that people actually need (rather than focus on mixed communities). One bedroom (and one-person) properties should have a minimum bedroom size of 12 sq m (in line with HCA recommendations - see Local Plan, Appendix D).

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.19

13914 Support

Summary:

I think its important to stress that control over the housing mix, is one way we can through the planning system influence the value, and therefore affordability, of homes built. This is a key lever to use to ensure affordable housing is provided, not just what is most profitable for developers.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.19

14113 Support

Summary:

Why is there such a fixation with the number of bedrooms? I suggest that, rather than focus on bedrooms, the council instead organise properties in terms of square feet. This would be a much better reflection of the property and would also pave the way towards ensuring Cambridge has an appropriate number of adaptable properties (e.g. a four bedroom house that could be adapted into two, two-bedroom flats and then back again, for example)

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.19

16537 Support

Summary:

Perhaps stress the need for more family housing, as well as for the elderly.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.19

17944 Support

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.19

18236 Object

Summary:

We would like to emphasise that occupancy levels are more important.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.19

18322 Object

Summary:

The UK has in recent years had one of the worst space standings compared to other countries. Policies in this area will be good such as in the London Plan.

However, building consumer awareness about the space they are buying (and specification in general) should also be considered. Developers like an ill-informed customer with a low design awareness. This should be challenged somehow.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.20

9203 Support

Summary:

Keep the flexibility of Option 100, but consider Option 101 on larger developments (100 or more dwellings) to require more homes with 3+ bedrooms than at present.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.20

12994 Object

Summary:

It's good to have mixed and balanced communities where possible, though we must also make sure housing provided meets what is needed. In Romsey and Petersfield I feel we don't need any more shared housing - rather we need one-bedroom flats for singles, flats/small houses for couples and larger properties for families. Housing co-operatives generally provide mixed and balanced communities and I would also like the Council to explore the options for how and where these could be developed in Cambridge (including the possibility of an older persons housing co-operative).

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.20

17945 Support

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.20

18269 Object

Summary:

Although a mix of accommodation types exists within the area, a large proportion is for students who live within their own campuses, and only a small proportion is for family use. Two features of the subject of housing merit attention:

-a- meetings are held between student representatives and councillors so it is assumed that any issues and options for the Local Plan are being submitted separately.

-b- several older properties accommodate students over shops in King Street. Bearing in mind the need for larger family accommodation rather than single bed-sits the opportunity exists here for more flexible conversion into flats for families. This should be considered as an option.

18323 Object

Summary:

Yes, greater awareness building.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.53

11425 Support**Summary:**

This is a very good idea with an aging population.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 111 - Lifetime homes standard applied to all new development

11015 Object**Summary:**

Bidwells objects to Options 111 and 113 as imposing a requirement for 100% Lifetime Homes and a proportion of housing to meet Wheelchair Housing Design Standards as this would result in an unnecessarily adverse impact on the viability of the development, and would increase the challenge of successfully developing constrained sites. The requirement for Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Housing Design Standards should reflect local needs and the characteristics of a site. Option 112 would be more appropriate, although additional flexibility should be incorporated to ensure that viability is not adversely affected, by including the wording "unless not viable".

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 111 - Lifetime homes standard applied to all new development

13968 Object**Summary:**

The Consortium objects to Option 111 since it imposes a requirement for 100% Lifetime Homes. This could result in an unnecessarily adverse impact on the viability of a development. The requirement for Lifetime Homes should reflect local needs and the characteristics of the site.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 111 - Lifetime homes standard applied to all new development

14024 Support**Summary:**

All new homes should be designed for safe and comfortable movement in and around them. If Cambridge were to adopt a Housing Design standard that required specific justification for raised thresholds, steps or narrow doorways, most of the Lifetime Homes criteria would become the norm, and people would not be excluded from parts of their own or their friends' houses by mobility problems.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 111 - Lifetime homes standard applied to all new development

15273 Support**Summary:**

Yes, definitely, nothing less should be acceptable.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 111 - Lifetime homes standard applied to all new development

16931 Support**Summary:**

We would support a policy to require new housing development to meet the lifetime homes standards even if the impact locally would be limited. Many residents would welcome the opportunity to move to homes readily adaptable to their changing circumstances and to have that option as part of a new development in the City would be valuable.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 112 - A proportion of new homes to meet lifetime homes standard

11018 Support**Summary:**

Bidwells objects to Options 111 and 113 as imposing a requirement for 100% Lifetime Homes and a proportion of housing to meet Wheelchair Housing Design Standards as this would result in an unnecessarily adverse impact on the viability of the development, and would increase the challenge of successfully developing constrained sites. The requirement for Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Housing Design Standards should reflect local needs and the characteristics of a site. Option 112 would be more appropriate, although additional flexibility should be incorporated to ensure that viability is not adversely affected, by including the wording "unless not viable".

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 112 - A proportion of new homes to meet lifetime homes standard
--	---

13438 Support

Summary:

Agree that a proportion of new homes should be built to Lifetime homes standards and a proportion of new homes should be suitable to be adaptable for wheelchair occupants. In order to ensure development is not hindered and the Council's LDF is in compliance with NPPF paragraph 21, we consider that Option 112 is a reasonable approach.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 112 - A proportion of new homes to meet lifetime homes standard
--	---

13971 Object

Summary:

While Option 112 is considered to be more appropriate than Option 111, flexibility should be incorporated to ensure that viability is not adversely affected in providing Lifetime Homes on developments.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 112 - A proportion of new homes to meet lifetime homes standard
--	---

15274 Object

Summary:

No, all new housing should be built to this standard.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 113 - A proportion of new homes that meet the Wheelchair Housing Design Standard
--	--

8897 Support

Summary:

Given the changing demographics and health needs, and the move to enable people to continue to live independently in their own homes, we should aspire to design homes that are as flexible as possible. In the longer term this is likely to represent better value for money and provide a better outcome for residents.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 113 - A proportion of new homes that meet the Wheelchair Housing Design Standard
--	--

9956 Support

Summary:

There are increasing numbers of disabled and elderly people.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 113 - A proportion of new homes that meet the Wheelchair Housing Design Standard
--	--

11020 Object

Summary:

Bidwells objects to Options 111 and 113 as imposing a requirement for 100% Lifetime Homes and a proportion of housing to meet Wheelchair Housing Design Standards as this would result in an unnecessarily adverse impact on the viability of the development, and would increase the challenge of successfully developing constrained sites. The requirement for Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Housing Design Standards should reflect local needs and the characteristics of a site. Option 112 would be more appropriate, although additional flexibility should be incorporated to ensure that viability is not adversely affected, by including the wording "unless not viable".

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 113 - A proportion of new homes that meet the Wheelchair Housing Design Standard
--	--

13447 Object

Summary:

Partly agree with option 113. We agree with the Council that policies providing adaptable housing to suit the needs of wheelchair users 'could be overtly prescriptive and not viable in certain circumstances' and therefore flexibility should be written into any policy.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Option 113 - A proportion of new homes that meet the Wheelchair Housing Design Standard
--	--

15275 Object**Summary:**

No. You can go from fit to wheel-chair bound in a second. To then find you have to leave home because you cannot get into it should not be necessary.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Question 9.29
--	----------------------

7118 Support**Summary:**

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Question 9.29
--	----------------------

7205 Support**Summary:**

We consider that all new homes should include the provisions shown in http://www.lifetimehomes.org.uk/data/files/For_Professionals/lthdiagram.pdf According to <http://www.lifetimehomes.org.uk/pages/costs.html> the costs of these are modest. This will have the incidental effect of slightly increasing the minimum area of the homes. As homes in the UK are said to be the least spacious in Europe, the small increase in cost will also benefit everybody.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Question 9.29
--	----------------------

8481 Support**Summary:**

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Question 9.29
--	----------------------

9507 Support**Summary:**

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Question 9.29
--	----------------------

12177 Support**Summary:**

Yes, policy needed

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Question 9.29
--	----------------------

14126 Support**Summary:**

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing	Question 9.29
--	----------------------

15438 Support

Summary:

Yes, there is a need for a policy.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.29

16546 Support

Summary:

Yes.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.29

17954 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.29

18246 Support

Summary:

There is a need for a policy addressing this issue.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.29

18332 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.29

18442 Object

Summary:

Option 111 to 113 suggest varying approaches to developing a policy requiring new housing to meet lifetime homes standard. Of the Options given, the County Council would support 112, as the percentage of new housing built to this standard could be varied and is less likely to undermine viability. Further consideration should be given to the possibility of modifying the policy to embrace the existing built environment, for example through redevelopment schemes. The comments made under Chapters 2 and 3 relating to an ageing population should also be brought into any explanatory text.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

7005 Support

Summary:

With an aging population there probably is a need for such a policy, and Option 113 seems most suitable.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

7119 Support

Summary:

I prefer Option 111

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

7206 Object

Summary:

It is not sufficient to require that only some fraction of new homes include these provisions. The object is to ensure that, when people become frail or are suddenly disabled, they can stay in their own homes for as long as possible. Therefore all new homes should include the provisions.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

8482 Support

Summary:

Option 113

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

9210 Support

Summary:

Option 112, possibly with further element of Option 113. Option 111 would add unnecessarily to the costs of construction and hence to the purchase or rental costs which are already high in the city.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

9509 Support

Summary:

Option 113

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

10735 Support

Summary:

Option 112

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

11439 Support

Summary:

Option 111

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

12194 Object

Summary:

Probably a combination of 112 and 113, say 10% wheelchair housing design standard and a further 15% to Lifetimes Home standard. This would improve our performance on this issue (an important one given our ageing population and historical failure to anywhere near meet the needs of the disabled), while not imposing too high a standard for developers.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

12762 Support**Summary:**

I think it's a good idea to make all (or almost all) new affordable housing meet the lifetime homes standard. As Option 111 points out "This option would help in providing flexible and adaptable housing to suit a range of needs and changing circumstances for all". This would mean people would be less likely to need to move if their circumstances change - this does (and rightly should) apply to people of all ages.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

14125 Support**Summary:**

Option 112

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

15440 Support**Summary:**

Option 113. Good quality housing should be readily available to all, including people in wheelchairs or otherwise having reduced mobility.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

15841 Support**Summary:**

We think that there is clearly a case for providing Lifetime Homes and all new development should be built to this standard (Option 111)

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

16548 Support**Summary:**

Option 113 preferred.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

17456 Support**Summary:**

Options 112 and 113 are both supported, and the current % on 112 increased

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

17955 Support**Summary:**

Option 111 - This provides vision for the future generations, so many houses do not have the versatile arrangements to accommodate the elderly or individuals that are disabled. Putting this in place now, will reduce future conversion costs.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

18247 Object

Summary:

We would want this standard to be modified, so that the expensive, onerous work to allow for a future lift is not always required. Housing providers rarely revisit to retrofit these lifts, but the expense at the outset is considerable to provide for the possibility. With this in mind, Option 112 would ensure some provision of Lifetime Homes in market housing.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

18333 Support

Summary:

Options 112 and 113

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.30

18443 Support

Summary:

Option 111 to 113 suggest varying approaches to developing a policy requiring new housing to meet lifetime homes standard. Of the Options given, the County Council would support 112, as the percentage of new housing built to this standard could be varied and is less likely to undermine viability. Further consideration should be given to the possibility of modifying the policy to embrace the existing built environment, for example through redevelopment schemes. The comments made under Chapters 2 and 3 relating to an ageing population should also be brought into any explanatory text.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.31

14210 Support

Summary:

Space needs are greater not only for physically disabled people but for people with other forms of disability eg learning disability, for example when they require a carer or carers all the time or for most of the time. Autistic people may not be able to go out very often because of the lack of adequate support and it has been known for some time that many disabled children (including autistic children) need extra room at home so that they can play.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.31

17956 Support

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.31

18334 Support

Summary:

This is a good criteria based assessment of housing. Perhaps the City should set mandatory assessment to be achieved as silver or gold.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.31

18444 Support

Summary:

Option 111 to 113 suggest varying approaches to developing a policy requiring new housing to meet lifetime homes standard. Of the Options given, the County Council would support 112, as the percentage of new housing built to this standard could be varied and is less likely to undermine viability. Further consideration should be given to the possibility of modifying the policy to embrace the existing built environment, for example through redevelopment schemes. The comments made under Chapters 2 and 3 relating to an ageing population should also be brought into any explanatory text.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.32

7179 Support**Summary:**

Fiscal incentives should be introduced to make attractive to many of those living in larger houses (e.g. single occupation of family homes) to downsize/smartsize, freeing up accommodation to those who have families.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.32

17957 Support**Summary:**

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.58

11441 Object**Summary:**

NOT supportive of grabbing gardens. We are a crowded city in a crowded country with not enough open, green space as it is. Gardens are proving to be an important wildlife refuge, as well.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.61

11442 Support**Summary:**

Yay for gardens.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.61

12391 Support**Summary:**

Developing gardens is inevitably on an ad-hoc basis and hence incoherent. It is usually opportunist and causes anger and inconvenience for neighbours. Proper planning control is required for back garden constructions of residential dwellings or offices.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.61

16550 Support**Summary:**

I agree with all these arguments against developing on gardens.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.61

17788 Support**Summary:**

We welcome recognition of the impacts and opportunities housing development can create for biodiversity and would look to relevant policies to seek to minimise impacts and maximise benefits for biodiversity where possible.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

6940 Support

Summary:

Good

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

7176 Object

Summary:

I consider gardens to be inner city Green Belt which should be preserved at all costs. This inner city Green Belt also provides habitats for bird and small mammal populations. Small scale development of gardens of existing properties will make a trivial contribution to Cambridge's housing needs and will lead to degradation of this inner city Green Belt and surrounding neighbourhoods and greatly increase housing density.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

7696 Support

Summary:

Only with high design standards!

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

9923 Object

Summary:

Gardens are a precious commodity- green lungs which if eroded by development will impact on the quality of our living environment. In some areas e.g. West Cambridge the large gardens are a defining quality of the Conservation Area. Would it not be better not to allow development unless certain criteria are met rather than permitting it subject to certain criteria.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

9957 Support

Summary:

This is a measured policy which does not restrict such development where appropriate.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

10292 Object

Summary:

gardens are a precious commodity- green lungs which if eroded by development will impact on the quality of our living environment. In some areas e.g. West Cambridge the large gardens are a defining quality of the Conservation Area. Would it not be better not to allow development unless certain criteria are met rather than permitting it subject to certain criteria. Option 115 preferable if a viable option?

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

11022 Support

Summary:

Bidwells supports Option 114 over Option 115, which does not provide sufficient flexibility to consider local circumstances for infill development in rear gardens. Option 114 provides adequate criteria to ensure such development is appropriate.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

12484 Support

Summary:

Qualified support with the proviso that the building of flats should be resisted - the Queen Edith way area has been damaged in this way. It should not happen that one day you have a family for neighbours and the next day fourteen (viz Wheatly Homes in QE Way).

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

12992 Object

Summary:

Cambridge will regret the loss of gardens. Family homes with gardens too valuable. Conservation areas need protecting.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

14864 Object

Summary:

The loss of amenity (loss of play area for children, loss of garden) coupled with the problems posed by flooding make this unwise, however many clauses are placed round it.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

15028 Support

Summary:

The provision of new additional residential units and replacement of aged substandard units should be encouraged within the city curtilage. It will:

- 1) Provide additional housing to meet some of the growth needed;
- 2) Provide a variety of designs enhancing the city's townscape;
- 3) Reduce the pressure to release Green Belt land.

Restrictions should not be over the top.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

15119 Support

Summary:

This is an area in which the city planners badly need clearer criteria. Agree that this is a situation in which situations vary enormously, but some recent planning decisions on infilling in gardens defy understanding (viz 27 Madingley Road.) Agree not all infilling should be prohibited, but there should be clearer guidelines.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 114 - Criteria based policy for all small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens

16123 Object

Summary:

I object to garden grabbing because of the deterioration in quality of life that would be involved.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

6941 Object

Summary:

Bad

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

7177 Support

Summary:

I consider gardens to be inner city Green Belt which should be preserved at all costs. This inner city Green Belt also provides habitats for bird and small mammal populations. Small scale development of gardens of existing properties will make a trivial contribution to Cambridge's housing needs and will lead to degradation of this inner city Green Belt and surrounding neighbourhoods and greatly increase housing density.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

9582 Support

Summary:

Protection should be given to all gardens with mature trees. They should not be allowed to be cut down as the loss of biodiversity is massive.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

9925 Support

Summary:

If this can be achieved, if it has the effect of providing better protection. The way option 115 is presented appears virtually to rule it out for this local plan - is it genuinely offered as an option here? If not, then the alternative 114 might need to spell out more explicitly still what is meant by the prevailing character of a garden-rich area such as North Newnham (see the recent decision to refuse permission for an infill build on the Barton Road)

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

10301 Support

Summary:

if this can be achieved, if it has the effect of providing better protection. The way option 115 is presented appears virtually to rule it out for this local plan - is it genuinely offered as an option here? If not, then the alternative 114 might need to spell out more explicitly still what is meant by the prevailing character of a garden-rich area such as North Newnham (see the recent decision to refuse permission for an infill build on the Barton Road)

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

10822 Support

Summary:

Gardens are vital for wildlife and maintaining a liveable population density in urban / suburban areas.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

11025 Object

Summary:

Bidwells supports Option 114 over Option 115, which does not provide sufficient flexibility to consider local circumstances for infill development in rear gardens. Option 114 provides adequate criteria to ensure such development is appropriate.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

11443 Support

Summary:

We need gardens in a crowded city in a crowded country where the green belt is being eaten away.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

12603 Support

Summary:

Yes, I think this should be broadly discouraged in policy as it encourages loss of greenspace which is important for future occupiers, wildlife (gardens are now a major reservoir for the UK wildlife) and also for flood-prevention. It would also reduce the traffic generated by extra developments.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

14865 Support

Summary:

Since flooding is now a problem in Cambridge, gardens, which allow water to drain away safely, need protection.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

15277 Support

Summary:

There is now a presumption against this and we should recognise that gardens are an important part of the green infrastructure of Cambridge.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

15369 Support

Summary:

Garden-grabbing often reduces materially the quality of life of residents in the vicinity as well as, in many instances, destroying the architectural integrity of a neighbourhood.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

15500 Object

Summary:

We object to Option 115 for the reasons stated by the Council, i.e. that this does not result in a balanced approach, and simply having an overall embargo on infill development in rear gardens would have a serious potential impact on the overall housing supply of the City.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

15815 Support

Summary:

Very specific local circumstances could be brought up to justify the approach. There could be provision for such building in exceptional circumstances but a general ban - presumption against. Cambridge's gardens are vitally important for quality of life and should be protected so the the city's great-great-grandchildren can still benefit from them, especially since current developments make scant provision. They contribute to quietness, foster wildlife, encourage physical activity, allow families to grow fruit and vegetables, benefit the soul. They are an asset we should not lightly undermine.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

16114 Support

Summary:

Support. No development in back gardens.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

16124 Support

Summary:

Support

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens

16906 Support

Summary:

We would favour a tougher policy on infill development in rear gardens and would support a general presumption against such development. We would welcome nevertheless a standalone policy as proposed to allow small scale residential development on derelict sites or where existing buildings have been demolished or have no alternative use.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Question 9.33

8114 Support

Summary:

I support having a policy

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Question 9.33

8483 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Question 9.33

9510 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Question 9.33

9926 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

10307 Support

Summary:

Yes to protect residential gardens from development.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

10628 Support

Summary:

The Wildlife Trust supports the development of a policy, as gardens form an important part of the ecological network of Cambridge, and in some parts of the city are the dominant form of green space. As the climate warms the maintenance of undeveloped land will become much more important in reducing the urban heat island effect.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

10736 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

11518 Support

Summary:

Support

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

12146 Support

Summary:

A policy based on Option 114 and subject to the criteria identified would be supported.

Option 115 is not supported.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

12203 Support

Summary:

Yes, let's have a policy

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

12604 Support

Summary:

Agreed.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

12767 Support

Summary:

Yes - we need a policy restricting infill development in rear gardens.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

14130 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

15276 Support

Summary:

Yes there does need to be a policy but neither suggested policy is the best way forward.

There should be a hierarchy to 'sites' based on back gardens. If the garden is too large then sub-division into garden and allotment should be the first consideration. If there is a general agreement in an area that their gardens are too large amalgamation to provide public open space or amenity, e.g. tennis courts, should be the next consideration. This would preserve the benefit of green space within the city without making demands on infrastructure.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

15837 Support

Summary:

While there is clearly scope for small-scale development on unused site, East Chesterton has suffered from some rear of garden development to its detriment. As stated earlier, the area is deficient in open space and recreation areas and gardens can provide much needed private amenity space. We would echo the points made in paragraph 9.61. We support the development of back gardens only in exceptional circumstances and where it does not detract from the urban grain of the area.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

16551 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

16697 Support

Summary:

Family homes and gardens should not be destroyed and replaced by flats!

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

16844 Support

Summary:

Yes there should be a policy on this issue.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

17958 Support

Summary:

Yes - most certainly

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

18248 Support

Summary:

A policy addressing this issue would be useful.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.33

18335 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

7006 Support

Summary:

Given that I do not believe that the population of Cambridge should be encouraged to increase, I would favour Option 115.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

8115 Support

Summary:

Support 114. The criteria are strict enough to allow only reasonable development. A blanket ban would seem to be over the top.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

8484 Support

Summary:

Option 114

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

9211 Support

Summary:

Option 114. Whilst Option 115 has attractions, especially in Conservation Areas, it might reduce the number of sites available to meet new housing construction targets.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

9499 Support

Summary:

Option 114

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

9511 Support

Summary:

Option 114 preferred by some of us and 115 by others.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

9928 Object

Summary:

115 if it can be achieved. If not then 114 but need to spell out what is meant but the prevailing character of an area -rich area such as North Newnham (see recent decision to refuse permission for infill build on Barton Road)

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

10305 Support

Summary:

114

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

10309 Object

Summary:

115 if it can be achieved. If not then 114 but need to spell out what is meant by the 'prevailing character of such a garden-rich area such as North Newnham (see recent decision to refuse permission for infill build on Barton Road)

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

10438 Support

Summary:

Support policy 114 as this is most likely to encourage more sympathetic building within the city and make use of unused space.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

10626 Support

Summary:

Option 114 but not if it means that existing areas of high density housing (especially streets of 19th century terraces off Mill Rd) become even higher density due to loss of badly needed garden space which future residents will need.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

10738 Support

Summary:

Option 115. This option should be used for areas such as the city core and surrounding historic neighbourhoods and conservation areas such as Newtown. Garden infill should be presumed non viable in these areas. The Local Plan needs to provide specific provision for developments in particular areas of Cambridge so that they can be decided within the context of their historic and local environment.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

11523 Support

Summary:

Support option 114, noting that often the only means to improve housing stock on a city site is to demolish and rebuild. While infill is something we should be cautious about, the policy should not mean that shoddy housing remains because it cannot be replaced with an equivalent new-build property.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

12000 Support

Summary:

Option 114. Properties with back gardens suitable for such development are most likely to be older properties where eg conversion for climate /water efficiency could be uneconomic. Developing on such gardens is likely to be less ecologically disadvantageous than large-scale building on green spaces.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

12219 Object

Summary:

Option 114. Provided the safeguards as set out in the suggested criteria are rigorously enforced, we should not oppose in filling but rather see it as a small but not insignificant contribution to our housing needs. The point about prevailing character of the neighbourhood is particularly important and should be given more prominence; we need to avoid new buildings being shoehorned into tiny spaces to maximise owners profit

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

12400 Support

Summary:

I support Option 115. The real demand for back-garden development will be in the most valuable areas and these tend to be close to the city centre and provide a welcome variety in what is already a very crowded location. Infill would be less damaging in the less-dense regions of the city, but there is less desire for development more than 10 minutes walk from the city centre.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

12606 Support

Summary:

115 - restrict

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

12772 Object

Summary:

I prefer Option 115. This is because 'garden grabbing' could have a serious negative impact on our City. There is little enough green space as it is, this would further exacerbate problems. Infill developments in gardens may make a contribution to housing supply, but they also (negatively) contribute towards our quality of life. We should have a strict policy that restricts (or disallows) infill development in rear gardens.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

13990 Support**Summary:**

I support Option 115 - Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens. The pressures towards over-development of sites within existing residential neighbourhoods should be reduced. Otherwise the character of many areas we now value will substantially change for the worse.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

14128 Support**Summary:**

Option 115

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

16553 Support**Summary:**

Option 114 preferred, but people should not be forced to give up their large gardens for development.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

16845 Support**Summary:**

We prefer option 115, which would restrict development in back gardens and infill sites. Romsey has suffered from inappropriate development of gardens and backlands and this policy would help to restrict densification and over-development.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

17459 Support**Summary:**

Back garden development - a policy combining features of the two options 114 and 115 is needed, to ensure effective protection of areas where back garden development is not appropriate

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

17959 Support**Summary:**

Option 115 - Far too many gardens are or have been developed. If we allow this to continue it will be of real detriment to the city.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

18249 Support**Summary:**

Option 114 permitting small scale residential development and infill development in rear gardens is our preference.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.34

18336 Support

Summary:

Option 115

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.35

9512 Object

Summary:

The amount of green space in a residential area needs to be addressed.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.35

10627 Support

Summary:

Need for a policy to restrict infill in areas of existing high density. These areas will need garden space for future generations but as long as speculators think they can make a quick profit today they are not bothered about the future.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.35

10631 Object

Summary:

The first policy option (114) fails to consider the impacts of loss of gardens on the wider ecological network across Cambridge or the potential for mitigation of the urban heat island effect in light of climate change.

In this context the biodiversity part of the policy is unworkable as planners and developers will only consider protected species, which are covered by other policies. This approach completely misses the biodiversity value of the network of gardens in Cambridge, providing for the common wildlife and bird song that enriches everyday lives. This must be addressed.

If policy option 114 is adopted i

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.35

10747 Object

Summary:

It is very important to view any development holistically in its context. That is why infilling garden spaces especially in conservation areas such as Newtown or areas close to the centre where green spaces are so valuable and are vital to retain. Provision must be made in the Local Plan for historic areas of Cambridge with specific reference to conservation areas and how any work in the area should consider its historic and visual context. Effects of any works to the local and surrounding environment should also be addressed. These issues should be included in the Local Plan.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.35

12774 Object

Summary:

A list of reasons has been given as to why gardens are important. This is a good list, but has missed one important item - the fact that gardens are important for our mental health and well being - health is of paramount importance.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.35

13704 Object

Summary:

Need to use the Local Plan to close an apparent planning loophole which permits a permitted development in a back garden to be converted to a residential building without having to seek planning permission.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.35

15515 Object**Summary:**

I would prefer a presumption against building in back gardens, allowing it only if there are very strong grounds, and resisting development especially strongly in areas where it would damage the character of the area if "everyone did that"

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.35

17960 Support**Summary:**

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.35

18250 Object**Summary:**

It should not be too easy to demolish existing buildings outside a Conservation Area, where a building might still be of interest.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.36

18595 Support**Summary:**

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.64

13828 Object**Summary:**

The designation of 3 stories seems out of date now that so many houses have attic conversions in cambridge.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.65

16973 Object**Summary:**

Inhabitants of large HMOs are often transient and some landlords do not keep their properties in a good state of repair.

Want to avoid HMOs outnumbering local family homes so support the proposed policy. Also like to see a specific policy that deters the conversion of large family homes to HMO's.

Like to see a policy protecting areas of large family homes in the Mill Road and Glisson Road/Newtown Conservation Area from conversion to HMOs.

Concerned this proposed policy does not cover smaller properties in our residential area. The threshold criteria requiring planning permission for conversion from single family to multiple occupation should be lowered.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 116 - Criteria based policy for HMOs

11065 Support

Summary:

This seems a sensible idea. I know parking is often a vexed issue so to have some thinking about that before HMOs are permitted would be good.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 116 - Criteria based policy for HMOs

11072 Object

Summary:

HMOs are an important part of the housing market in Cambridge. Cost of housing prices many young people out of the market. There is a shortage of affordable housing and 8,210 people on the Council's waiting list. HMOs play an important role in meeting housing needs and enabling workers who can not afford to buy to live in the city close to where they work.

Restrictions on HMOs will worsen affordability and push rents up.

Restrictions on HMOs are likely to price out support service workers and employees of institutions such as the universities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 116 - Criteria based policy for HMOs

11129 Support

Summary:

HMOs are an essential sector of the housing stock at the lower end of the housing market. A positive approach should be taken to provision. Para 9.67 states 20% of HMOS are occupied by students. Therefore HMO policy should link in to a supportive policy for the provision of new student accommodation as the demand for both types of housing increases.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 116 - Criteria based policy for HMOs

12487 Support

Summary:

HMOs are becoming an active nuisance in some areas, particularly when occupied by students. Regulation is required.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 116 - Criteria based policy for HMOs

13379 Object

Summary:

I am against the development of larger HMOs, I live next to a "smaller" HMO and there are serious issues with noise, rubbish and parking as it is. There should be a cap on the number of HMOs in an area due to the attendant problems they cause.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 116 - Criteria based policy for HMOs

13481 Support

Summary:

HMOs are an essential sector of the housing stock at the lower end of the housing market. A positive approach should be taken to provision. Para 9.67 states 20% of HMOS are occupied by students. Therefore HMO policy should link in to a supportive policy for the provision of new student accommodation as the demand for both types of housing increases.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 116 - Criteria based policy for HMOs

16766 Support

Summary:

It is important that any HMOs be subject to suitable scrutiny to ensure that the accommodation offered to tenants is of a decent quality, properties are maintained properly and associated shared spaces are in good order and to ensure that the impact on neighbours is minimised.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 116 - Criteria based policy for HMOs

16896 Object**Summary:**

We agree that it is important to retain a mix of housing stock to meet the requirements of a diverse community, and would support the inclusion of a specific policy on HMOs. However the current draft appears not to give sufficient weight to their possible cumulative impact on established residential area. We should prefer to see an additional criterion introduced which explicitly took into account the existing number of HMOs already in the street and the impact an additional HMO would have on the mix of tenure and on available accommodation for larger families. The assessment should also include the consequences of a high turnover of residents and empty properties at particular times of the year: this can weaken community ties and lead to a democratic deficit locally. We have a similar view on conversions (option 118).

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 116 - Criteria based policy for HMOs

16974 Object**Summary:**

Inhabitants of large HMOs are often transient and some landlords do not keep their properties in a good state of repair.

Want to avoid HMOs outnumbering local family homes so support the proposed policy. Also like to see a specific policy that deters the conversion of large family homes to HMO's.

Like to see a policy protecting areas of large family homes in the Mill Road and Glisson Road/Newtown Conservation Area from conversion to HMOs.

Concerned this proposed policy does not cover smaller properties in our residential area. The threshold criteria requiring planning permission for conversion from single family to multiple occupation should be lowered.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

7007 Support**Summary:**

Yes, there is a need for a policy regulating HMOs - and I would support the policy entitled Option 116.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

7609 Support**Summary:**

The lack of criteria is unhelpful.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

8485 Support**Summary:**

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

9513 Support**Summary:**

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

10753 Object

Summary:

Yes, it is important to have a policy addressing the issue of houses of multiple occupancy. Numbers per street/area should be restricted particularly in areas such as Newtown surrounding the city centre. A maximum number of HMOs in proportion to the density of the population in an area should be established. The type of HMOs should also be addressed. There should be a limit to the number of larger HMOs and restrictions on the smaller HMOs. The Local Plan must provide clear guidance for specific areas of Cambridge such as conservation areas so that any work can be done in context.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

11076 Object

Summary:

Policy not needed.

HMOs are an important part of the housing market in Cambridge. Cost of housing prices many young people out of the market. There is a shortage of affordable housing and 8,210 people on the Council's waiting list. HMOs play an important role in meeting housing needs and enabling workers who cannot afford to buy to live in the city close to where they work.

Restrictions on HMOs will worsen affordability and push rents up.

Restrictions on HMOs are likely to price out support service workers and employees of institutions such as the universities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

11086 Object

Summary:

The policy is unnecessary. It will affect housing supply and affordability issues.

The matters identified in the criteria, such as provision of bins, and numbers of occupants and amenities are not matters for the planning system to address, but are management matters and should be controlled through the licensing system

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

11526 Support

Summary:

Support

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

12230 Object

Summary:

This is one area where we do not support having a policy, even though it is an important issue and is being abused at present.

The problem is that the City cannot easily monitor or have the resources to provide enforcement. Having a policy we don't enforce is worse than no policy

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

12993 Support

Summary:

Support. Some HMO are exploited.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

14133 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

15278 Support

Summary:

Criteria for limiting the spread of HMOs and consequential displacement of family homes is desirable.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

15842 Support

Summary:

With regard to HMOs, East Chesterton has many shared houses and HMOs. We agree that a policy is necessary and that there should be controls to prevent inappropriate multi-occupation where the building or location is unsuitable and to ensure that impact on an area is adequately assessed and considered

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

16893 Object

Summary:

Whilst the Colleges are committed to provision of accommodation, in or nearby to Colleges, a flexible policy approach is required to allow for accommodation to be provided, when this is not possible. Such a policy approach would allow for the provision of new HMOs, it would also allow for HMOs to be used as and returned to other types of residential accommodation.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

17961 Support

Summary:

Yes - current policy is sufficient.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.37

18337 Support

Summary:

Yes, however.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.38

9514 Support

Summary:

Option 116

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.38

11078 Object

Summary:

Policy not needed.

HMOs are an important part of the housing market in Cambridge. Cost of housing prices many young people out of the market. There is a shortage of affordable housing and 8,210 people on the Council's waiting list. HMOs play an important role in meeting housing needs and enabling workers who cannot afford to buy to live in the city close to where they work.

Restrictions on HMOs will worsen affordability and push rents up.

Restrictions on HMOs are likely to price out support service workers and employees of institutions such as the universities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.38

17962 Support

Summary:

Only one listed? Current policy is sufficient; do not foresee the need for change.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.38

18338 Object

Summary:

Do not set a policy the City cannot police or have the resources to provide enforcement.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

7608 Support

Summary:

There is a need to address the following situation: a large house on two floors with room for more than 6 residents. This is neither a Small HMO (since there are more than 6 residents) nor a Large HMO (because it is not on 3 floors). There need to be clear criteria set out for a potential developer of such a property -- it is unhelpful if too many cases fall under the vagaries of the 'sui generis' heading.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

9212 Support

Summary:

There should be a requirement for all licensed HMOs to lodge contact details for their owners and managers with local police or on the City Council website, so neighbours can have immediate access in cases of anti-social behaviour or emergencies.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

9515 Object

Summary:

Car parking

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

11542 Object

Summary:

HMO more sustainable than a block of tiny flats. Family accommodation vs small HMO - merely whether the residents are related. HMO landlords tend to care less for their properties than owner-occupiers.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

11937 Object**Summary:**

I believe that restrictions on car ownership should be considered as a means of dealing with some of the problems. I believe there is still such a policy for college accommodation and have always included such restrictions in the tenancy agreements for my own house.

One important consideration, however, is that non-resident landlords should be able to buy visitor's parking permits for use by people working on the house, so that it can be kept in good repair.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

12790 Object**Summary:**

We don't need any more HMOs in Cambridge, as people do not really require them - they just live in them as they have no alternative choice. Although for developments that are university-only then they could be allowed if need dictated.

I am happy to see HMO licensing and space standards for HMOs - many of our existing HMO's are poorly maintained by landlords, in fact some pose serious ongoing health hazards. I'd like the Council to do regular checks of all HMOs.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

13978 Support**Summary:**

There needs to be a clear policy against pushing house sharers out of Cambridge.

House sharing is an important aspect of the housing provision in Cambridge.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

14229 Support**Summary:**

Most of the actual HMOs in Romsey aren't even classified as HMOs because the accommodation is only on 2 storeys. For example a very small 3 bedroom house where the third bedroom is only 7' square may have five adults living there. Many of these small houses are overcrowded and this type of property in multiple occupation, with a non-resident landlord, is also in need of regulation.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

16894 Object**Summary:**

A specific issue that does not appear to be addressed is that if a policy is too restrictive, there is a danger that this could discourage proposals to house more than 6 occupiers, when the property is capable of accommodating more. This would result in inefficient use of housing stock and place unnecessary demands upon that housing stock.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

17463 Support**Summary:**

The largest properties need improved regulation, but without limiting the contribution that flexible shared housing makes to local housing provision. There also needs to be a review and improvement plan for the private rented sector.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.39

17963 Object

Summary:

A further option?

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.40

11082 Object

Summary:

Policy is not needed.

HMOs are an important part of the housing market in Cambridge. Cost of housing prices many young people out of the market. There is a shortage of affordable housing and 8,210 people on the Council's waiting list. HMOs play an important role in meeting housing needs and enabling workers who cannot afford to buy to live in the city close to where they work.

Restrictions on HMOs will worsen affordability and increase rents.

Restrictions on HMOs are likely to price out support service workers and employees of institutions such as the universities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.76

16555 Support

Summary:

Support

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 117 - Specialist housing

14837 Support

Summary:

I think it very important for residents of nursing homes or residential homes to have access to safe and secure open space. However frail, mentally or physically, someone is, going outside where you can hear the birds singing or smell flowers or just be quiet is vital, I think.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 117 - Specialist housing

16054 Object

Summary:

Support the need for a specific policy encouraging the provision of specialist accommodation for the elderly.

Request the Council exercise caution if they choose to specific amenity space requirements for accommodation for the elderly.

Council should not restrict evidence of need for specify accommodation for the elderly to specific Council documents.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 117 - Specialist housing

16968 Support

Summary:

We specialise in the development of specialist older person accomodation and are currently developing a number of schemes.

We are keen to ensure a sound policy position is established for Cambridge should any potential development opportunities arise and that the Local Plan adequately reflects the evidence-base documents. Our attached representation outlines the key benefits of the development of specialist older person housing including:

dwelling mix, design & goverment aims

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

8117 Support

Summary:

Need policy, especially because of the need to match services with the housing.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

8614 Support

Summary:

The Trumpington Residents' Association supports Option 117 about the need for a policy on specialist housing. We are concerned that there should be the provision of facilities such as care homes within easy access of each neighbourhood. There is very limited provision within Trumpington at present and there appear to be no plans for new care homes within the agreed developments across the Southern Fringe. We think this will become a serious issue in the future when families will look for local provision for relatives who are in need of care.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

9516 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

12235 Support

Summary:

Yes, we need a policy

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

12800 Support

Summary:

Yes we need a policy on specialist housing.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

13177 Support

Summary:

The University supports provision of accommodation for specialist needs and to meet the requirements of an aging population. Any policy relating to specialist housing provision must take into account the market's ability to deliver such provision and other site-specific demands.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

13966 Support

Summary:

The Local Plan should help people to live near their extended families if they want to, as this has many benefits for the individuals and the communities concerned. Older people particularly find it difficult to travel far to keep in touch with friends and family, so it is important for them to be able to find suitable housing, moving house if necessary, but not moving neighbourhood. When older people wish to move into Cambridge to join relatives already living here, there should be suitable accommodation available throughout the City.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

14135 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

15279 Support

Summary:

Agree, especially with the need to be close to a local centre for the largest need group, older people, who may enjoy limited mobility but can manage short local trips with little or no assistance from carers.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

15843 Support

Summary:

We support a policy for specialist housing, in particular for older people. East Chesterton is already home to a number of such developments. We agree with Option 118

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

16556 Support

Summary:

Yes.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

17964 Support

Summary:

Yes - current policy is sufficient

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

18339 Support

Summary:

Yes, however.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.41

18533 Support

Summary:

We support Option 117 about the need for a policy on specialist housing. We are concerned that there should be the provision of facilities such as care homes within easy access of each neighbourhood. There is very limited provision within Trumpington at present and there appear to be no plans for new care homes within the agreed developments across the Southern Fringe. We think this will become a serious issue in the future when families will look for local provision for relatives who are in need of care.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.42

8118 Support

Summary:

Perhaps support (within the boundaries set out above) for larger, high quality, retirement homes such as the new Abbeyfield development at Girton, could be specified in the plan. There is an opportunity here to reclaim some family housing for the younger city dwellers (providing the retirement housing didn't actually attract people from outside the city, of course).

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.42

9517 Object

Summary:

Car parking

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.42

10636 Support

Summary:

Yes. Need for bungalows for the elderly who want to leave houses with stairs but do not like flats with lifts. Especially often need with this group for small private garden space as in Seymour St. Despite much new development in Romsey in the last decade no new bungalows and often existing bungalows demolished for more high density development. This means those seeking bungalows move to villages, away from support of friends and away from proximity to much needed facilities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.42

12008 Support

Summary:

As I get older this issue is becoming increasingly important to me. The views of Trumpington Residents' Association echo mine.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.42

12245 Object

Summary:

We need to separate specialist housing from affordable housing. In one nearby new development, the developer negotiated out of any commitment to build affordable housing by building a specialist housing scheme. Is this acceptable or not. Our view would be that specialist should be allowed to be a substitute for affordable. The important thing is to be clear on this.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.42

12799 Object

Summary:

I would like to see an older persons housing co-operative developed in Cambridge. This could be similar to the one mentioned above (which is in Birmingham) and would promote independence whilst providing a necessary support network and allowing for changes in circumstances (e.g. for a carer to move in).

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.42

17525 Object

Summary:

Major improvements need to be made with regard to provision of care especially for the elderly. The aging population will mean that more care homes will be needed. Private care homes do not always maintain acceptable standards. Voluntary organisations should be more involved.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.42

17965 Support

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.42

18340 Object

Summary:

Policies in this are should be unpicked from other affordable housing categories.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 118 - Opportunities for providing new housing

16909 Object

Summary:

We agree that policies are needed to address conversions and the loss of housing of particular sorts, but the emphasis should be less on the need to create new units of accommodation and more on the need to retain the existing variety of stock suitable for different household sizes. We would resist, for example a policy which appeared to encourage the few larger houses in this area to be converted into smaller units, unless there was clearly no demand from larger households and the impacts properly assessed and mitigated. Not only are conversions often poorly carried out and lead to a loss of scarce larger properties, but they increase the likelihood of more traffic and can have adverse impact on the community and its character.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.44

8119 Support

Summary:

Yes I would support such policies

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.44

9518 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.44

10755 Support

Summary:

Yes there is a need for the policy re opportunities for new housing.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.44

12148 Support

Summary:

The University would support a policy seeking to increase the opportunities for new housing, including the conversion of large properties, which would serve to increase the housing supply within the City.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.44

12252 Support

Summary:

Yes to a policy

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.44

14136 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.44

15280 Support

Summary:

Agree with a policy but it should be designed to discourage short-term thinking and ensure that opportunistic developments do not result in any deleterious skewing of the overall housing mix in a particular area.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.44

16558 Support

Summary:

Yes.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.44

17966 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.45

9214 Support

Summary:

Loss of housing to other uses should not be permitted in Conservation Areas, and elsewhere only where there is a clearly demonstrable need. Conversion of large properties should only be allowed where new housing results.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.45

10328 Support

Summary:

Would the policy stop existing supported housing being emptied of residents and left at risk of crime and decay?

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.45

10765 Object

Summary:

There should always be the presumption particularly for buildings of historic interest and in conservation areas such as Newtown that any conversion returns the house or building to its original use. The priority must always be the context of the buildings and areas rather than commercial gain. Again this emphasises the need for specific policies concerning areas and types of buildings. It is crucial that development is carried out in context and holistically. For historic and conservation areas especially there must be a requirement within the Local Plan to refer to heritage guidelines for development above any commercial interest.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.45

12718 Support

Summary:

Two more options which should be considered:

- 1 Identify empty houses to be repaired and brought back into use (perhaps using council loans to be paid back once a house is let or sold).
- 2 Identify derelict sites on residential streets which could be used for small amounts of housing (e.g. the old tapes shop on Gwydir Street).

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.46

10339 Support

Summary:

Cohousing communities are intentional communities created and maintained by their residents. Cohousing creates neighbourly support required for sustainable communities to work. Planning policy should encourage cohousing as a sustainable and affordable housing option which simultaneously provides community amenities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.46

10771 Object

Summary:

We suggest that older buildings and those not in use should be renovated to address housing needs before there are schemes for large scale housing developments that lack community infrastructure. The Cambridge Local Plan requires different area policies that are contextual to prevent inappropriate piecemeal development. The conversion and sympathetic adaption of properties in conservation and historic areas of Cambridge should always work to tough guidelines to preserve the historic environment. There should be a requirement to use the national and local plan heritage policies as a priority when determining any planning application.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.81

14127 Object

Summary:

Concerned Traveller population is being under-estimated and that this will increase the level of unmet need for Traveller provision, including land, locally.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.81

14386 Object

Summary:

Gypsies and Travellers are the largest minority group comprising 1% of the population in our region, yet Cambridge City Council suggests only 1 pitch is required between 2011-2031.

We are particularly concerned because we believe this is based on the Cambridge Sub-Region Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTAA) 2011) which seriously underestimates the need for permanent pitches in Cambridgeshire. The Assessment was carried out by the local authorities themselves as an internal technical exercise. It reported only to politicians, ignoring strong guidance for involving the wider community and specifically the Gypsy and Traveller communities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.82

14076 Support

Summary:

However, the gradient of inequalities may be steeper than reported here. The recent inequalities report from the DCLG includes the following statement in relation to life expectancy:

"...a recent study stated that the general population were living up to 50% longer than Gypsies and Travellers."

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/2124046.pdf>

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.82

14156 Object

Summary:

Whilst I support the acknowledgement of inequalities I think the wording could be more careful in relation to the expression 'not all of them actually travel' which is misleading and widely misunderstood. Also the level of inequalities of health and education may be more severe than reported here and should reflect recent government reports indicating very severe health and life-expectancy inequalities for instance.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.82

14415 Support

Summary:

The desk-based arithmetic modeling in the 2011 GTAA approach is highly dependent on the assumptions which do not reflect the evidence and our knowledge of the Gypsy and Traveller communities. We dispute the 40% reduction in unauthorised (caravan) need, unreliable counts for caravans on unauthorised sites or encampments, overcrowding on private pitches and the demand for pitches by G&Ts wishing to move out of bricks&mortar into private sites. Discounting need shows a complete misunderstanding of the culture and way of life of this group. Travellers choose to live in large extended family groups not in arbitrarily designated sites.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.83

14088 Support

Summary:

Travellers want to be able to access education for their children and this is often compromised by lack of stability of accommodation, caused by insufficient land allocation for Traveller sites. This must be addressed to allow Traveller children proper access to education.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.83

14158 Support

Summary:

Travellers want to be able to access education for their children and this is often compromised by lack of stability of accommodation, caused by insufficient land allocation for Traveller sites. This must be addressed to allow Traveller children proper access to education. The evidence on inequality related to educational outcomes is strong and stated in the recent DCLG document on inequalities facing the Gypsy/Traveller community:

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/2124046.pdf>

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.84

14177 Object

Summary:

This statement does not sufficiently recognise the extent to which Travellers have been forced into council accommodation against their wishes and in a way which erodes their culture, and nor does it reflect the detrimental effects of being forced into council housing, especially in a climate where racism against Travellers is rife. Council housing spells the breakdown of Traveller communities. No other ethnic minority in this country is forcefully broken up or undermined in this way.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.84

14436 Support

Summary:

In the 2011 GT Sub-region NA, the turnover of pitches on public sites is the only part of the model which takes account of movement between bricks & mortar housing and caravans. Our experience is that a significant part of the demand for new pitches is from Gypsies & Travellers moving from bricks & mortar into private sites. We consider the numbers seriously underestimate the numbers involved. Since despite strong guidance there was no consultation with either the wider community or Gypsies and Travellers, we have no confidence in the statements of need.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.85

14203 Object

Summary:

Recent assessment procedures for the local need for Travellers sites are invalid and require reconsideration. There needs to be independent consultation with the Traveller community to properly assess need and without this the current needs assessment are insufficient and likely to be open to legal challenge.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.86

13753 Object

Summary:

The 2011 needs assessment is not robust; almost certainly underestimates needs. The Councils have ignored the guidance at paragraph 6 of Planning policy for travellers and at paragraphs 40, 41,46, 49, and 50 of the DCLG guidance note on assessments on the central importance of engaging the Traveller communities. The low assessment of need in Cambridge is also the failure by the City Council to make provision over many years. It is self realising.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.86

13946 Object

Summary:

Given that point 9.81 accepts that 1% of the population are travellers the provision of one pitch is shockingly inadequate. How was this figure reached? It is not enough to base the figure on current numbers given that hugely disproportionate numbers of travellers are currently homeless or without adequate housing provision

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.86

14222 Object

Summary:

There should be sites in Cambridge city. The current needs assessment are inadequate and are leading to gross unmet need across the region. If there is to be the release of local land to allow for growth in the local population and to provide sufficient social housing, parts of this land must also be made available for permanent Travellers sites, to prevent homelessness and increasing inequalities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.87

7499 Object

Summary:

There are competing demands, but Travellers always come at the bottom of the pile. The northern fringe east & Cambridge east areas would appear to be eminently suitable to accommodate new Traveller sites, as would the potential green belt release sites on the fringes of the city. For the answer always to be no when specific sites are considered questions how inclusive and committed to equality is the City.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.87

8020 Object

Summary:

The Milton area is overloaded with Gypsy and Traveller provision and any further sites should be located elsewhere.

We would also like consideration for a transit site located near Addenbrooke's hospital.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.87

10408 Support**Summary:**

It is very important to identify a mechanism/policy to provide further accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers. 9.82 clearly sets out that this community experiences poorer health outcomes and suitable accommodation is a pre-requisite for good health. The current Cambridgeshire G and T strategy includes an objective to increase Traveller accommodation. It is a sensible approach to work closely with SCDC on this.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.87

11548 Support**Summary:**

While sites should be provided, controls should be in place such that G&T provision is not a 'back door' to for-profit development. For example, conversion of agricultural land to individual G&T residence to building land sold on the open market.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.87

13959 Object**Summary:**

This does not explain why there has so far been a failure to provide sites for travellers? The current suitability requirement allows for discrimination against the gypsy traveller community whose applications for sites are turned down at an unacceptable rate and without any efforts being made to help them find alternative sites.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.87

14061 Support**Summary:**

The Local Plan should indeed guide the location of Traveller sites if people put in a planning application for a small one in the City. However, in view of the competing demands for land for homes, the reality is that the Council cannot find a suitable site in the City to provide one.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.87

14270 Object**Summary:**

Cambridge city should provide for Travellers - if land can be found for social housing, some of it should be made available also to Travellers and to reflect the scale of the local Traveller population and the great unmet need for accommodation currently faced by the Traveller population.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 119 - Criteria based policy for the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites

9583 Support**Summary:**

Protection of amenity for nearby residents should be paramount. Existing gypsy and traveller sites must be protected from possible landgrabs as they are in a desirable area, or in an area that becomes desirable, eg if a station is built nearby so the site becomes attractive for commuter housing. The existing residents should not feel forced to move on if they are living on legal pitches that have been there for many years.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 119 - Criteria based policy for the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites

13927 Object

Summary:

The requirement that 'There should not be an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents or the appearance or character of the surrounding area.' allows for racist prejudice to determine objections by other residents. Specifically the phrase 'unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents' assumes that the presence of travelling people will affect an area 'adversely'. This is a racist assumption. It would never, for example, be possible to object to the presence of Jews or Asians in an area because it has 'unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents.'

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 119 - Criteria based policy for the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites

13975 Object

Summary:

The approach to Traveller sites should be as similar as possible to that for housing. The approach to housing is effectively to accommodate as much housing as possible within the city, that towards Traveller sites to ask them to meet a series of criteria. In particular the criterion about impact on residential amenities and the appearance and character of the area may make it difficult for any site to be acceptable.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 119 - Criteria based policy for the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites

15281 Support

Summary:

Agree with policy but there needs to be adequate access and services to any site. Suggest land off Coldhams Lane might actually be suitable.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Option 119 - Criteria based policy for the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites

16028 Object

Summary:

Green Belt should not be used for purpose. Possibly the wildlife area in Option 40 could be used.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Question 9.47

7287 Support

Summary:

Was very pleased to see that this issue is given a proper airing, and think that there should be explicit policy to support needs of Travellers / Gypsies.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Question 9.47

8120 Support

Summary:

I believe this is necessary, but note the great difficulty which is always encountered in finding suitable sites.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Question 9.47

8486 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing

Question 9.47

9519 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

10409 Support

Summary:

Yes it is important to have a policy - see response 9.87 (below)

It is very important to identify a mechanism/policy to provide further accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers. 9.82 clearly sets out that this community experiences poorer health outcomes and suitable accommodation is a pre-requisite for good health. The current Cambridgeshire G and T strategy includes an objective to increase Traveller accommodation. It is a sensible approach to work closely with SCDC on this.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

11549 Support

Summary:

Support

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

14046 Support

Summary:

Clearly the needs of the travelling community are not currently being met. Policy which adequately deals with the cultural specificities of the requirements of travelling people and counters the entrenched and systemic racism against travellers that currently influences planning decisions must be developed if Cambridge is to stop failing travelling people.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

14138 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

14369 Support

Summary:

Yes, and that policy must be built on independent consultation of the Traveller community and consultation with Traveller support groups. The current policy is inadequate and will fail to meet the needs of Travellers locally, just as they have failed to meet these needs historically. Council legal costs will remain high while Traveller needs will remain unmet. This is a poor outcome and must be avoided through much more careful policy which addresses local prejudice.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

14870 Support

Summary:

Yes. Support Option 119

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

15046 Support

Summary:

Yes, support.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

15844 Support

Summary:

At present the area (Chesterton Fen) falls far short of the criteria set out in option 119. The continual designation of these sites as temporary has resulted in poor planning and inadequate service provision for the residents. There is inadequate and unsafe road access, no near access to public transport, no mains drainage, high flood risk and site contamination.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

16559 Support

Summary:

Yes.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

17464 Support

Summary:

Policy supported, and further site assessment needed.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

17967 Support

Summary:

Yes - as suggested.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.47

18369 Object

Summary:

The Needs Assessment shows a need in Cambridge for 1 permanent pitch and suggests that given the tight administrative boundary and competing demands it is difficult to find land that is suitable for site provision and refers to work with SCDC to identify suitable land. Given the need in the wider Cambridge area it will be important that the Council's work together to meet needs, which could include provision within city boundaries.

The Councils are already working together on the specific issue of identifying a suitable site to deliver new pitches utilising a jointly secured government grant.

The 'Site Assessment Process 2012' explores a range of site options identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, and outlines why sites are not suitable. It does not consider opportunities that may arise from new land allocations, to achieve delivery as part of major schemes, an issue identified for consultation in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan issues and options report.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.48

9986 Support

Summary:

An area should be set aside for this use on the edge of new additions to the city envelope.

A transit site for limited duration should be found near to Addenbrooke's Hospital, possibly beside the Babraham Road P&R site.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.48

11551 Support**Summary:**

Efforts should be made to integrate the communities on both sides, rather than a 'them and us' culture which sometimes prevails.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.48

13861 Object**Summary:**

It is not acceptable to depend on a criteria based policy. Specific allocations should be made. The Council's refusal to identify sites also risks losing the grant allocation of £0.5m that has been made to the City jointly with S Cambs. We understand HCA is requiring a site to be identified; have planning permission by December 2012 or the funding will be lost.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.48

14064 Object**Summary:**

The current policies do not take into account the fact that the current system fails to adequately account for travellers needs - the fact, for example that most of the population is illiterate, due to historical conditions of discrimination which have made it difficult for them to learn to read. It does not adequately take account of the racism against travellers which causes other residents to object to any plans that mean travellers will be residing near their property. For proof of this, see the comments below any online article that mentions travellers in Cambridge Evening News.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.48

14410 Support**Summary:**

There is a desperate need for speedy allocation of land for permanent Traveller sites - the constant delays in decisions which lead to positive provision is exacerbating the level of unmet needs and increasing the deprivations experienced by the local Traveller community. Meeting the needs of this community needs to be treated as a priority.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.49

15846 Support**Summary:**

The area is adjacent to the planned new station development and should be included in the overall strategic plan for the area and considered jointly by three Authorities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.88

13896 Object**Summary:**

The national guidance has clearly thus far been insufficient given the failure to provide adequate site provision so far.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.88

14364 Object

Summary:

The criteria are prejudiced against Travellers. Criteria for Traveller sites should be no different for criteria for the provision of social housing. Hundreds of thousands are wasted annually on legal costs fighting planning applications and an impoverished Traveller population continues to spend thousands attempting to authorise sites to overcome homelessness. This money could be better spent, to improve circumstances for local Travellers and to improve relations between the Traveller and remaining local population. The criteria offered exacerbate and do nothing to overcome these issues.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.90

14031 Object

Summary:

This is not an acceptable outcome.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.90

14449 Object

Summary:

It is incomprehensible that this is stated as a bald fact. When will appropriate sites be found. There should be provision alongside new housing developments for sites.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.50

11448 Object

Summary:

No.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.50

12802 Object

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.50

14139 Support

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.50

14871 Object

Summary:

No. Absolutely not.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.50

16562 Object

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.50

17968 Support

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.91

11453 Object

Summary:

I do not believe the green belt should be released for this purpose.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

7008 Object

Summary:

In my opinion, there is no way that land in the green belt should be used for gypsy/traveller sites. The green belt is for leaving as green fields, not for use for buildings, caravans, or anything other than farming and walking.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

7120 Object (W/drawn 2012-07-15)

Summary:

Green Belt land should not be disfigured with the type of settlement/encampment favoured by the travelling community, especially as experience shows that they cannot be trusted to keep them tidy and free from rubbish.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

7207 Object

Summary:

It is important that the Green Belt be retained as far as possible and so Gypsy and Traveller provision should be in South Cambs beyond the Green Belt

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

9215 Object

Summary:

Green belt should be retained as it is.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

9520 Object

Summary:

Not in the green belt since such a location would destroy the whole idea of the green belt.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

10772 Object**Summary:**

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

11457 Object**Summary:**

No.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

12259 Object**Summary:**

No. If encroachment onto green belt land for house building is not allowed (as we have argued earlier) similar bans should apply to travellers.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

12806 Object**Summary:**

As there is no space in the city for a suitable site, then we do need to look at other areas. As I would prefer not to build on the green belt, I think we need to look at other sites further afield (i.e. outside the green belt).

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

14003 Support**Summary:**

Yes, in the sense that the planned release of Green Belt land to provide significant areas of housing development capacity on the fringe of the city should also specifically allocate sites for Travellers.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

14006 Support**Summary:**

Yes. Given the failure to find urban locations, the green belt must surely be considered.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

14141 Object**Summary:**

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

14371 Support

Summary:

Yes, just as local green belt land is being considered for housing. Where ever land is offered up for the expansion of the population Travellers must be part of that provision to ensure equality - just as with social housing there are requirements for portions of land in each development to be made available for social housing. Anything less reflects prejudicial mistreatment of the needs of the local Traveller population.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

14873 Object

Summary:

No. Definitely not.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

15048 Object

Summary:

Do not support.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

16050 Object

Summary:

A very dangerous situation would be created should the Green Belt become a target for Gypsies and Travellers, easier that it is at present. Where they have purchased Green Belt, in some cases there has been illegal settlement on the land. Cambridge is a rather vulnerable area to this abuse.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

16563 Object

Summary:

No. No more land in the Green Belt should be used for any development except for leisure and recreation purposes.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

17970 Object

Summary:

No - previous policy should be adhered to

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.51

18371 Object

Summary:

National policy is that Green Belt boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances, but could be altered through the plan making process to meet identified need.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.52

9217 Object

Summary:

In South Cambs or elsewhere in the county

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.52

9987 Support

Summary:

Beside Babraham P&R

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.52

11455 Object

Summary:

No - green belt should be protected and this seems like a particularly detrimental use.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.52

13706 Support

Summary:

Near park and ride sites?

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.52

14143 Object

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.52

14378 Support

Summary:

I am not fully familiar with all the available greenbelt land. However, I understand that there is land which does not even fall within the greenbelt which could and should be made available for permanent Traveller sites, at Northstowe (land owned by the Homes and Communities Agency), Meadow Lane in Willingham (which was previously an authorised site), and in Bassingbourn.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.52

14874 Object

Summary:

No. If the Council approves inappropriate Traveller sites it risks facing legal action from homeowners whose property values are adversely affected.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.52

17971 Object

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.53

14403 Support**Summary:**

I have identified three sites and also think that the Smithy Fen Traveller site could be expanded.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.53

16067 Object**Summary:**

Support for planning permission for the Smithy Fen Cottenham Traveller Site is vital for the council to fulfil its pledges in Cambridge Local Plan.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.53

17972 Object**Summary:**

Consider improving current sites & ensuring transport links to these sites are improved.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.92

14387 Support**Summary:**

Large sites should be possible to allow the Traveller community to thrive in large, mutually supportive, extended family groupings. Amenity blocks and provision for chalets as well as trailers and caravans are all necessary. Without permission for sufficient amenity blocks proper sanitation will not be possible leading to inhumane living circumstances.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.93

13029 Support**Summary:**

The Chesterton Fen is a long established traveller site in South Cambs. Unfortunately the sole road access, within the City boundary, is entirely inappropriate for the weight of existing traffic.

The City Council could substantially enhance the prospects for traveller development through a policy to connect the Fen to Cowley Road, providing more direct connection to the trunk road network for heavy vehicles. Given the presence of the railway sidings this is likely to be along the northern boundary of network Rail's land.

Extra trains serving the new Science Park Station will make the existing level crossing unworkable.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.93

14025 Object**Summary:**

South Cambs have a history of rejecting traveller planning applications on spurious grounds. They recently rejected planning permission by travelling family living within the travellers site at Smithy Fen without adequate justification. They it would adversely affect the character of the surrounding area, despite the fact that the plots in question are completely surrounded by sites which have already gained permission. They do not have a good track record and any cooperation with them should bear this in mind. 10 sites is also a pathetically small number of sites given the size and needs of the population.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.93

14389 Support

Summary:

It is essential that this money is spent on the provision of new permanent sites with proper amenities to meet the needs of homeless Travellers locally - at the moment no land has been identified. Identifying this land is a priority or the money will be lost or will not be spent in ways which meet the needs of local homeless Travellers who are in dire need of stable accommodation for health and educational reasons.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing 9.93

14453 Object

Summary:

We are very concerned that while Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Council have been successful in securing £1m of funding from the Homes and Communities Agency, they have yet to identify any 'acceptable' land for pitches in either area despite the fact that they continue to refuse planning permission for permanent sites for Irish Travellers at Smithy Fen and provide for clear unmet needs for sites in our area. We wonder what purpose was served by bidding for HCA funding and whether Cambridge City will be returning the money received?

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 120 - Residential moorings

9584 Object

Summary:

New residential moorings should not be at the expense of short-stay tourist moorings or to the detriment of the overall riverscape.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 120 - Residential moorings

11067 Support

Summary:

The biggest issue seems to be parking - river boat residents often leave vehicles for long periods of time. When residents parking schemes are being considered, perhaps the boat people should also be considered for eligibility.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 120 - Residential moorings

12608 Object

Summary:

Needs to include the amenity of local residents (if appropriate) too i.e. loss of light, bin space, extra traffic etc.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 120 - Residential moorings

14073 Support

Summary:

The present approach to residential moorings has much to recommend it, and its inclusion in the Local Plan would be sensible.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 120 - Residential moorings

14795 Support

Summary:

The River Cam is quite a fragile environment, and while it's great to welcome narrow boats, there's a risk of air and water pollution already with the recent increase in houseboats (and I mean over 10-15 years).

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Option 120 - Residential moorings

15282 Support

Summary:

These should be more tightly controlled to give back to City residents access to the riverbank at Midsummer Common. There should be no additional encroachment on Stourbridge Common. The idea of a purpose-built marina is worth pursuing but the only site identified so far would require a solution to the Chesterton Fen access problem.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.54

9221 Object

Summary:

In South Cambs or elsewhere in the county

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.54

9521 Object

Summary:

Typographical error? Not exclusively about gypsies.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.54

12808 Object

Summary:

PLEASE NOTE: ERROR ON FORM - NO RESPONSE BOX NEXT TO QUESTION 9.53, SO ANSWERING IT HERE.

I have seen other examples of Gypsy & Traveller sites that work well. For example, one site where the outer boundary is fully tree-lined and internal space is mostly green space (helping avert adverse impact on local residents who may live nearby, as well as provide a nice space for living). Also, there is a specific block of toilet/shower facilities for residents + another block with basic kitchen washing facilities. Residents are free to come and go as they wish. Works well, well maintained.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.54

14148 Support

Summary:

Identification of brown land sites (not contaminated)

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.54

15049 Object

Summary:

This question is misleading. The City Council needs to regard residential boaters as a separate household group which is distinct from 'Gypsies and Travellers'. Most of the residential boaters would be horrified to be categorised as 'Gypsies and Travellers'! Not one person living on board a City-based boat is a member of the 'Gypsies and Travellers' community. Many of these people are white collar professionals such as University workers who have chosen to live on board boats for short periods of time (up to 5 years). Others are genuine 'hard luck' cases who cannot get onto the property ladder or afford rent or simply do not wish to conform with the restrictions of living on land.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.54

15283 Object

Summary:

This question is clearly inspired by "The Golden Compass" or AP Herbert. I am not aware of any extensive use of houseboats by 'gypsies and travellers'. Houseboats are occupied by a broad sample of the population.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.54

15852 Object**Summary:**

We do not understand question 9.54 and consider it an error. Boat dwellers come from a diverse range of cultures and backgrounds

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.54

17974 Object**Summary:**

Ensuring that transport links are available & improved to current sites and moorings providing access to amenities.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.55

9219 Object**Summary:**

Not appropriate for gypsies and travellers

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.55

9522 Support**Summary:**

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.55

14149 Support**Summary:**

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.55

15050 Support**Summary:**

Yes, the City Council needs a specific policy for residential moorers because their needs are unique.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.55

16564 Support**Summary:**

Yes.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.55

17976 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.56

6942 Support

Summary:

Yes, we should consider a marina

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.56

9222 Support

Summary:

Yes, subject to strict criteria

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.56

10130 Object

Summary:

No moorings should be provided within the City boundary without standards enforced, equivalent to those which would be required of land dwellings. For example coal and diesel should not be burned emitting fumes at one to two metre height.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.56

10774 Object

Summary:

Despite the safeguards outlined in Option 120, moorings should be limited to protect the river which is a major amenity for people in Cambridge and especially for those living close by.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.56

14150 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.56

14393 Support

Summary:

Yes, but most of all permanent sites are needed - this is what the Gypsy and Traveller community need. They are happy to buy this land, but need to be able to get planning permission for the development of sites and would benefit from access to funding to support the development of these sites to make them of a high quality. Permanent provision is much more important than moorings - but since this is an area where Travellers pass through, it is also important that they can do so without being moved on by police.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.56

15051 Support

Summary:

Yes. Consideration must be given to the provision of 'offline' moorings (e.g. a marina).

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.56

17977 Support

Summary:

Yes

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.57

9224 Object

Summary:

No - not in City, anyway

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.57

13711 Support

Summary:

Fen Ditton

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.57

15052 Support

Summary:

There are two other possible sites for a marina but these would require joint planning with SCDC because they lie outside Cambridge.1. Land to the west of the River Cam off Fen Road formerly designed as a Waste Transfer Station under the Cambs & Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan 2009. Low lying floodplain. Limited excavation required. Significant capacity for moorings.2. Land to the south-east of Clayhithe Bridge, Waterbeach, owned by the Conservators and let for seasonal cattle grazing. Probably Green Belt.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.57

17979 Support

Summary:

Yes - to the North side of the river Cam, near Fen road. Further mooring on the south side of the river could be provided on Stourbridge common, but a better path should be provided

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.58

13997 Support

Summary:

I think the council should seek and consider evidence of who is actually living on "travellers" sites. It appears to me that they are becoming sites providing poor quality housing for economic migrants from Eastern Europe, Russia and elsewhere.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.58

14015 Support

Summary:

I think there ought be more diversity in moorings. I don't think the council should restrict its moorings entirely to full time residential boaters. I would like to see more recreational and visitor's moorings.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.58

14406 Support

Summary:

I think language around intensification of Traveller sites is deeply prejudicial and that the idea that Travellers sites should be small in relation to the remaining local population should be challenged on the basis of racial prejudice.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.58

14796 Support

Summary:

Some kind of policy re: potential increase of general river use as well as moorings to protect the fragile environment of the Cam.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.58

15055 Support

Summary:

Residential boats must comply with future policies on pollution.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.58

15855 Support

Summary:

There are many costs associated with living on a boat including mooring, license navigation insurance and boat maintenance fees/cost. Mooring fees charged by the Council are well below market rates. There are 70 moorings in Cambridge available to residential boaters on Stourbridge and Midsummer Commons as well as just below Jesus Lock. The City Council should monitor these moorings as the riparian owner. There is little scope for additional residential moorings and a paucity of visitor moorings and inadequate provision for boaters generally. All these matters need to be the subject of a strategic study proposed in Option 23 it cannot be dealt with piecemeal through a policy outlined in option 120.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.58

17980 Support

Summary:

No

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.59

15056 Support

Summary:

Charge mooring fees which are in line with rates elsewhere nationally to 'raise the bar' for the standard of vessels moored on the Cam and the quality of the people making use of these vessels.

9 - Delivering High Quality Housing Question 9.59

17982 Object

Summary:

Only as above.

'Yes - to the North side of the river Cam, near Fen road. Further mooring on the south side of the river could be provided on Stourbridge common, but a better path should be provided'
