

Appendix C: Analysis, responses and preferred approach to employment, plus summaries of representations received

ISSUE: STRATEGIC PRIORITY

Total representations: 18	
Object: 11	Support: 7

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 121: Building a strong and competitive economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essential that the Council continues to support the University of Cambridge which supports Cambridge's economy, social and cultural life and environment; • Sustainable development for homes and jobs close to Cambridge will help build a strong and competitive economy; • Should plan for growth outside Cambridge, close enough to benefit from links to the University; • Need for growth should not be assumed at this stage; • The report downplays Anglia Ruskin University's role; • Cambridge's economy too skewed towards public sector; • The number of people and jobs need to be balanced; • Emphasis on strong sectors will exacerbate city's imbalance; • Encourage affordable employment space; • Limited land means much employment growth will have to go in surrounding districts; • Need to support economy of Cambridge sub-region; • Good transport links between employment sites important.

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Most representations did not propose new options but instead sought to change the proposed option, nevertheless some representations wanted to replace the option with an alternative option that did not seek to grow the economy.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

This Option should help maintain the City's position as one of the UK's most competitive cities by capitalising on its existing strengths in higher education, research and knowledge based industries. The city centre is likely to benefit from the focus on strengthening its retail and tourism offering. The extent to which it will reduce education and employment inequalities and manage potential growth in transport is unclear.

KEY EVIDENCE

- SQW (2011). Cambridge Cluster Study 2011;
- Cambridge City Council (2008) Employment Land Review 2008;
- Cambridge City Council. Employment Land Review Update 2012;

- Cambridgeshire County Council. Cambridgeshire Local Economic Assessment 2011;
- GVA Grimley(2008). Cambridge Sub-Region Retail Study;
- Shopping surveys carried out by Cambridge City Council – 2011/12;
- Hotel Solutions for Cambridge City Council (2012). Cambridge Hotel Futures Study

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Not applicable.

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 19 states the Government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system. Paragraph 21 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that Local Plans should set out a clear economic vision and strategy for their area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth.

Many of the objections sought changes to the priority, rather than opposing it outright. Some work around developing the detail of the priority will be needed prior to the next stage of consultation. The priority will avoid excessive detail, but needs to ensure it captures what makes Cambridge’s economy special and how the economy can be best supported.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 121 subject to minor amendments.

ISSUE: Selective Management of the Economy

Option 122: Total representations: 30	
Object: 3	Support: 27
Option 123: Total representations: 24	
Object: 9	Support: 15
Option 124: Total representations: 10	
Object: 3	Support: 7

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 122 – Continue with selective management of the economy unamended	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should apply only to new buildings, not conversions, or retrofitting existing buildings; • Unduly restrictive and restricts employment growth in the city; • Amend slightly to allow manufacturing and HQ development associated with the cluster; and

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on looking back and playing it safe. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for employment uses which provide a service for the local population; • The current policy is working; • Focus on strengths and locate larger, land hungry, businesses outside Cambridge; • Reserve land for uses that support high tech industry; and • Only relax if local economy is stalling.
<p>Option 123 – Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High tech HQs could just contain back office staff; • High tech HQs and manufacturing should be considered separately; • High tech manufacturing growth needs to be coordinated with surrounding districts, Alconbury is a potential location; • Existing policy allows for high tech HQs to locate to Cambridge; • High tech manufacturing growth will impact on traffic in Cambridge; • Will increase pressures on land supply, increasing prices and rents; • Should apply only to new buildings, not conversions, or retrofitting existing buildings; and • Unduly restrictive and will continue to restrict employment growth in the city. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High tech HQs should be encouraged, will encourage employment diversity and organic growth; • Support the wider economy; • Promote high end manufacturing; • Increased flexibility may help retain commercialisation of research; and • HQ operations are important to grow large companies.
<p>Option 124 – Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should maintain focus on high tech service sector; • Free for all would allow industrial sprawl; and • Encourage businesses with real roots in Cambridge that will remain through the bad times as well as the good. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Let the market decide;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current policy discourages development of employment space that no longer meets modern standards, restricting supply of office space; • Current policy too restrictive; • Current policy contrary to the spirit of the Use Class Order; and • Current policy unfairly discriminates against non-local users.
<p>Other additional key issues raised in paragraphs 10.7-10.10 & questions 10.3-10.6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should look at growth of professional, service and retail industries commensurate with high tech growth; • Amend policy to allow small scale companies involved in research, development and production to support commercialisation of research; • Existing policy isn't restrictive enough, growth should be encouraged in other areas of the country; • This policy has helped keep Cambridge a nice place to live; • High tech manufacturing and HQs require major investment in rail and road infrastructure to be competitive; • Manufacturing development is unlikely to be viable given high costs in Cambridge; • Need to preserve Cambridge's special character; • Should support live-work units and studios for inner areas; and • Building higher, where existing buildings are only one or two storey would help create capacity.

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

It was suggested that the policy of selective management of the economy should only apply to new buildings and not to conversions or retrofitting of existing buildings.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

It is not clear the extent to which the Selective Management Option is responsible for Cambridge's historic and current economic success. However, it is likely that this Option would contribute positively to Cambridge's economy and City Centre. The amended selective management Option should provide additional flexibility, also capitalising on contribution to the local economy from high tech industries which is not currently realised.

A market based approach would free up investment in new employment land and may result in a more efficient use of employment space. However, this approach may not be the most economically efficient for the city as a whole.

KEY EVIDENCE

- SQW (2011). Cambridge Cluster Study 2011;
- Cambridge & South Cambridgeshire (2008) Employment Land Review 2008;
- Cambridge & South Cambridgeshire Employment Land Review Update 2012;
- Cambridgeshire County Council. Cambridgeshire Local Economic Assessment 2011.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 7/2 (Selective Management of the Economy)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Cambridge has a long established policy of 'Selective Management of the Economy', whereby employment uses that have an essential need for a Cambridge location or provide a service for the local population are given positive support. This ensures that the limited supply of land in Cambridge is reserved for businesses that support the Cambridge economy.

Paragraph 21 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states local planning authorities should

“plan positively for the location, promotion and expansion of clusters or networks of knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries”

The Cambridge Cluster Study 2011, looked at the health of the Cambridge Cluster fifty years after its formation. It noted that the policy of Selective management of the Economy may be having unintended consequences: discouraging large scale, high value manufacturing as well as high-tech headquarter functions from locating in the area. It made a number of recommendations with regard the policy of Selective Management of the Economy:

- Stop the net loss of manufacturing land and, and remove the cap on the scale of high value manufacturing facilities that can be developed – other planning considerations can be used to prevent intrusive activities;
- Remove the constraint on HQ functions setting up in Cambridge, whether these are the HQs of local firms or inward investment;
- Allow the development of more open B1 space, in and around Cambridge whilst maintaining the restrictions on science parks to R&D uses (B1(b)).

The Employment Land Review 2012 also made a number of recommendations regarding the policy of Selective Management of the Economy, these are summarised below:

- The assumption that demand for employment land exceeds supply in the Cambridge area is arguably no longer the case and care should be taken to avoid slowing growth;
- The market is helping to keep out low value activities that do not need to locate in Cambridge.

- There is a shortage of B1a office permissions in Cambridge.
- Size restrictions for office and manufacturing appear to be arbitrary.
- If a distinction needs to be made between what is allowable close to Cambridge and further out, the inner limit of the Green Belt seems a logical boundary.
- There appears to be little point in requiring research establishments new to the area to show a “special need to be located close to existing major establishments in related fields”.

It is apparent that circumstances have changed since the policy of Selective Management of the Economy was last reviewed in 2006. Furthermore the policy is having a number of unintended negative impacts on the economy: discouraging some high value business functions from locating to the area, discouraging redevelopment of offices going past their prime and discouraging new office development. While the Employment Land Review 2012 does recommend a number of changes that could be made to improve the policy, the evidence would appear to suggest that it is no longer needed, and the market will safeguard against large, low value, land hungry uses.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 124 and discontinue the policy of Selective Management of the Economy.

The policy of Selective management for the Economy has existed around Cambridge in one form or another for a long time and there are risks to discontinuing this policy. If in terminating this policy this leads to a large increase in business development unrelated to the Cambridge Cluster such that R&D and other high tech employers are harmed (e.g. by being unable to find employment land, or indirectly through the businesses that serve the local area being unable to find land), then this policy could be reintroduced. Careful monitoring of the effects of discontinuing this policy will be needed.

Promoting research uses on specific sites, through masterplans and area based development frameworks, will remain an option open to the Council. This will help to ensure that Cambridge remains a centre for research in the future and strengthen the Cambridge Cluster.

ISSUE: Protection of industrial and storage space

Option 125: Total representations: 13	
Object: 4	Support: 9
Option 126: Total representations: 15	
Object: 7	Support: 8
Option 127: Total representations: 13	
Object: 4	Support: 9

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
<p>Option 125 – Continue with protection of industrial and storage space unamended</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge’s strengths lie in service sector; • These uses have significant transport impacts, should be relocated outside Cambridge; • Empty sites could have office uses on them; • Some protected industrial sites do not have much industry on them; and • Fails to provide sufficient flexibility. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effectiveness of its implementation should be enhanced; • Critical to success of Cambridge economy; • Traffic generated by these uses tend to be outside rush hours; and • Once lost potential is gone forever.
<p>Option 126: Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will allow redevelopment to residential, adding to congestion, and reducing employment opportunities for low skilled workers; and • Once sites are lost from employment use, they are lost forever. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Also amend criteria to assess sites; • Increased flexibility where employment sites are surplus to requirements; and • Cambridge’s strengths lie in service sector.
<p>Option 127: Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of best industrial sites; • Important to sustainable live / work plans; • Cambridge’s strengths lie in the service sector; and • Still not sufficiently flexible. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should apply where there are persistent vacancies; • Improve job diversity; • Increased flexibility; and • Counter productive to enforce unviable uses to remain on a site.
<p>Other additional key issues raised in paragraphs 10.11-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without protection no industrial site can fight off residential land values; • Plans should be able to rapidly respond to changing

<p>10.13 & questions 10.7-10.10</p>	<p>circumstances;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies should not seek to protect sites where there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for that purpose; • Increased flexibility, but not to change to offices, but for cultural activities or even housing; and • Vital need for small workshops as initial homes for new businesses.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
<p>Not applicable.</p>	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT
<p>Option 125 should contribute positively to ensuring a diversity of work opportunities with good transport accessibility. However, it will be important to ensure that protection status should match the identified need.</p> <p>Applying a citywide approach (Option 126) to protection of industrial storage space would enable a more efficient use of available land while still offering a degree of protection through the use of existing criteria. Option 126 could help deliver higher levels of low skilled job opportunities compared to Option 125 helping address issues relating to income and employment deprivation.</p> <p>Providing additional flexibility based on specific criteria which would address the misapplication of Option 125 (this policy has not succeeded in preventing the loss of industrial floorspace in the past) should provide greater opportunities to address community and well being and economy related issues, particularly whereby criteria allow change of use to reduce employment inequalities.</p>

KEY EVIDENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SQW (2011). Cambridge Cluster Study 2011; • Cambridge & South Cambridgeshire (2008) Employment Land Review 2008; • Cambridge & South Cambridgeshire Employment Land Review Update 2012; • Cambridgeshire County Council. Cambridgeshire Local Economic Assessment 2011.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 7/3 (Protection of industrial and storage space)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that:

“Local Plans should meet objectively assessed need, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:

- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
- specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.”

Paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that:

“Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Land allocations should be regularly reviewed. Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities.”

Paragraph 51 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should:

“normally approve planning applications for change to residential use and any associated development from commercial buildings (currently in the B use classes) where there is an identified need for additional housing in that area, provided that there are not strong economic reasons why such development would be inappropriate.”

Option 125 proposes that development within a protected industrial cannot result in the loss of floorspace in B1c, B2 or B8 use under any circumstances. Paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework precludes carrying forward option 125, as the approach does not distinguish between circumstances where there is a reasonable prospect of that use continuing. Empty land and buildings benefit no one.

Evidence from the Employment Land Review 2012 and the Cluster Study is that loss of industrial land continues to be an significant issue for Cambridge, and they both recommend that manufacturing sites within and close to Cambridge should be protected from loss to housing or retail, but equally it is important to recognise that market factors dictate that this will not be possible in all cases. The Employment Land Review notes that allowing hybrid buildings, that enable flexibility of use, could be one way of addressing this issue.

Top industrial rents in Cambridge stand at around £8 - £9 per square foot, outside the city centre this drops to £5.50 - £6. Research by Halifax in 2011 found that

Cambridge residential prices were £2,783 per square metre, or £259 per square foot. Even allowing for the difference in the size of industrial buildings and residential buildings, this is still a significant difference. Without some form of protection, land and buildings in industrial use in Cambridge cannot fight off the residential land values that compete with them.

However, the Employment Land Review notes that safeguarding of industrial land may not be possible in all instances. As older sites become functionally obsolete, and making them attractive to users requires their redevelopment, the low value of industrial buildings can make their redevelopment unviable. In this instance allowing the development of alternative employment uses, such as offices or 'hybrid buildings' (buildings combining office functions, but also Research and Development and production facilities all under one roof), would be a way of making the redevelopment more viable and retaining the site in employment use.

The transport impacts of redevelopment would be considered at the planning application stage. Once sites are lost from industrial use they are unlikely to go back into this use, however the National Planning Policy Framework requires the policy to be flexible, the policy will still seek to retain the site in employment use.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue a combination of option 126 and option 127, deleting the specific protected employment areas and amending the policy to allow more flexibility over the type of employment development that replaces the industrial and storage uses.

ISSUE: Protection of other employment space

Option 128: Total representations: 15	
Object: 0	Support: 15
Option 129: Total representations: 11	
Object: 1	Support: 10

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 128: Do not protect office space	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No arguments in favour of protecting offices. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not necessary, market forces can achieve a sustainable balance; Allow market forces to decide; Increased flexibility for owners; and Many existing empty offices, and new offices going up near station; no need to protect offices.
Option 129:	ARGUMENTS AGAINST:

Protection of office space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not necessary, market forces can achieve a sustainable balance; • Reduced flexibility for owners, impacting on Cambridge economy; • Allow market forces to decide; and • Many existing empty offices, and new offices going up near station; no need to protect offices. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to sustainable live / work plans.
Other additional key issues raised in paragraphs 10.14-10.15 & questions 10.11-10.14	<p>Responses to the questions show a mix of support and objections for a policy to protect offices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on supporting redevelopment / upgrading of existing stock; and • Increased offices in the historic core will impact congestion and the environment.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
Not applicable.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

There is likely to be a medium term shortage of office space in Cambridge. By not protecting office space this situation could be exacerbated. The extent to which this would impact the Cambridge economy is not clear and would depend on the value added by other proposed uses.

Protecting office space would ensure provision for small and growing businesses (an identified need) adding to the diversity of the Cambridge economy.

KEY EVIDENCE

- SQW (2011). Cambridge Cluster Study 2011;
- Cambridge City Council (2008) Employment Land Review 2008;
- Cambridge City Council. Employment Land Review Update 2012;
- Cambridgeshire County Council. Cambridgeshire Local Economic Assessment 2011.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Not applicable.

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that:

“Local Plans should meet objectively assessed need, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:

- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
- specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.”

Paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that:

“Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Land allocations should be regularly reviewed. Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities.”

Paragraph 51 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should:

“normally approve planning applications for change to residential use and any associated development from commercial buildings (currently in the B use classes) where there is an identified need for additional housing in that area, provided that there are not strong economic reasons why such development would be inappropriate.”

The Employment Land Review 2012, using the Cambridge Econometrics Local Economic Forecasting Model (LEFM), translated the baseline and policy-based LEFM projections, into floorspace requirements, by use type. For B1a offices in Cambridge this translated into a requirement of 45-59,000m² by 2031 (or 6.7-8.7ha), and for South Cambridgeshire 98-100,000m² (or 30.0-30.6ha). The review notes that, in principle these figures should be adjusted upwards to create some flexibility.

In looking at the current supply of B1a land, the Employment Land Review 2012 compares a number of different sources. Information from Savills Commercial Limited identified 97,266m² of grade A office space where there is known potential for development in the short term, it should be noted that this excludes strategic allocations such as Northstowe and North West Cambridge.

The Employment Land Review notes that at March 2011 there were sites with planning permission for 157,281m² (or 29.16ha) of B1a in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. However the Employment Land Review notes:

“the apparent plentiful supply of land for B1a offices in the City almost certainly reflects the fact that past completions have been constrained by limited supply, not market demand. Table 3-9 shows a net loss of B1a land over the last decade, which if continued into the future, and in the light of the forecast increase in demand for office premises from professional, business and financial services, would cause supply shortages”

The Employment Land Review also notes that in the last few years demand has contracted into the most popular locations, the City Centre (including Hills Road down to the Station) and the Science and Business Parks around the Northern Fringe.

It also notes that there is currently very little availability of offices in prime city centre, and much of the vacancies lie within secondary locations in Cambridge and the wider area. When looking at the policy of Selective Management of the Economy the Employment Land Review notes:

“There is a shortage of offices with B1a permissions in Cambridge. Unless this is addressed through a combination of intensification and making more land available in the more attractive locations, it could adversely affect projected employment growth, which is mainly in office sectors. The evidence suggests that a combination of applying local user restrictions and making space available beyond the immediate environs of Cambridge is not going to solve the problem of the demand/supply imbalance in the city”

County monitoring data for March 2012 notes that there are net commitments for 43,712m² (or 3.98ha) of B1a floorspace in Cambridge and 45,726m² (or 10.93ha) in South Cambridgeshire. This is substantially lower than the sites with planning permission identified in the Employment Land Review 2012. New allocations at Cambridge Northern Fringe will help meet demand and provide choice to businesses, however if substantial numbers of offices are lost then there is a risk that levels of jobs growth will be adversely effected.

The risk in leaving it to market forces is that secondary offices will see land values decrease relative to residential in the short to medium term, and there will be pressure to redevelop them. This could hinder job growth in the longer term, when the wider economy improves, and leave capacity to meet demand undermined.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 129, and seek to protect office development in Cambridge. This will take the form of a criteria based policy that has inbuilt flexibility to allow for loss when there is no reasonable prospect of that use continuing.

However having policies protecting industrial uses and offices and no policy protecting other land employment use (B1b & other B use classes) could have the unintended consequence of discouraging R&D development it is therefore proposed

to protect all land and buildings in employment use (B use class).

ISSUE: Promotion of cluster development

Option 130: Total representations: 18	
Object: 1	Support: 17
Option 131: Total representations: 4	
Object: 3	Support: 1

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 130: Continue to promote cluster development	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cluster should grow naturally. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides reassurance to potential occupiers that sites will be occupied by related uses; Justifies the principle of development on some sites; and Carry forward existing policy.
Option 131: Do not promote cluster development	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carry forward existing policy. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should look at what businesses are actually doing.
Other additional key issues raised in paragraphs 10.16-10.17 & questions 10.15-10.18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discontinue policy as of no apparent previous value; Strong support for cluster development, especially knowledge-driven, creative or high tech industries; The new station will help the cluster expand; Clusters assist networking; Promoting clusters is in line with the NPPF; Provision of incubator units can help some entrepreneurs; Provides a positive statement of the type of development the Council wishes to see; and Needs to mention growth of SMEs.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
Not applicable.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT
This Option should help to facilitate development and support Cambridge as an internationally recognised high tech centre where it is used. However if it were to be discontinued is unlikely to have any significant effect on the sustainability topics due to the infrequency of its application.

KEY EVIDENCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SQW (2011). Cambridge Cluster Study 2011;

- Cambridge City Council (2011). Cambridge Annual Monitoring Report 2011.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Policy 7/4 (Promotion of Cluster Development)

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Paragraph 21 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states local planning authorities should

“plan positively for the location, promotion and expansion of clusters or networks of knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries”

While the policy has not been well used in planning decisions it gives a clear steer to business as to the strengths of the Cambridge economy, and promotes particular forms of development to support the cluster, as well as particular locations. Responses were largely in favour of retaining the policy.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 130, and continue to promote cluster development; this could be through a strategic objective. Promoting research uses on specific sites, through masterplans and area based development frameworks, will remain an option open to the Council. This will help to ensure that Cambridge remains a centre for research in the future and strengthen the Cambridge Cluster.

ISSUE: Shared social spaces as part of employment areas

Option 132: Total representations: 19	
Object: 0	Support: 19
Option 133: Total representations: 6	
Object: 4	Support: 2

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 132: Promote shared social spaces	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No arguments against the option. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot be left to market forces, will only be of interest to developers with a long term interest; • Requires a long term commitment to them; • Community is important in workplaces; and • Support for residential over commercial premises to enliven areas after hours.
Option 133: Do not promote shared social spaces	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires a long term commitment to them; and • Support for residential over commercial premises to enliven areas after hours.

	<p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No arguments against the option.
Other additional key issues raised in paragraphs 10.18 & questions 10.19-10.22	<p>Responses to the questions show a mix of support and objections for a policy provide shared social spaces in employment areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a matter for local plan policy; • Not necessary or desirable; • Lack of facilities on commercial developments leads to extra journeys during the day; • Gardens for communal lunches; • Only realistic on larger employment sites; • Occupiers may have to subsidise; and • Increased costs to developers will increase rents.
NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
Not applicable.	

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

The promotion of social spaces involving a mix of uses could potentially contribute to a diverse economic and social mix through provision of a variety of employment / social spaces tailored to particular local need. Provision of attractive shared social spaces could help reduce pressure on city centre office space. Whether the attractiveness of peripheral employment sites will improve with time is not known, and the likely success of this Option on meeting sustainability objectives is unclear without further detail on what form the shared social spaces could take.

Compared to the above Option 132, a market based approach may mitigate the risk of unintended consequences or financial implications for developers, particularly given the uncertainty over what shared social spaces would take.

KEY EVIDENCE

- SQW (2011). Cambridge Cluster Study 2011.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Not applicable.

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

The Cluster Study 2011 recommends that Cambridge's new developments are designed as social spaces, not just as locations for business and research.

There was some concern expressed in the representations that this would lead to increased costs for the development of new employment areas, which would be passed onto occupiers. If the policy was worded such that it promoted but did not require social facilities this concern could be addressed, then the sites would only provide them if they felt there was a business case to them making the site more attractive.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 132, and promote shared social spaces as part of employment sites, this could be through a more general, mixed-use policy.

ISSUE: **Densification of existing employment areas**

Option 134: Total representations: 24	
Object: 0	Support: 24
Option 135: Total representations: 8	
Object: 5	Support: 3

OPTION NUMBER	KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION
Option 134: Densify existing employment areas	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No arguments against the option. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support with adequate weight given to possible detrimental effects (traffic, noise, visual intrusion); Will reinforce transportation, density and sustainability goals; Preferable to erosion of green spaces and Green Belt; and Makes best use of employment land supply.
Option 135: Do not densify existing employment areas	<p>ARGUMENTS AGAINST:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional pressure to erode green spaces and Green Belt. <p>ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When a cup is full, it is full.
Other additional key issues raised in paragraphs 10.19-10.21 & questions 10.23-10.26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should be planned in coordination with the transport strategy; Densification should be complemented by fast connecting transport links, particularly at peripheral locations; Smarter use of land;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Densification should not undermine value of open spaces and social areas, should be considered on a case by case basis, not a blanket policy; • Higher densities promote walking and cycling; • Densification where good public transport exists or can be provided; • Care must be taken of the historic environment in Cambridge; • Brownfield development is better than Greenfield; • Increased traffic from denser developments; and • Criteria based policy may be effective.
--	---

NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Not applicable.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

Cambridge faces significant development constraints and opportunities to maximise the sustainable development of employment sites should be pursued. Densification would likely result in reducing pressure on Cambridge’s landscape/townscape and green infrastructure. Through increasing density in peripheral employment sites, this Option would also enable greater opportunities to develop inclusive and attractive shared spaces on employment sites.

Concerns regarding change of use as a consequence of densification could be mitigated by applying protective criteria. Densification of employment sites is likely to increase the viability of new sustainable transport provision but overall, could also contribute to greater pressure on surrounding transport infrastructure. This Option (135) could result in reduced opportunities to develop more social spaces due to increased pressure on land values.

KEY EVIDENCE

- SQW (2011). Cambridge Cluster Study 2011;
- Cambridge City Council (2008) Employment Land Review 2008;
- Cambridge City Council. Employment Land Review Update 2012;
- Cambridgeshire County Council. Cambridgeshire Local Economic Assessment 2011.

CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED

- Not applicable.

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE

One of the principles underlying planning set out in paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework is that planning should:

“encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value”

The Issues & Options 2 consultation has consulted on a number existing employment sites where they may be potential for intensification as buildings come to the end of their life. No decision on these sites has been taken.

Linking densification of employment uses to existing or potential high quality public transport routes would help minimise the traffic impact of any additional employment onsite.

Whether densification of employment uses on a site is appropriate or not will depend on the site specific issues of the site. The National Planning Policy Framework already encourages effective reuse of land; a policy seeking densification of employment areas would not add anything that would help in the determination of planning applications.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

The recommendation is to pursue option 135 and not have a specific policy that seeks to densify existing employment areas. Individual allocations and proposals will be considered on their merits, and a general strategic objective can seek to make best use of land by encouraging densification in suitable locations across the city in highly accessible locations.

APPENDIX C - ANALYSIS, RESPONSES AND PREFERRED APPROACH TO EMPLOYMENT PLUS SUMMARIES OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.1

8309 Support

Summary:

'Sensibly managed growth' might well be a state of no absolute growth but of dynamic equilibrium which can encompass desirable change.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.1

16163 Support

Summary:

The Vision set out on pages 221-222 is strongly supported, and clearly it is important to put the right policies in place to further this vision.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.2

8311 Support

Summary:

It is important to support district and local centres.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.3

8312 Support

Summary:

We welcome the statement that development of tourism should not adversely impact on the quality of life of residents.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.3

11769 Object

Summary:

This paragraph does not mention the attraction of the city itself, the narrow streets, the market, the river etc. The conservation areas such as Newtown are also a vital part of what makes Cambridge an attractive place to visit. These are a major part of the tourist attraction and should be part of a long term local plan.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

7208 Support

Summary:

The limited land available within the City boundary dictates that a significant proportion of employment growth will have to be located in surrounding districts. It is essential that Cambridge City's policies give adequate weight to the needs of the surrounding new communities, as they make a crucial contribution to sustaining the overall quality of life throughout the Cambridge sub-region and its economic competitiveness. The economy within the City needs to be considered together with that in South Cambs. In particular, good transport links need to be provided between all the employment sites, so as to facilitate cross-fertilisation of expertise.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

8121 Object

Summary:

It may be necessary to strengthen the economy, but I find it difficult to see how further growth can take place within the city. The 2006 Local Plan stated that the city had twice as many jobs as working residents, resulting in commuting into the city. It was for this reason that land was removed from the green belt to provide housing. Any further increase in jobs will lead to a greater need for housing. Both jobs and housing must be developed together, close enough to Cambridge to benefit from links with the University etc, but outside the city boundary.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

8313 Object

Summary:

We would replace the phrase 'to strengthen and grow' with the phrase 'to maintain the strength of'. Need for growth should not be assumed at this stage.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

10915 Object

Summary:

The Issues & options report downplays Anglia Ruskin's role. The university performs a significant role, which is not limited to "the needs of the Region". It has a number of important specialisms, including international links and relations. Its Department of Optometry, for example, carries out world leading research into diseases such as glaucoma. Its role in health and social care education and training is significant and growing internationally.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

12192 Support

Summary:

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

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

12264 Support

Summary:

we support this strategic priority

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

12267 Support

Summary:

In addition to delivering excellence in teaching and research, the University has a major impact on Cambridge's economy, social and cultural life, and environment. It is essential therefore that policies in the plan should continue to encourage and enable the future development of the University and its related activities.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

12492 Object

Summary:

The local economy will grow of its own accord. The real question is how much it will/should grow and what price will be paid for it? You can't grow for ever, so it seems silly to have it always as a goal. Why not equilibrium?

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

13194 Support

Summary:

We would support the development of a policy supported by guidance setting out design and locational criteria in order to assess the suitability of development proposals for tall buildings on a case by case basis. This would be supported as it will allow flexibility for developers by not limiting building heights across the city or part thereof. Where developable land is at a premium, tall buildings not only create important landmark features within the city, but also allow increased density and encourage the best use of land.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

13937 Object

Summary:

- * Option 121 needs to refer to this issue to build a strong and competitive economy through sustainable development for homes and jobs together and close to Cambridge.
- * This approach is the most sustainable option rather than new homes and jobs growth in surrounding settlements where new development will add to the increase in longer distance vehicle movements.
- * Planning new growth at distances from Cambridge is unsustainable, is a drain on resources of energy and time thereby reducing the effectiveness of the Cambridge economy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

13976 Object

Summary:

Option 121 does not recognise the crucial need for a proper balance between existing jobs (together with new jobs expected to be created) and the need for new homes within the City, and the cumulative impact that this could have both on the Cambridge sub-regional economy and on 'UK plc' if this balance is not fully and effectively achieved.

The Option should refer to the benefits of building a strong and competitive economy through sustainable development of both homes and jobs together, in close proximity to the City of Cambridge.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

15300 Object

Summary:

Cambridge economy is insufficiently diverse to be sustainable, too dependent on the public sector, too skewed to a 16-26 demographic and failing to meet the needs of many residents.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

16565 Object

Summary:

I question the need for further growth of the economy over and above what was decided in the 2006 Plan.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

16871 Object

Summary:

Support a policy: On the business front it is interesting to note that Mitchams Corner is one of the 3 District Centres in the City and yet park and ride won't stop here! The document ignores the big issue of business rates which is a central government tax and is a serious disincentive to start ups. The City has little interest in negotiating 'rate free periods as landlords do with rent as they do not get the money. The obsession with preserving A1 retail use is based on the past...England is no longer a nation of shopkeepers...it is still a nation of small business based on a little footfall but very much on service and the internet!
Provision for developing a river walk on the north bank of the Cam.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

17780 Support

Summary:

John Lewis supports the Council's strategic priority, Option 121, to maintain and strengthen the city's regional role as a centre for shopping and tourism.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

18254 Object

Summary:

We feel that the over emphasis on the 5 stand out business sectors is likely to exacerbate the city's imbalance in availability of employment space and thus not provide what is spatially and socially required for Cambridge - genuine mixed use, dynamic, lively and affordable employment sites.

A significantly weak section in the report is the lack of thought on mechanisms to improve the quality of existing employment sites. Expansion of employment in the city is being encouraged, to run in parallel with housing growth, however, apart from hotel locations there is little thought given to the best location for any new premises. The CAA suggest that Mill lane, Newmarket road and some other existing "protected industrial storage space! sites would be suitable sites for employment focus.

The plan should encourage "affordable employment space" and seek mixed use sites combining housing, social and employment space.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

18391 Support

Summary:

Support this option. Please refer to the full text of submission.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 121 - Building a strong and competitive economy

18584 Object

Summary:

Not surprisingly, the majority of Chamber businesses are not rushing to respond to these consultations. Generally they feel that if the area is to achieve the desired economic growth and prosperity the plans need to be coordinated and to cover a much larger area than Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, ideally in one single plan. For consultation to deliver any meaningful conclusions there needs to be much closer collaboration across local authority areas and much better connection between different issues. For example, the question of how many homes should be built in and around Cambridge is quite obviously linked to how will the growing population get around? Realistic answers to these questions can only be made if major road and rail infrastructure developments, as well as walking, cycling and use of public transport are part of the consultation.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Key facts

11773 Object

Summary:

Objectives Employment in Box. First bullet to Promote the growth of and linkages....
Integration of public transport planning within and outside the city is vital.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Key facts

12609 Object

Summary:

I'm not sure where Cambridge Retail Park and the Beehive fit into this and would argue that there should be a separate plan for retail warehouse provision in Cambridge to discourage in-commuting which is creating huge problems in these areas.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Key facts

15057 Object

Summary:

Key attractions for visitors also include the River Cam.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Key facts

16162 Object

Summary:

Under the headings 'Key Facts' and 'Objectives', Higher and Further Education should be moved to sit between Employment and Retail, to reflect its level of importance and the interaction between Employment and Higher and Further Education.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Objectives

7209 Support

Summary:

The vitality and viability of centres in Cambridge needs to be considered together with that of those in the wider sub-region.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Objectives

10917 Object

Summary:

The report downplays Anglia Ruskin's role. The university performs a significant role, which is not limited to "the needs of the Region". It has a number of important specialisms, including international links and relations. Its Department of Optometry carries out world leading research. The University is a major provider of education and training in Health and Social Care and its role internationally is growing.

The 3rd objective under Higher and Further Education be amended to read "To support the growth and development of Anglia Ruskin University and the upgrading and enhancement of its campus and facilities."

The final objective under Higher and Further Education should be deleted. The provision of student accommodation helps to relieve the pressure on existing homes used as shared houses and reduces the pressure on affordable housing stock. Its attractiveness to developers is irrelevant.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Objectives

10918 Object (W/drawn 2012-10-30)

Summary:

The final objective under Higher and Further Education should be deleted. The provision of student accommodation helps to relieve the pressure on existing homes used as shared houses and reduces the pressure on affordable housing stock. Its attractiveness to developers is irrelevant.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Objectives

12500 Object

Summary:

Tourism needs no encouragement; if anything, the reverse, if it were possible. Visitor nummbers have increased by c. 30% at least since the mid-1980s. It was well-nigh intolerable then. I do support the proposals to try to reduce the pressure on the centre.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Objectives

12611 Object

Summary:

I broadly agree with this but there needs to be stronger wording around retail to include "sustainable". I would argue that not all retail centres are operating effectively (Cambridge Retail Park and the Beehive) because of this and the emphasis should be on "improve" rather than just "maintain".

Support the assertion that Cambridge has lost valuable industrial sites. All current sites should be protected.

Object to comment about Cambridge Retail Park and Beehive Centre. these sites emphasise how restrictive land use policies have prevented appropriate out of town development, which could have reduced congestion.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy Objectives

12615 Support (W/drawn 2012-10-30)

Summary:

Completely support the assertion that Cambridge has lost valuable industrial sites, despite protection, and I would argue that this is therefore a failure to implement the existing protection, which must be a key goal of this new plan. All current sites should be protected - even the less occupied ones that could be turned over to office use etc perhaps - if they are de-protected we will lose all of this land to housing.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy Objectives

12618 Object (W/drawn 2012-10-30)

Summary:

Cambridge Retail Park and the Beehive emphasise how the restrictive land use policies around Cambridge fringe have prevented appropriate out-of-town development of supermarkets etc that would significantly reduce the inward commuting of shoppers to these areas that is currently causing serious congestion. I would argue therefore that in some areas there should not be further future development (as would be encouraged in the wording currently) until these existing issues have been resolved and out-of town sites should be considered instead.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy Objectives

15948 Object

Summary:

And whilst we're on the subject of the city centre, is there now too much tourism? Perhaps. As a long-term resident of Cambridge, I'm happy enough to share its sights and history with visitors, but there are many times of the day now when it's a real trial to make your way around the city centre. We're not talking Venetian levels of disruption or intrusion, thank heavens, but even so.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy 10.5

13170 Object

Summary:

The lack of land is surely an argument against further growth. The compact nature of the city should be preserved to that end, the plan should encourage regional employment growth and seek to spread Cambridge's reputation for excellence beyond the city boundaries to outlying towns.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy 10.6

8315 Object

Summary:

We see the two components of the 'vision' as mutually incompatible. We do not believe that the emphasis on 'growth' can also allow for the quality of life in the city to be maintained.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy 10.6

11834 Support

Summary:

We agree with the vision expressed in Paragraph 10.6 and add to the statement that the "quality of life in the city that makes it an attractive place to live...will be protected and enhanced" should explicitly include references to the green spaces and compactness of the City. This is consistent with the Vision proposed in Option 1 and, we believe, essential to the continued success of the City in attracting leading academics from around the world.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.6

12172 Object

Summary:

For the new Cambridge Local Plan to continue its current focus on higher, further and university education, at the expense of recognising the role of the entire education sector would be wrong.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.6

15489 Support

Summary:

We agree with the vision expressed in paragraph 10.6 and add to the statement that the "quality of life in the city that makes it an attractive place to live...will be protected and enhanced." Should explicitly include references to the green spaces and compactness of the City. This is consistent with the Vision proposed in Option 1, and, we believe, essential to the continued success of the City is attracting leading academics from around the world.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.6

16196 Support

Summary:

We agree with the vision expressed in paragraph 10.6 and add to the statement that the "quality of life in the city that makes it an attractive place to live...will be protected and enhanced." Should explicitly include references to the green spaces and compactness of the City. This is consistent with the Vision proposed in Option 1, and, we believe, essential to the continued success of the City is attracting leading academics from around the world.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

6943 Support

Summary:

yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

7009 Object

Summary:

NO, I definitely do not agree with the vision.

Cambridge's attractiveness is largely due to its compactness, and the proximity of countryside to the university within walking distance. Cambridge cannot cope with further expansion of its industry without expansion of its residential accommodation or increasing the already excessive commuter traffic. Growth cannot go on for ever without damaging what is good about the city.

Cambridge University - alone - needs to be permitted to grow at a reasonably low rate, and the rest of Cambridge's industry needs to experience an incentive to locate elsewhere.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

7121 Support

Summary:

Yes. I have reservations about encouraging the development of the city as a regional shopping centre and would actively discourage tourism.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

7697 Support

Summary:

Vital.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

8124 Object

Summary:

I think the two parts of the vision statement are incompatible. I don't think that 'expansion' of the economy can happen except at the expense of the quality of life in the city.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

8316 Object

Summary:

Don't agree. We see the two components of the 'vision' as mutually incompatible. We do not believe that the emphasis on 'growth' can also allow for the quality of life in the city to be maintained.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

8487 Support

Summary:

yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

9361 Support

Summary:

I support the vision so long as it is understood that it can and must be achieved within existing parameters (including the science developments envisaged for North-West Cambridge). The city should go for quality not quantity even in the hi-tech field, and for compactness as an enabler in research and high value economic growth. It should NOT become a shopping centre for the East of England, nor a dormitory town for London. Most of the housing projected for the city and certainly for the Green Belt is undesirable and will destroy the 'vision'.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

10823 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

10927 Support

Summary:

The Vision for the local economy is supported. It will be important that the local plan translates the vision into policies which supported the continued growth and success of the City's universities and the economy, and ensures sufficient new homes, both market and affordable housing, are delivered.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

11776 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

11835 Support

Summary:

We agree with the vision expressed in Paragraph 10.6 and add to the statement that the "quality of life in the city that makes it an attractive place to live...will be protected and enhanced" should explicitly include references to the green spaces and compactness of the City. This is consistent with the Vision proposed in Option 1 and, we believe, essential to the continued success of the City in attracting leading academics from around the world.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

12210 Support

Summary:

I agree with the vision stated at the top of p. 222.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

12266 Object

Summary:

Broadly agree but while our economic success may be largely built on 'hi tech' and the usually highly qualified key staff who populate those companies, we need to find or create jobs for those with lower level qualifications and skills and achieve a more balanced economy as well as avoid unemployment.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

12275 Support

Summary:

The vision in this section is supported but the wording 'continue to develop' should be incorporated in the elements of the vision set out at Option 1

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

12419 Object

Summary:

Agree with Prof Kerrigan
"I support the vision so long as it is understood that it can and must be achieved within existing parameters (including the science developments envisaged for North-West Cambridge). The city should go for quality not quantity even in the hi-tech field, and for compactness as an enabler in research and high value economic growth. It should NOT become a shopping centre for the East of England, nor a dormitory town for London. Most of the housing projected for the city and certainly for the Green Belt is undesirable and will destroy the 'vision'." And finally, to allow the University of Cambridge alone to prosper would be utterly self-indulgent and a "non-optimal" use of the the public money on this University has been set up and continues to operate.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.1**

12427 Object (W/drawn 2012-10-30)**Summary:**

Support: In addition, I strongly disagree that the city is for the exclusive benefit of the University of Cambridge (or a few in the University). For the University to benefit the country, it needs to interact with and start new hi-tech companies. Support strongly the Cambridge cluster - do not rest on laurels.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.1**

12446 Support (W/drawn 2012-10-30)**Summary:**

And finally, to allow the University of Cambridge alone to prosper would be utterly self-indulgent and a "non-optimal" use of the the public money on this University has been set up and continues to operate.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.1**

12507 Object**Summary:**

I don't agree with the vision because its aims conflict. Expanding the economy, and all the 'growth' and people and housing that will bring, will not protect or enhance the quality of life here. You can't grow and expect to stay the same.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.1**

14118 Object**Summary:**

I think that 'continuing to develop as a world leader' implies an expansion and densification of the City that will in due course destroy the very assets that the Council seeks to protect and enhance. Cambridge is a small city, and sometimes we cannot compete for new business with much larger ones. We can adapt and innovate, but if we expand in some areas, we may have to be at the expense of others. E.g. if Marshalls were to move out, this would create opportunities for new development, but the land supply is limited

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.1**

14124 Support**Summary:**

Must continue to develop but there are obvious constraints on physical expansion

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.1**

14153 Support**Summary:**

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.1**

14207 Object**Summary:**

Not everyone is suited to work in a knowledge based economy. For sure it's important, but need there be so much emphasis on it?

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.1**

14875 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

15058 Object

Summary:

Support:

Yes, but second sentence of the Vision statement reads awkwardly and needs to be drafted.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

15301 Object

Summary:

Very pretty words but develop means growing the whole not just one section of the community at the expense of the rest. More attention should be given to making life better for the non-academic people who actually make the academic monster work and who actually make Cambridge a place worth living in. Academe should be a jewel in the crown of a more balanced economy but appears to risk becoming an economic cancer sucking the life-blood out of the rest of the city.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

15491 Support

Summary:

We agree with the vision expressed in paragraph 10.6 and add to the statement that the "quality of life in the city that makes it an attractive place to live,...will be protected and enhanced." Should explicitly include references to the green spaces and compactness of the City. This is consistent with the Vision proposed in Option 1, and, we believe, essential to the continued success of the City is attracting leading academics from around the world.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

16197 Support

Summary:

We agree with the vision expressed in paragraph 10.6 and add to the statement that the "quality of life in the city that makes it an attractive place to live,...will be protected and enhanced." Should explicitly include references to the green spaces and compactness of the City. This is consistent with the Vision proposed in Option 1, and, we believe, essential to the continued success of the City is attracting leading academics from around the world.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

16567 Object

Summary:

The Vision sets out two incompatible aims.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

16846 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

17458 Support

Summary:

I agree with the vision that Cambridge should develop as a leader in the fields of higher education and research but this has to be done within the constraints of a finite water supply

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

17487 Support

Summary:

We fully support the statement that there is a need to strengthen and grow Cambridge's economy, to build upon existing strengths and to enhance the city's regional role. The need to plan positively for economic growth is a requirement of the NPPF, whilst the NLP report which is appended to these representations also underlines the importance of planning sufficiently for the economic development needs of the area. The importance of applying a cross-boundary approach to planning for the economic development needs of Cambridge, in conjunction with South Cambridgeshire, should also be stressed.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.1

18446 Support

Summary:

The County Council supports the vision as outlined in 10.6 and suggests further consideration of the barriers to investment over the life of the Plan could be added, for example, the identification of priority areas for infrastructure provision. Forthcoming census data on commuting patterns and economic activity will facilitate our understanding of the Travel to Work Area (TTWA) of the sub-region.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.2

8317 Support

Summary:

The idea of change without growth has not been considered.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.2

11836 Support

Summary:

We agree with the vision expressed in Paragraph 10.6 and add to the statement that the "quality of life in the city that makes it an attractive place to live...will be protected and enhanced" should explicitly include references to the green spaces and compactness of the City. This is consistent with the Vision proposed in Option 1 and, we believe, essential to the continued success of the City in attracting leading academics from around the world.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.2

11939 Object

Summary:

I support the development of the tourism industry and the encouragement of longer stays (though repeat visits are an alternative which should also be encouraged). Particular attention should be paid to encouraging visitors to venture outside the city using sustainable transport, which entails better public transport, more traffic free walking and cycling routes, and better information and marketing which emphasises the availability of sustainable transport modes. The last is crucial as many visitors may not have easy access to the Internet during their stay.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.2

12274 Object

Summary:

The second objective under Higher and Further education should read 'To support the University of Cambridge and the Colleges in maintaining their pre-eminent position nationally and internationally.'

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.2**

12281 Support**Summary:**

the words 'whilst also seeking to develop the diversity of jobs' after 'knowledge based economy'. We need to reflect the 2nd bullet point of employment objectives as set out on p220.

While our economic success may be largely built on 'hi tech' and the usually highly qualified key staff who populate those companies, we need to find or create jobs for those with lower level qualifications and skills and achieve a more balanced economy as well as avoid unemployment.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.2**

14155 Support**Summary:**

I would remove the reference to 'prosperity'.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.2**

14215 Support**Summary:**

What about training, employment opportunities in such things as sustainable building, making existing building more energy efficient, water conservation and grey water use, heat pumps, solar, local power
Also appliance repair, recycling
Also care for green spaces etc

I may have missed it, but I have not seen much in this plan about employment opportunities in these kinds of areas.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.2**

14538 Support**Summary:**

I suggest redrafting the vision to make clear that the "research" in: "world leader in the fields of higher education and research" includes commercial research and development (largely in some way linked to and/or derived from the academic activity in the city).

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.2**

15060 Support**Summary:**

The River Cam needs to be part of that vision. The City should be viewed as the hub of a larger catchment.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.2**

15492 Support**Summary:**

We agree with the vision expressed in paragraph 10.6 and add to the statement that the "quality of life in the city that makes it an attractive place to live,...will be protected and enhanced." Should explicitly include references to the green spaces and compactness of the City. This is consistent with the Vision proposed in Option 1, and, we believe, essential to the continued success of the City is attracting leading academics from around the world.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.2**

16201 Support

Summary:

We agree with the vision expressed in paragraph 10.6 and add to the statement that the "quality of life in the city that makes it an attractive place to live,...will be protected and enhanced." Should explicitly include references to the green spaces and compactness of the City. This is consistent with the Vision proposed in Option 1, and, we believe, essential to the continued success of the City is attracting leading academics from around the world.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.2

17461 Support

Summary:

The point about development not exceeding environmental constraints is missing from the vision

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.2

17489 Support

Summary:

We fully support the statement that there is a need to strengthen and grow Cambridge's economy, to build upon existing strengths and to enhance the city's regional role. The need to plan positively for economic growth is a requirement of the NPPF, whilst the NLP report which is appended to these representations also underlines the importance of planning sufficiently for the economic development needs of the area. The importance of applying a cross-boundary approach to planning for the economic development needs of Cambridge, in conjunction with South Cambridgeshire, should also be stressed.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.2

17596 Support

Summary:

South Cambs are proposing to create between 14-30K new jobs and the City 10-20K over the next 20 years, how far have these plans been coordinated?

A large proportion of jobs created in S Cambs are likely based on businesses created in the City, who are forced to move out as they grow. There are currently a large number of vacant business premises at the Science park and Waterbeach, these could accommodate City businesses without impacting on infrastructure.

Small units should be provided in the City on small sites with good transport links to University sites and the station.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.2

17984 Support

Summary:

There is mention only of the knowledge based economy. Cambridge should foster also the highly skilled technical sector - emphasising the synergy between the universities and City- such as precision engineering. C has a strong tradition here e.g. Cambridge Instrument Co, Pye This sector offers skilled employment and a skilled workforce; likely to benefit innovative entrepreneurs

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.2

18251 Support

Summary:

It is good the options report identifies the 5 key business sectors in the city however there is not enough effort placed in the report on strengthening the other sectors that a city needs in order to generate a diverse city - the city needs to attract top people, does it?

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.7

8318 Support

Summary:

We agree that it is important to give positive support to employment uses which provide a service for the local population.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

7122 Support

Summary:

I support this option (Option 122)

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

8947 Support

Summary:

Continue with the current policy. It is working.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

11863 Support

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the city, where transportation links are better, distribution cost lower and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

12509 Support

Summary:

This is better than the alternatives.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

13196 Support

Summary:

We would suggest that this policy be applicable only to new buildings and not to conversions or retrofitting of existing buildings.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

13234 Support

Summary:

We support Option 122.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

13792 Object

Summary:

The current policy is unduly restrictive and restricts employment growth in the city.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

13904 Support

Summary:

Management is a good idea. Amendment may become necessary.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

14539 Support (W/drawn 2012-10-30)

Summary:

This policy appears to me to be in both Cambridge's and the wider national interest. I support it.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

14543 Object

Summary:

This policy appears to me to be in both Cambridge's and the wider national interest. I generally support it, but think it ought be slightly relaxed to address the concerns raised that it could prevent or deter certain related manufacturing or HQ from locating in Cambridge even though their presence would be synergistic with the city's established businesses.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

15302 Object

Summary:

Selective management is always based on looking back and playing it safe by repeating what appeared to work well last time rather than encouraging genuine initiative. We do not have the space for large scale manufactures so outsource production to places that do, a process that has been the source of much of the land released for redevelopment in recent years in Chesterton and other parts of the city. The idea of cluster development is supported but we should have diversity and build on solid foundations not hot research money.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

15499 Support

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower, and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended

16202 Support

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower, and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended**

16903 Support**Summary:**

We support a policy which seeks to manage the local economy in such a way that it reserves scarce land in the City for firms that complement the nature of the economy, with its emphasis on high tech and vital service jobs. Relaxing this policy as in option 123 would be justified only if the local economy were to stall significantly or if sites elsewhere were clearly unsuitable.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended**

16938 Support**Summary:**

ARM also supports 'Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy Unamended' of the Cambridge Local Plan IOR which reserves new employment land in Cambridge for uses that support the high tech cluster or provide a service for the local population. By limiting employment land to those firms that benefit from locating in Cambridge and benefit the Cambridge Phenomenon or those that serve the local economy, the policy ensures that there is enough land for these firms and that they are not priced out of the market by more generic, but higher value, uses.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 122 - Continue with selective management of the economy unamended**

17714 Support**Summary:**

I cannot see any reason to change the management of the economy and therefore support Option 122.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses**

7123 Object**Summary:**

I am wary of the reference to high tech headquarters if such headquarters would simply accommodate back office staff

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses**

7210 Support**Summary:**

Headquarters and large-scale high-value manufacturing need to be considered separately. Encouragement should be given for high-tech firms to keep their headquarters in the Cambridge sub-region (including the city) when they grow. This will contribute to employment diversity and avoid disruption to organic growth. Space needs to be available in a variety of sized units at a variety of locations so that firms have a range of choices. Consideration of appropriate locations needs to be co-ordinated with South Cambs, East Cambs and Huntingdon (particularly bearing in mind the potential role of the enterprise zone at Alconbury).

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses**

7551 Support**Summary:**

Whilst it is sound economics to support clusters, the wider Cambridge economy must profit too from the commercialisation of research into larger employment providers

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses**

7698 Support

Summary:

The Holford report's effects are still visible in the shape of the local economy. It would be good to see high end mfg promoted.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

11871 Object

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the city, where transportation links are better, distribution cost lower and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. Option 122 allows for high technology headquarters to be located in Cambridge, provided they support the local cluster or provide local services. We do not see the need to create a new policy for this.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

12436 Support

Summary:

Support views of Cambridge Past, Present & Future.

Country needs its start-ups to grow. Relocating office / manufacture outside Cambridge will lead to reverse commuting.

Do not encourage head office location of non-Cambridge companies. Cambridge has a role which it needs to fulfil for the nation (hi-tech, leading R&D and then innovation and commercialisation) but Cambridge is not big enough to sustain everything that might want to locate to this lovely place (financial services etc).

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

12514 Object

Summary:

High tech firms don't have to be here. Nor do we want 'big players' coming in with the consequent inflation of land values, rents and property values. Nor do we want large-scale anything, if the Cambridge we know is to survive.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

13197 Support

Summary:

We would suggest that this policy be applicable only to new buildings and not to conversions or retrofitting of existing buildings.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

13239 Support

Summary:

There is some merit in Option 123.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

13795 Object

Summary:

This option is unduly selective and will restrict employment growth in the city.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

14144 Support

Summary:

More flexible approach might mean the City keeps more of the commercialisation of its research

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

14876 Support

Summary:

Support

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

15303 Support

Summary:

It is important to have headquarter operations in Cambridge if you want enterprise to survive hard times. Our clusters should be the centre of design and development for much wider networks as both Marshalls and ARM have become. Pure R&D, with rare exceptions, does not grow large enterprises; it is dependent on successful enterprise for funding, e.g. Bell Labs and Microsoft for two.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

15513 Object

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City in South Cambridgeshire District, where transportation links are better and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing pressure on the City's green spaces. Option 122 already allows for high technology headquarters to be located in Cambridge, provided they support the local cluster or provide local services. We do not see the need to create a new policy for this. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

16214 Object

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City in South Cambridgeshire District, where transportation links are better and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing pressure on the City's green spaces. Option 122 already allows for high technology headquarters to be located in Cambridge, provided they support the local cluster or provide local services. We do not see the need to create a new policy for this. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses

17646 Object

Summary:

The City Council Property Services Department considers that this policy approach may need to incorporate some flexibility, to protect specific areas but allow others to be released for other high value manufacturing or high-tech office uses by inserting additional criteria similar to those listed in Policy 7/2 of the current Local Plan. There may be some merit in allowing higher value or high tech companies on certain sites, or allowing B1a (office) and B1c (light industry) that have direct links to companies that need a Cambridge location or widen the range of local employment opportunities. It is considered this would be of benefit to Cambridge, and is something that could be considered at Northern Fringe East (see separate comments from the Council in respect of Option 33).

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 124 - Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy

7124 Object

Summary:

I do not support this option

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 124 - Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy

11872 Object

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the city, where transportation links are better, distribution cost lower and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. Option 122 allows for high technology headquarters to be located in Cambridge, provided they support the local cluster or provide local services. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 124 - Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy

12517 Object

Summary:

Letting the market decide would mean a free-for-all and the rapid ruin of Cambridge. That is how 19th century industrial sprawls happened.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 124 - Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy

13244 Object

Summary:

We do not support Option 124.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 124 - Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy

13721 Support

Summary:

Let the market decide.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 124 - Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy

13797 Support

Summary:

The current policy discourages the development of employment space that no longer meets modern standards and consequently restricts the supply of office space in the city.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 124 - Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy

15305 Object

Summary:

We do need to be selective but manufactures are as important as biochemicals and design and development as important as research. We do need to get smarter and seek to encourage businesses with real roots in Cambridge that are likely to remain in bad times as well as good.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 124 - Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy

15516 Object

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City in South Cambridgeshire District, where transportation links are better and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing pressure on the City's green spaces. Option 122 already allows for high technology headquarters to be located in Cambridge, provided they support the local cluster or provide local services. We do not see the need to create a new policy for this. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 124 - Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy

16215 Object

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City in South Cambridgeshire District, where transportation links are better and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing pressure on the City's green spaces. Option 122 already allows for high technology headquarters to be located in Cambridge, provided they support the local cluster or provide local services. We do not see the need to create a new policy for this. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 124 - Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy

18392 Support

Summary:

We also wish to express our support for Option 124. Whilst our client fully supports the concept of promoting what Cambridge excels at and providing support to local enterprises, there is concern that the existing policy is too restrictive and contrary to the spirit of the Use Classes Order. In our view, the policy currently unfairly discriminates against non-local users and distorts the market accordingly.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.3

7125 Support

Summary:

Undoubtedly. I urge the pursuit of existing policies which should include allowing the growth of professional, service and retail industries commensurate with the growth of the high tech sector.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.3

8320 Support

Summary:

need policy

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.3

11778 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.3

11864 Support

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the city, where transportation links are better, distribution cost lower and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.3**

12280 Object**Summary:**

The view of University Estate Management Officers is that the policy should be amended to allow for small scale companies involved in research, development and production to allow for the commercialisation of academic research to take place in Cambridge.

This would assist business start ups and spin out companies that would encourage the development of the hi-tech Cambridge cluster and benefit the local economy.

This matter needs further discussion within the University before a definitive response can be given.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.3**

12285 Support**Summary:**

yes, we need a policy

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.3**

14161 Support**Summary:**

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.3**

15501 Support**Summary:**

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower, and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.3**

16206 Support**Summary:**

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower, and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.3**

16569 Support**Summary:**

Yes.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.3**

16847 Support

Summary:

Yes - support.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.3

17470 Support

Summary:

There is need for a policy addressing the selective management of the economy

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.3

17985 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.3

18448 Support

Summary:

The County Council supports the need for a policy addressing the selective management of the economy (options 122-4)

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

7010 Object

Summary:

Definitely there is a need for selective management of the economy. Of the three options 122 to 124 presented, Option 122 seems far the most preferable, but in my view it doesn't go far enough in limiting local increase in employment. Other parts of the country already have sufficient housing stock, much of it unwanted, and rather than ruin further parts of the country (e.g. Cambridge), it seems far preferable to have gradually and naturally increasing disincentives for more businesses to locate here.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

7639 Support

Summary:

Option 122. Absolutely this is a reason why Cambridge is a relatively nice place to live and has been successful. Only an idiot would change things.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

7791 Support

Summary:

Option 122.

Given the limited growth consistent with the vision of Cambridge as a compact city we should focus on those activities that most benefit from locating in Cambridge.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

8321 Support

Summary:

support option 122

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

9363 Support

Summary:

Option 122

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

10360 Support

Summary:

122 because with limited land it should go to start ups and research sites that need good links with the university to prosper.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

10442 Support

Summary:

Support policy 123 because this looks more flexible and likely to achieve better results.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

11780 Object

Summary:

option 122. Cambridge should continue doing what is unique to Cambridge and what we do best. High value manufacturing and high tech headquarters will need a major investment in rail and road infrastructure to be competitive and these jobs are needed more elsewhere. The 'Cambridge Phenomenon' because of the talented people here, is agile and will move with the times whereas manufacturing is much less so.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

11865 Support

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the city, where transportation links are better, distribution cost lower and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

12296 Object

Summary:

On balance we support Option 123 but with some modifications

1 we query whether large scale manufacture is even feasible given Cambridge's high cost base;

2 we do strongly support is encouragement of high value manufacturing - pre and pilot production and final assembly of complex systems. Here unit costs are less important but employee skills are paramount. Marshall's aerospace is an excellent example Supporting Head Office employment may also help the diversity of jobs

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

14162 Support

Summary:

Option 122

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

14540 Support

Summary:

I support option 122, with elements of option 123.

I think the current selective policy ought continue, but be changed (relaxed) slightly to allow, and encourage, high tech manufacturing and headquarters functions, which relate to, serve, or show a need/benefit to being co-located with Cambridge's existing academic and commercial skills and expertise.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

15502 Support

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower, and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

15859 Object

Summary:

The vision for the Cambridge economy needs to be consistent with maintaining essential character of the City and the quality of life of its inhabitants. The economy thus should be managed to meet those aims. It follows that of the options put forward, Option 122 is one we would favour, namely continuing with the current selective management of the economy rather than expanding the scope (option 123) discontinuing a policy of selective management (option 124).

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

16193 Support

Summary:

Option 123 is generally supported. The policy set out in the current Local Plan (Policy 7/2) is too restrictive in that it does not currently allow for uses which could potentially support an important primary use. We do not support option 124 as there is a continued need for a policy on selective management of the economy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

16207 Support

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower, and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.4

16573 Support

Summary:

Option 122 preferred on the whole. Option 123 would certainly be preferable to Option 124, which could lead to unregulated development of business.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.4**

16848 Support**Summary:**

We prefer Option 123, which would provide more flexibility. The policy should also include reference to live-work units and studios for inner areas of Cambridge, where artists and craftspeople can be encouraged to set up creative businesses within residential neighbourhoods.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.4**

17466 Support**Summary:**

Economy - Option 123 supported including high value manufacturing, and support for wider under-provided employment categories. Policies also need to assist the expansion and retention of successful businesses. Transport integration of major new housing sites and major job locations also needs to be given far more priority and attention

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.4**

17486 Support**Summary:**

It would be best to continue with Option 122 and continue with the selective management of the economy. Unless larger scale development can be shown to be water neutral it should not be encouraged.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.4**

17637 Object**Summary:**

Whilst we support proposals to assist SMEs, we accept that the re-location of a major company to Cambridge would enhance the City's reputation and may attract other large companies. However, many large companies already have a presence in Cambridge through sponsorship of laboratories, either through funding the building of a laboratory or by sponsoring a research project. So it is unlikely that a major company will re-locate its research and development function to Cambridge city. However, a policy that does not permit this to happen seems shortsighted. We therefore support Option 123 to allow for this to happen.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.4**

17989 Support**Summary:**

Option 123

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.4**

18449 Support**Summary:**

Option 123 - Amend selective management of the economy to include some additional uses is supported

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.5**

9364 Support**Summary:**

The places to try option 123 are existing or new Science Parks etc, outside the City boundary but easily accessible by good public transport.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.5**

10232 Support**Summary:**

We would like to see the local economy diversify to make better use of local resources. A great deal more of our basic needs should be provided for efficiently from local sources. This promotes resilience against global crises such as fluctuations in fuel prices and other world markets.

In general we support small businesses which benefit the local community. From now through to 2031 we expect expansion in following areas:

- * Local food production
- * Local production of natural materials, such as willow, wood for fuel
- * Education in how to create and provide goods and services locally
- * Research in methods to utilise local resources efficiently

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.5**

11866 Support**Summary:**

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the city, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.5**

15504 Support**Summary:**

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower, and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.5**

16198 Support**Summary:**

Option 123 refers to the possibility of allowing 'large scale, high value manufacturing and high tech headquarters to locate in Cambridge' which is supported but the policy should be relaxed further to allow for uses with a clear 'support link' to well-established employment uses which are essential to the continuing success of the Cambridge economy, such as sales and marketing uses. The policy also needs to recognise the importance of other support functions including things such as warehousing and distribution as all are important to sustain a vibrant and sustainable knowledge based economy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.5**

16209 Support**Summary:**

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower, and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.5**

17007 Support

Summary:

Specifically, the vision and objectives should support the following actions:

- Make it here: Better connecting the success in generating ideas and innovations in our area into manufacturing activities and jobs. Provision should be made specifically for manufacturing space in the Cambridge area. It is therefore important that there is a clear understanding between the offer of Cambridge employment sites and those key employment sites in and around Cambridge including the new Enterprise Zone at Alconbury.
- Innovation adoption: Capturing local business benefits from innovation for regional, national and international advantage.
- Promoting our world-leading capabilities and track record: Campaigning on the importance of our innovation strengths and specialisms to HM Government and internationally.
- Using our international reputation to capture quality foreign direct investment: Better promoting and marketing the science and innovation base in terms of the assets, businesses and institutions for general and tailored promotion and to attract quality investment.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.5

17468 Support

Summary:

Economy - Option 123 supported including high value manufacturing, and support for wider under-provided employment categories. Policies also need to assist the expansion and retention of successful businesses. Transport integration of major new housing sites and major job locations also needs to be given far more priority and attention

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.5

17488 Support

Summary:

Water consumption has not been taken into account in considering the selective encouragement of national rather than local businesses.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.5

17606 Support

Summary:

Marshalls is the only major industrial employer in the City and one with a world class reputation. However they seem to have reached a steady state in their expansion programme and are unlikely to generate any significant number of new jobs over the coming plan period, either through aviation engineering or airport operation. Any provision for growth in the industrial sector therefore seems to be based on small to medium sized companies.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.5

17990 Support

Summary:

Firms that did not benefit from locating in Cambridge would be unlikely to locate here, squeezing out others, given the high land costs. Firms' headquarters would compete for office locations rather than industrial areas.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.5

18450 Support

Summary:

Option 123 The County Council believes that the additional uses allowed should be restricted to those downstream and headquarter uses linked to the high tech sector and excludes more general financial and business service headquarters.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.6

11867 Support

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the city, where transportation links are better, distribution cost lower and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.6

12303 Support

Summary:

There are significant opportunities to make better use of existing high tech clusters by both redevelopment and building higher - often existing buildings are 1 or at most 2 storey. This would make better use of existing land rather than use up scarce new land. The main thrust should be to help develop the successful hi tech / innovation / research sectors by creating the right environment for them to flourish. To some extent, growth would then be self generating

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.6

15505 Support

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower, and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.6

16211 Support

Summary:

We believe the selective policy is in the best interest of the City and should be maintained. We believe the City should maintain its focus on service sectors and locate high value manufacturing outside the City, where transportation links are better, distribution costs lower, and large-scale industrial facilities can be better serviced without increasing the pressure on the City's green spaces. We do not believe the Green Belt should be eroded in support of Option 123 or 124, which we oppose.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.6

17490 Support

Summary:

Developments should only be considered if they can be shown to be water neutral

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.6

17991 Support

Summary:

Given the likely changes in industrial organisation and production over the next twenty years, and the wish to encourage innovation, policies should not be restrictive

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.11

14560 Support

Summary:

The Rattee and Kett site at the bottom on Purbeck Rd (later National Extension College, now Homerton Business Centre) is very suitable for light industrial and workshop premises. The site is an important part of the artistic and industrial heritage in Cambridge. It features publicly funded artwork and gardens, currently hosts a print workshop and a bookshop, a cookery school, and could become a center for craft, masonry, iron, woodwork, glass, print related economic activity. It would be ideally suited to become a "low-tech" counterpoint to the high-tech centres which so far dominate local planning.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 125 - continue with protection of industrial storage space unamended

7211 Support

Summary:

The effectiveness of its implementation should be enhanced.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 125 - continue with protection of industrial storage space unamended

11875 Object

Summary:

Oppose. We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. We believe that storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. We believe these spaces once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 125 - continue with protection of industrial storage space unamended

12621 Support

Summary:

This is an absolutely critical requirement for the future success not only of Cambridge as an economy, but it is essential to the execution of the live/work local strategy outlined in this plan. Another critical element is that even if these businesses do generate traffic, it is during the day when many workers will be away, so that it is not clashing with existing rush hours as would be created by any residential developments on these sites. Traffic is therefore balanced better.

The argument that sites with empty plots should be deprotected is also incorrect in my opinion as why cannot these be turned to a different use such as office space? Any de-protection would significantly weaken the Cambridge economy and the entire central strategy of this plan.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 125 - continue with protection of industrial storage space unamended

12624 Support (W/drawn 2012-10-30)

Summary:

One this land is lost it's potential use for the Cambridge economy is gone forever. The argument that sites with empty plots should be deprotected is also incorrect in my opinion as why cannot these be turned to a different use such as office space - of which this very report says we need more? Once gone we can never use this land again. Any de-protection would significantly weaken the Cambridge economy and the entire central strategy of this plan.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 125 - continue with protection of industrial storage space unamended

13166 Object

Summary:

We object to Option 125 because it would unnecessarily retain Homerton Business Centre as a protected industrial/storage site.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 125 - continue with protection of industrial storage space unamended

14879 Support

Summary:

Support

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 125 - continue with protection of industrial storage space unamended

15306 Support

Summary:

We must not allow alternative uses to be sacrificed to the great god Housing but the emphasis should be on encouraging local enterprises to grow rather than allowing in satellite operations that can close down at the hint of economic recession.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 125 - continue with protection of industrial storage space unamended

15521 Object

Summary:

Oppose. We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 125 - continue with protection of industrial storage space unamended

15590 Object

Summary:

We consider that Option 125 ('Continue with protection of industrial and storage space unamended') fails to provide sufficient flexibility for the future redevelopment of existing employment sites, given that it seeks to safeguard those sites designated under the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted 2006).

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 125 - continue with protection of industrial storage space unamended

16218 Object

Summary:

Oppose. We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 126 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites

11878 Support

Summary:

Support We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. We believe that storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. We believe these spaces once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 126 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites

12626 Object

Summary:

Totally disagree with this option - there will simply be no chance that this land will do anything other than become residential. This will add congestion on the roads in rush hour, rather than adding traffic throughout office hours when most industrial businesses are open i.e. adding further to rush hour congestion. Local people will lose their jobs, and potential value land will be lost that could be used for office space? Industrial land could be contaminated, making only dense garden-less developments possible which will add disproportionately to local traffic. Please don't take this option!

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 126 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites

13181 Support

Summary:

We support Option 126, provided the current policy protection on the site (for light industry, general industrial and warehousing) is removed, and replaced with an allocation for mixed use residential development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 126 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites

13649 Support

Summary:

We support Option 126 so that all protected industrial and storage sites are deleted, including land to the north of Cambridge Leisure.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 126 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites

14027 Support

Summary:

We support Option 126 so that all protected industrial and storage sites are deleted.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 126 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites

14882 Object

Summary:

Object

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 126 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites

15307 Object

Summary:

No this would release land that would be gobbled up for housing but then what? The diminished real economy would leave many local option but to become underpaid servants of the universities or quit Cambridge for places which offer opportunities for the non-academically gifted.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 126 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites

15526 Support

Summary:

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 126 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites

15589 Support

Summary:

Therefore, we favour this policy as it would allow the greatest flexibility for employment sites to come forward for redevelopment for alternative uses including mixed use or residential led developments, where appropriate. In drafting the Policy, we are of the opinion that the policy should explicitly state that where employment spaces are surplus to requirements (including those that are protected) that they are encouraged to come forward for mixed use or residential led developments where it is demonstrated that there is no demand for continued use or the premises are no longer commercially suitable for employment use.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 126 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites

16222 Support

Summary:

Oppose. We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 127 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development

11877 Object

Summary:

Oppose. We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. We believe that storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. We believe these spaces once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 127 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development

12632 Object

Summary:

I would disagree with this for the very reason that you've outlined which is that some of the best sites in Cam could come under pressure if protection is not strong. There are certain things that are critical to the execution of the central live/work local strategy running through this report and the protection of existing sites is one. Why has the existing protection failed? This should be looked at rather than admitting nothing can be done. Cannot re-designation of use be done whilst also protecting sites too? Are these really mutually exclusive?

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 127 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development

14166 Support

Summary:

Qualified to apply when there are persistent vacancies. Should improve the diversity of jobs

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 127 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development

14776 Support

Summary:

As the report highlights, whilst sites are required for employment in Cambridge, it is counterproductive to force sites to remain in a use which are not viable. However if planning policy showed flexibility and sensitivity to each case then viable uses of existing sites could be achieved at the same time as improving the sites.

To assist in this process I consider that there needs to be an ability to introduce alternative types of employment onto sites and consider mixed use developments which will maximise the use of existing sites and enable schemes to be economically viable.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 127 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development

15308 Support

Summary:

This looks like a good approach, especially in the context of encouraging design and development enterprises.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 127 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development

15535 Object

Summary:

Oppose. We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 127 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development

15593 Object

Summary:

Similarly, we consider Option 127 ('Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development') also fails to provide sufficient flexibility for the redevelopment given that this policy seeks to retain all existing employment land in employment uses, including those sites not designated under the Local Plan.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 127 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development

16223 Object

Summary:

Oppose. We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 127 - Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development**

17648 Support**Summary:**

The Property Services Department at the City Council support Option 127 and suggest inclusion of additional criteria where changes of use to other employment generating development would be acceptable, such as the characteristics of the proposed use compared with B1c, B2 or B8 uses, the amount of employment the proposed use generates and the value of those jobs to the local economy. It would also be relevant to consider what alternative locations exist for the proposed use, and whether they are available and suitable. The City Council Property Services Department understands that there are examples where companies, such as a taxi firm, have not been able to locate on protected sites because of this current policy approach. We suggest that additional criteria might be added to the wording implicit in current Local Plan Policy 7/3 to support other employment uses. The Northern Fringe East / Cowley Road Area could be a location where a less restrictive industrial policy could apply and other types of employment could be located, although this needs to be assessed on a more comprehensive basis. The Council owns land within this area (see representations under Option 33).

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.7**

11553 Support**Summary:**

Support

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.7**

11781 Support**Summary:**

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.7**

11879 Support**Summary:**

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. We believe that storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. We believe these spaces once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.7**

12308 Support**Summary:**

yes, good to have a policy here

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.7**

12634 Support**Summary:**

Yes, this is critical to the execution of this policy and local jobs rely on it. Without protection no industrial site can hope to fight off residential developers forever - certain things like this and green space need protection.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.7**

15527 Support

Summary:

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.7

16225 Support

Summary:

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.7

16958 Support

Summary:

In line with the NPPF, Councils should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century. Policies should therefore be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances (NPPF, paragraph 21).

The local plan policy addressing this issue needs to include the flexibility to consider sites on an individual basis, based on their location and specific circumstances. The policy should avoid applying a blanket protectionist policy where there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for that purpose, or where the site is able to fulfill other strategic functions. This approach is supported by national guidance contained within the NPPF - where applications for alternative uses of land or buildings on such sites should be treated on their merits, having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities (paragraph 22).

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.7

17992 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.7

18451 Support

Summary:

The County Council supports the need for a policy addressing the protection of industrial and storage space.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.8

9365 Support

Summary:

Option 127, especially in cases of persistent or prolonged vacancy

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.8

11785 Support

Summary:

Option 126; need flexibility to use unused space creatively, but NOT necessarily for office space but for socially useful, cultural activities or even housing.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.8

11881 Support

Summary:

Option 126

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. We believe that storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. We believe these spaces once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.8

12309 Object

Summary:

either option 125 or 127; the latter does give flexibility and encourages employment of all types but Option 125 is OK.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.8

12638 Support

Summary:

Very strong protection, but surely there's a way of doing this but having flexibility for employment use at the same time. Just please don't open these areas up to the developers!

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.8

14175 Support

Summary:

Option 125

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.8

15529 Support

Summary:

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.8

16228 Support

Summary:

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.8**

16960 Support**Summary:**

We would support option 126, which seeks to amend the policy by removing the protected industrial and storage sites and using a criteria based policy to assess the loss of any industrial sites within the City.

This approach will provide flexibility to use or re-use sites for the most appropriate and sustainable purposes, responding to market conditions and changing needs and demands, and will prevent industrial units standing empty or under utilised. This enables the planning authority to be pro-active and positive in its management of land use and promotion of sustainable development.

A set of criteria will also give the protection where needed to ensure a balance and mix of uses within the city for example, promoting employment uses as part of larger mixed-use schemes.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.8**

17633 Support**Summary:**

The number of industrial sites within the City has decreased and we support the proposal, Option 127. We also suggest that small parcels of land to be considered to provide sites for groups of small industrial units, for example on land released by building multi-storey car parks at the retail sites on newmarket road and/or Beehive centre. some of these could be ground floor units below residential units.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.8**

17993 Support**Summary:**

Option 125

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.8**

18452 Support**Summary:**

The County Council supports option 127 Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment development with provisos. It is critical that expanding the criteria does not result in an accelerated loss of industrial floorspace particularly of the type which can accommodate the noisier and less attractive types of employment uses and/or can provide relatively cost effective facilities for start up industrial concerns, both of which are necessary to provide a mix of employment uses in a city the size of Cambridge.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.9**

8322 Object**Summary:**

We were unable to respond to this section because we did not understand what was implied by the phrase 'industrial and storage space'. This needs to be made clear.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.9**

11882 Support**Summary:**

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. We believe that storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. We believe these spaces once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.9**

12635 Support

Summary:

Traffic would be worse at rush hour times if these areas were turned over to housing as they currently generate most traffic during the day when people are at work.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.9

15530 Support

Summary:

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.9

16229 Support

Summary:

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.9

17994 Support

Summary:

There is a vital need for small workshops on 'cheap' sites as initial homes for new businesses if C is to foster innovative entrepreneurs. Some protection of these sites is therefore important. This also promotes a variety of enterprises offering varied employment

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.10

11883 Support

Summary:

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. We believe that storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. We believe these spaces once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.10

15532 Support

Summary:

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.10

16231 Support

Summary:

We believe that Cambridge's strength lies within the service sectors, and that the City roads and transportation infrastructure do not promote sustainable industrial and storage space. Storage facilities should be moved to locations on the borders of the City where transportation networks are less congested and parking less of a problem. Provided the City provides a sustainable transportation system and reduces congestion by relocating these units, such facilities should be able to increase productivity. These spaces, once freed up, should be available for mixed employment use, governed by the selective policy amended in line with Option 126.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.10

16961 Support

Summary:

Economically, Cambridge functions as a city-region, providing employment for the sub-region. It is therefore reasonable to assess employment land opportunities across the administrative boundary with South Cambridgeshire. There may be appropriate and available sites that lie within South Cambridgeshire District Council, yet would assist in meeting the needs of both local authorities.

Paragraph 181 of the NPPF expects local planning authorities to work collaboratively and in a "continuous process of engagement".

Development plans will also be expected to demonstrate evidence of "having effectively cooperated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts".

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.10

18608 Support

Summary:

We agree there is need for a policy. We believe that

Policies on industrial units, warehousing and failing business should be relaxed to allow re-development of selected units

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.14

12639 Object

Summary:

I'm not sure that I agree entirely here - the Intercell site has stood empty for years?

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 128 - Do not protect office space

11885 Support

Summary:

We do not believe a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 128 - Do not protect office space

13198 Support

Summary:

We would support a policy which continues not to protect office space from change of use. This would continue to allow the market to determine loss of office space to conversion to alternative uses as dictated by demand. This allows flexibility for the owners of such buildings to apply for change of use should offices remain vacant for extended periods of time.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 128 - Do not protect office space

15539 Support

Summary:

We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 128 - Do not protect office space**

16234 Support**Summary:**

We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 128 - Do not protect office space**

17730 Support**Summary:**

As far as offices are concerned, there are so many empty offices and a new office block in Station Road that I cannot think that there is a need to build yet more. I therefore oppose any proposals to build more or to preserve offices. Let the market determine what other use is appropriate for an empty office. I therefore support Option 128.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 129 - Protection of office space**

11888 Object**Summary:**

We do not believe a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 129 - Protection of office space**

12640 Support**Summary:**

Yes, I think that similarly to the protection of industrial space this is a key requirement of the live/work local strategy

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 129 - Protection of office space**

13200 Object**Summary:**

We would not support the protection of office floorspace in Cambridge. This would reduce flexibility for the owners of such buildings which would impact on the Cambridge economy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 129 - Protection of office space**

15540 Object**Summary:**

We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 129 - Protection of office space**

16236 Object**Summary:**

We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Option 129 - Protection of office space**

17732 Object

Summary:

As far as offices are concerned, there are so many empty offices and a new office block in Station Road that I cannot think that there is a need to build yet more. I therefore oppose any proposals to build more or to preserve offices. Let the market determine what other use is appropriate for an empty office. I therefore oppose Option 129.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

8323 Support

Summary:

need policy

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

11787 Support

Summary:

yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

11889 Object

Summary:

We do not believe a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

12288 Object

Summary:

The University occupies a number of former residential buildings that are now used as offices. We are concerned to ensure that Local Plan policy for the use of office space is sufficiently flexible to enable change of use of this type of space.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

12311 Support

Summary:

yes to a policy

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

12641 Support

Summary:

Yes, it's key to the central live/work locally premise.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

15309 Object

Summary:

It is probably best to leave this to the market to decide but focus on making it relatively easy to upgrade/replace office space no longer capable of meeting modern demands. conversion to other uses, e.g. student accommodation could be considered if it would contribute to the release of housing currently occupied by students back into the housing market and not feed growth in the number of students.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

15541 Object

Summary:

We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

16238 Object

Summary:

We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

17995 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.11

18453 Support

Summary:

The County Council supports the need for a policy addressing the protection of other employment uses.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.12

8324 Support

Summary:

support option 128

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.12

9366 Support

Summary:

Option 128, but only marginally

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.12

11788 Support

Summary:

Option 128

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

11890 Object**Summary:**

We do not believe a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

11941 Support**Summary:**

I believe that office space should be protected at relevant locations.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

12316 Object**Summary:**

we support option 129 rather than 128.

We recognise a number of employers like the city centre and it can be convenient for employees (once they have travelled to work). But, do we really want to encourage office space in the centre of Cambridge? Better for office space to be further out, like CB1 or even on the edge of the city next to retail parks, science parks etc

this would help to avoid further city centre congestion, where, for example the volume of buses at peak times is a major contributor to congestion

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

12642 Support**Summary:**

129- protect

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

14171 Support**Summary:**

option 129 except where non sustainable in structure or location

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

14176 Support**Summary:**

Option 128

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

15544 Support**Summary:**

Support Option 128. We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

16239 Support**Summary:**

Support Option 128. We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

17628 Support**Summary:**

we oppose the creation of yet more office space within the City and therefore see no case for option 129 since it does not seem necessary. We therefore support Option 128. Judging by the number of empty office blocks (City/Unix House on Hills Road and new office development at the Station) we cannot see any justification for more accommodation. The position would be different if a headquarters of a major insurance/finance institution were to move in, although they may prefer to be situated near the M11.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

17996 Support**Summary:**

Option 128

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

18181 Support**Summary:**

Support Option 128. We do not object to Option 129, albeit request that we can get involved with and be consulted on the evolution of this type of policy so that we can properly understand the implications for USS and the potential future redevelopment of Mount Pleasant House.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.12**

18454 Support**Summary:**

The County Council supports Option 129 Protection of office space.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.13**

11795 Object**Summary:**

Planning for out of town offices should be integrated with residential development to lessen transport needs, and transport should be integrated in planning decisions. Allowances should be made for home working that may well diminish the need for office space and transport. Alternative work sites in nearby towns should be considered. The city planners should work closely with other authorities and the Local Plan should be integrated with region wide transport plans. New work spaces in the historic and conservation areas of Cambridge should primarily be found by utilising existing buildings.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.13**

11891 Support

Summary:

We do not believe a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.13

12212 Support

Summary:

Concerning office space (p. 227), it may be desirable to have more properties available for sale rather than for rent.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.13

15545 Support

Summary:

We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.13

16242 Support

Summary:

We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.13

17997 Support

Summary:

You argue that there is a lack of office space. While this is so, office space is not likely to be lost to other uses. Once satisfied by new office building, old premises might become residential properties? So much the better to bring residents back into the centre. New offices should be established on good public transport routes; they do not need central locations

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.14

11892 Support

Summary:

We do not believe a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.14

15547 Support

Summary:

We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.14

16243 Support

Summary:

We do not believe that such a policy is required to protect office space and we believe that market forces will achieve a sustainable balance between office and other industrial, retail and residential requirements.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 130 - Continue to promote cluster development

11893 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 130 - Continue to promote cluster development

13246 Support

Summary:

We support Option 130 and request that a policy supporting cluster development be retained.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 130 - Continue to promote cluster development

15310 Object

Summary:

whilst business does like to cluster these should grow naturally out of genuine business need, e.g. shoe shops and estate agents like to be near each other as they have found from experience that that benefits them all.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 130 - Continue to promote cluster development

15564 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 130 - Continue to promote cluster development

15620 Support

Summary:

No.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 130 - Continue to promote cluster development

16246 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 131 - Do not protect cluster development

11901 Object

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 131 - Do not protect cluster development**15311 Support****Summary:**

We should encourage the growth of real businesses by looking at what someone is actually doing and not relying on beautiful business plans to make support decisions. The awful example of Ionica should be compulsory study for all planners. A putative telecoms company that won every business planning award going but fell at the first fence when it actually opened for business and found it could not supply its first customers because there were trees in the way; we do have quite a few trees even in one of the least wooded counties of England.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 131 - Do not protect cluster development**15573 Object****Summary:**

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 131 - Do not protect cluster development**16259 Object****Summary:**

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15**8325 Object****Summary:**

no policy required as apparently of no previous value

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15**11555 Support****Summary:**

Support

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15**11796 Support****Summary:**

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15**11894 Support****Summary:**

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15

12291 Support

Summary:

The University strongly supports the promotion of cluster development particularly where such development is related to knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries.

The University would object strongly to the discontinuance of this policy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15

12318 Support

Summary:

yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15

15565 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15

15860 Support

Summary:

The promotion of cluster development Option 130 is practical and sensible. We recognise that the new station development with its particular intention of serving the Science Park, will attract additional business to the area and expand the cluster development of the high tech industry towards the new station. This again underlines the need for proper strategic planning of the new station.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15

16248 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15

18372 Support

Summary:

SCDC considers a policy is still required that continues to promote cluster development as in Option 130.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.15

18455 Support

Summary:

The County Council supports the need for a policy addressing the promotion of cluster development. Even if it has been rarely used to date, it is important from a perceptions perspective in affirming the City's support for the Cambridge high tech cluster.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

9367 Support

Summary:

Option 130

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

11557 Support

Summary:

Support for cluster development (Option 130) should be encouraged, but not to much detriment of other types of industry which 'don't fit' the preconceived ideas.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

11798 Support

Summary:

Option 130, Continue to promote cluster development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

11895 Support

Summary:

Option 130
We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

12319 Support

Summary:

Option 130 - keep existing policy.

Evidence seems to show that people, esp in hi tech area, appreciate the networking capabilities of clusters.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

14242 Support

Summary:

Option 130 although hard to know how much to credit the policy for the clusters.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

15567 Support

Summary:

Support Option 130 - We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

16203 Support

Summary:

Option 130 - Continue to promote cluster development - is supported. This is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework which at paragraph 21 requires local planning to 'plan positively for the location, promotion and expansion of clusters or networks of knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries'. With the acknowledged shortage of land in Cambridge it is important that such uses are given clear priority. It does however need to be recognised that in order to support a successful cluster, ancillary and supporting uses must be permitted to locate in proximity to these primary uses.

Option 131 is not supported as there is a continued need for a policy promoting cluster development

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

16251 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

17998 Support

Summary:

Option 130. Despite being rarely used, the provision of incubator units is provided for by this policy and could help some entrepreneurs if rents are kept in check

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

18373 Support

Summary:

SCDC considers a policy is still required that continues to promote cluster development as in Option 130. Whilst the City Council may rarely use the policy, it sets out a positive statement of the type of development it wishes to see in Cambridge. It may become more relevant depending on the approach taken in the new Local Plan on other types of employment and the selective management of the economy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.16

18456 Support

Summary:

The County Council supports option 130 Continue to promote cluster development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.17

11898 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.17

15568 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.17

16254 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.17

17491 Support

Summary:

any development policy regardless of whether it encourages cluster development or not should take into account the finite amount of water available and should be water neutral.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.17

17632 Support

Summary:

the plan barely touches on what the Council proposes to do to foster the creation and growth of SMEs within the City. The University is a source of many of these companies as spin outs from research. There are some propagator units for these companies e.g. at Babraham, but very few sites are available. The units need to be small to facilitate small overheads. there needs to be a pool of small industrial units for short-term rent with a catering service to integrate the units with the community there is an example of this at Sawston. The plan should incorporate this requirement into new developments.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.18

11899 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.18

15570 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.18

16257 Support

Summary:

We believe the existing policy should be carried forward with the same criteria for decisions.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 132 - Promote shared social spaces

7213 Support

Summary:

This cannot be left to market forces: it will interest only developers that take a long-term interest.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 132 - Promote shared social spaces

7699 Support

Summary:

Vital!

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 132 - Promote shared social spaces

11907 Support

Summary:

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. I would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regard to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 132 - Promote shared social spaces

13184 Support

Summary:

Option No. 132

Support/Object: Support

Option 132 seeks opinions on whether to promote shared social spaces within employment areas, effectively allowing for a mix of uses in employment areas. The proposed redevelopment of Homerton Business Centre could deliver a mix of uses; consolidation of existing office uses in conjunction with residential development.

We support Option 132.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 132 - Promote shared social spaces

13186 Support

Summary:

community is important in work places as well as residential.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 132 - Promote shared social spaces

15580 Support

Summary:

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. It would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regards to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 132 - Promote shared social spaces

16262 Support

Summary:

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. It would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regards to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 132 - Promote shared social spaces

17720 Support

Summary:

It makes good sense to have residential accommodation above ground floor commercial premises. This will reduce the risk of areas becoming dead after hours. I therefore support option 132.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 133 - Do not promote shared social spaces

11909 Object

Summary:

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. I would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regard to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 133 - Do not promote shared social spaces

15587 Object

Summary:

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. It would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regards to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 133 - Do not promote shared social spaces

16270 Object

Summary:

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. It would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regards to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 133 - Do not promote shared social spaces

17723 Object

Summary:

It makes good sense to have residential accommodation above ground floor commercial premises. This will reduce the risk of areas becoming dead after hours.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.19

8326 Support

Summary:

policy needed

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.19

11558 Support

Summary:

Support

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.19**

11800 Support**Summary:**

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.19**

11912 Support**Summary:**

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. I would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regard to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.19**

12298 Object**Summary:**

This is not a matter for Local Plan policy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.19**

12321 Object**Summary:**

We do not feel we have any expertise on this but it does not seem necessary or particularly desirable to have a policy, so yes to Option 133.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.19**

14178 Support**Summary:**

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.19**

15312 Object**Summary:**

There should be a presumption in favour of such provision as and when the market is ready for it but I am not sure it is a suitable policy objective. We should encourage sustainable enterprise and look to facilitate support services where they are really needed even if the end result is a bit untidy in planning terms

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.19**

15583 Support**Summary:**

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. It would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regards to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.19**

16264 Support**Summary:**

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. It would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regards to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.19**

18253 Support**Summary:**

The option of adding social use to the employment sites is mentioned. We stress that the plan should adopt this this and stress that not enough emphasis is given to achieving it.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.20**

8328 Support**Summary:**

support option 132

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.20**

9368 Support**Summary:**

Option 132, but only marginally

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.20**

10244 Support**Summary:**

Option 132 - promote shared space. Community is important at work as well as at home.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.20**

11559 Support**Summary:**

Support option 132 (promote social spaces) - since social interaction is key to much of the 'Cambridge Phenomenon', but are poorly provided in centrally-planned developments.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.20**

11801 Support**Summary:**

Opt 132, promote shared social spaces.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.20**

11914 Support

Summary:

Option 132 - We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. I would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regard to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.20

12322 Support

Summary:

Prefer Option 133. We do not feel we have any expertise on this but it does not seem necessary or particularly desirable to have a policy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.20

14179 Support

Summary:

Option 132

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.20

14267 Support

Summary:

Option 132 .. lack of amenities on commercial developments lead to many extra journeys in the day

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.20

15584 Support

Summary:

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. It would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regards to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.20

16265 Support

Summary:

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. It would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regards to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.20

17630 Support

Summary:

We support the concept of upgrading existing office buildings rather than building new ones and we also support the concept of shared social spaces - Option 132

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.20**

17999 Support**Summary:**

Option 133

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.21**

10245 Support**Summary:**

Gardens which could be utilised for communal lunches might be included as a type of shared social space in an employment area that could be encouraged.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.21**

11803 Support**Summary:**

Housing should be located near or as part of employment areas. Mixed development is more sustainable and promotes more integrated communities. Living over the shop!

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.21**

11924 Support**Summary:**

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. I would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regard to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.21**

15585 Support**Summary:**

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. It would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regards to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.21**

16219 Support**Summary:**

Option 132 - Promote shared social spaces. Whilst it is acknowledged that social spaces can add value to employment areas, this can only realistically be viably done on larger sites where there is sufficient critical mass for them to thrive once they have been provided. Whilst the costs of initially providing such facilities are likely to be borne by the developer, it should be recognised that occupiers are likely to have to subsidise such facilities in the longer term if they are not viable which could prove unattractive.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.21**

16267 Support

Summary:

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. It would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regards to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.21

18000 Support

Summary:

This type of social engineering is probably unsuccessful, different employers will desire different spaces, The additional costs to developers will increase rents

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.22

11927 Support

Summary:

We believe that sustainability implies locating jobs close to homes and retail outlets. I would therefore seem appropriate to support shared social spaces. However, we agree that the design and support of these shared social spaces requires a long term commitment. We also believe that these shared spaces should be constructed not only inside the City but also within South Cambridgeshire as a whole. The mix of industrial, storage, retail and office space should be carefully considered with regard to the transportation requirements and feasibility of transportation improvements that might be required to support the shared space development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.22

18133 Support

Summary:

In reference to paragraphs 10.22-10.45:

USS notes that options for retailing in the City are presented throughout this document and that these are generally supportive of and will continue to direct retail investment towards the City Centre.

We very much welcome this approach and hope that this can be carried through to future iterations of the document as this will ensure the future vitality and viability of the City Centre.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

10.20

12785 Object

Summary:

It is beneficial to demand the planned combination of transport links with other development. However the need for businesses to be near the city railway station and the city centre reinforces the point that development should be integrated with a transport strategy. We do not agree that employment in some areas of the city and in the surrounding historic areas should be densified as the City Station area has been. In the Local Plan the historic area of the Station and surrounding areas should refer primarily to heritage guidelines so that historic buildings and environment should be preserved.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 134 - Densify existing employment areas

7214 Support

Summary:

Adequate weight must be given to possible detrimental impacts (eg traffic, other noise, visual intrusion) on surrounding areas. The need for complementary provision of amenity space should also be considered.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 134 - Densify existing employment areas

7700 Support

Summary:

This approach will reinforce your transportation, density and sustainability goals.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 134 - Densify existing employment areas

11460 Support

Summary:

yes.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 134 - Densify existing employment areas

11943 Support

Summary:

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements in cycleways and public transport should be within policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 134 - Densify existing employment areas

13189 Support

Summary:

Option No. 134

Support/Object: Support

Option 134 seeks opinions on increasing the density at existing employment areas, in order to make the best use of the employment land supply. The proposed redevelopment of Homerton Business Centre, involving the consolidation of existing office uses, would increase the density at the existing site, thus using land more efficiently and enabling the residual land to be used for a mix of other uses.

We support Option 134.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 134 - Densify existing employment areas

13203 Support

Summary:

We would support the densification of existing employment areas as this would make the best use of existing developed land and would reduce pressure on Greenfield sites. One way in which densification could be achieved could be through increasing building heights to provide additional floor space. This could be achieved at Compass House where a densification of the existing site would allow additional office floorspace to be provided within a sustainable location close to the city centre.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 134 - Densify existing employment areas

14777 Support

Summary:

As the report highlights, whilst sites are required for employment in Cambridge, it is counterproductive to force sites to remain in a use which are not viable. However if planning policy showed flexibility and sensitivity to each case then viable uses of existing sites could be achieved at the same time as improving the sites.

To assist in this process I consider that there needs to be an ability to introduce alternative types of employment onto sites and consider mixed use developments which will maximise the use of existing sites and enable schemes to be economically viable.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 134 - Densify existing employment areas

15592 Support

Summary:

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 134 - Densify existing employment areas

16272 Support

Summary:

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 134 - Densify existing employment areas

17705 Support

Summary:

I oppose releasing any of the Green Belt land for industrial use. If there is a shortage of industrial units these can be provided within S. Cambs and not within the City, or by densification and upgrading of existing units. Densification would give the City flexibility in accommodating an upturn in business.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 135 - Do not densify existing employment areas

11940 Object

Summary:

Oppose. We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements in cycleways and public transport should be within policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 135 - Do not densify existing employment areas

12518 Support

Summary:

When a cup is full it is full.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 135 - Do not densify existing employment areas

13204 Object

Summary:

We would not support a policy which would not seek to densify existing employment areas. This would add additional pressure to release Greenfield sites for employment uses which would have the effect of creating employment space in edge of city locations which do not have the same sustainability credentials as city centre and edge of city centre sites such as Compass House.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 135 - Do not densify existing employment areas

15598 Object

Summary:

Oppose. We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 135 - Do not densify existing employment areas

16281 Object

Summary:

Oppose. We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Option 135 - Do not densify existing employment areas

17708 Object

Summary:

I oppose releasing any of the Green Belt land for industrial use. If there is a shortage of industrial units these can be provided within S. Cambs and not within the City, or by densification and upgrading of existing units. Densification would give the City flexibility in accommodating an upturn in business.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.23

11560 Support

Summary:

Support

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.23

11945 Support

Summary:

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements in cycleways and public transport should be within policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.23

12301 Support

Summary:

The University supports the densification of appropriate existing sites which would make better use of existing developed land (e.g. West Cambridge) and present an opportunity to redevelop other sites (e.g. Old Press/Mill Lane).

Densification of employment sites should be complemented by fast connecting transport routes, particularly at peripheral locations - for example linking the Cambridge Biomedical Campus at Addenbrooke's to West Cambridge and North West Cambridge to the Science Park to the new railway station, by-passing the city centre. Such routes would help to deliver sustainable transport improvements and contribute to local, national and international economic development.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.23

12326 Support

Summary:

yes, a policy would be helpful

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.23

12793 Support

Summary:

Yes

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.23

15313 Support

Summary:

Smarter use of land is a must and the opportunity currently presents itself at Chesterton Station to build a high density transport hub with shops offices and railway premises sited above the tracks and road links to Science and Business Parks, Chesterton and Cambridge. The remaining land should be mixed use with appropriate housing, offices and industrial activities complementing existing activities but not being a forced cluster.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.23

15594 Support

Summary:

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.23

16126 Object

Summary:

Densification of some employment sites may be appropriate but the value of open space and social areas should not be underestimated and it is important that employees have easy access to such areas. The merits of densification should be considered on a case by case basis rather than being required by a blanket policy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.23

16274 Support

Summary:

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.23

16574 Support

Summary:

Yes.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.23**

16852 Support**Summary:**

Yes - support

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.23**

16962 Support**Summary:**

We consider there is a need for a policy to address this issue so that the most effective and efficient use of land can be made within the city. With high quality design and landscaping there is no reason why higher density sites cannot be equally as attractive as lower density areas. Higher densities also promote walking and cycling and would release land for alternative uses. However this needs to be considered on a site-by-site basis as it may not be the appropriate solution on all sites, and viability and deliverability considerations are paramount.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.23**

18151 Support**Summary:**

USS notes that a new Study is to be commissioned by Cambridge City Council with a view to looking further into the capacity of the City Centre and competing uses.

This Study will look at how the City Centre currently functions, whether there are distinct zones and how these work together now and in the future. In addition, we note that this Study will outline in more detail the type of retail provision Cambridge should be planning for and where this should be located.

USS requests early engagement with the City Council and its advisors regarding this forthcoming Study-not least because it will guide future retail development across the City and help to define the functionality of the City Centre including the Primary Shopping Area.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.23**

18252 Support**Summary:**

The option of densifying employment sites is mentioned. We would encourage this and stress that not enough emphasis is given to achieving it.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.23**

18457 Support**Summary:**

The County Council supports the need for a policy addressing the densification of existing employment uses although it needs to be applied sensitively and selectively so that it does not result in the image and perception of certain employment areas such as the Science Park being diluted and losing their attractiveness.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.24**

7011 Support**Summary:**

I would favour Option 135, in order to avoid further increases in jobs and population outside the university.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.24**

9369 Support

Summary:

Option 134

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

11562 Support

Summary:

Option 134. Many of the existing sites (eg Science Park) have much wasted space - car parks, unappealing grass. This space could be much better used - for example, underground car parks, grass where you can sit out at lunchtime.

Higher density employment would support better land-use and more sustainable living and transport options.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

11942 Support

Summary:

I would prefer densification on those sites where adequate public transport already exists or could be provided in advance of new employment being advertised.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

11947 Support

Summary:

Option 134

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements in cycleways and public transport should be within policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

12338 Object

Summary:

We support option 134 but with the proviso below.

There are significant opportunities to make better use of existing high tech clusters by both redevelopment and building higher - often existing buildings are 1 or at most 2 storey. This would make better use of existing land rather than use up scarce new land. There are also opportunities to redevelop run down sites (including possible changes of use from derelict retail areas)

However we should not aim to densify in the City Centre but do so on specific sites further out

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

12443 Support

Summary:

I support option 135, where practicable, for example on the West Site. But note that this site is unsuitable for housing and will need upgraded cycle and public transport links as the capacity increases.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

12810 Object

Summary:

No option is preferred. Densification can only be done with discretion according to the environment. The Local Plan should have area specific policies. Heritage guidelines for the historic centre and surrounding areas near the rail station must be robustly stipulated by the Local Plan and comply with national heritage guidelines. Development that encourages transport links with employment and other development could be encouraged in other ways. For example transport networks and infrastructure should be implemented that could link out of town and other regional employment options.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

14183 Support

Summary:

Option 134

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

14284 Support

Summary:

Option 134 on sustainable sites only

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

15595 Support

Summary:

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

16130 Object

Summary:

Densification of some employment sites may be appropriate but the value of open space and social areas should not be underestimated and it is important that employees have easy access to such areas. The merits of densification should be considered on a case by case basis rather than being required by a blanket policy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

16275 Support

Summary:

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.24

16578 Support

Summary:

Option 134 preferred, if it really would reduce the pressure to develop greenfield sites. Brownfield must always be preferred as a first option.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.24**

16854 Support**Summary:**

We prefer Option 134, which would allow a densification of existing employment areas, to improve the amenity and facilities of these areas and make them look less like the setting for "The Office".

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.24**

16963 Support**Summary:**

We would support option 134 to densify selected existing employment areas. This would allow for the partial redevelopment of existing employment sites, where employment space could be provided at a higher density. This would make a more effective and efficient use of land and present a more sustainable solution.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.24**

18001 Support**Summary:**

Option 134

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.24**

18458 Support**Summary:**

The County Council supports Option 134 but with discretion in its application.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.25**

9370 Support**Summary:**

Encourage expansion upwards in appropriate cases

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.25**

10446 Support**Summary:**

This is neither objection nor support but a comment.

If you densify employment areas you create traffic jam potentials in the morning and evening. Unless this is addressed the whole point of densifying employment areas is counter productive and just creates traffic hot spots like Addenbrookes with it surrounding problems.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.25**

11948 Support**Summary:**

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements in cycleways and public transport should be within policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.25**

15596 Support**Summary:**

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.25**

16132 Object**Summary:**

Densification of some employment sites may be appropriate but the value of open space and social areas should not be underestimated and it is important that employees have easy access to such areas. The merits of densification should be considered on a case by case basis rather than being required by a blanket policy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.25**

16277 Support**Summary:**

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.25**

16964 Object**Summary:**

Rather than identifying selected sites, a criteria-based policy would be more flexible, as land ownership and their intentions may change over the plan period, unforeseen opportunities may arise, there may be changes in surrounding land uses, all of which will affect the appropriate treatment of a site. The criteria could set out the circumstances when densification of an employment site would be appropriate.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.25**

18002 Support**Summary:**

It is important to achieve a variety of employment units in a variety of areas. Some specified areas could be densified. The criteria used are important

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.26**

11950 Support**Summary:**

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements in cycleways and public transport should be within policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**Question 10.26**

12820 Support

Summary:

A reasonable alternative would be to densify out of town areas but not to densify in the inner city near the historic centre. For other areas such as the Histon road and the Science park densification may be suitable. Densification MUST be linked to adequate transport, local residential accommodation and other amenities and facilities. This emphasises the need for the Local Plan to have area specific policies that take into account the context of any development work within its immediate and surrounding historic and residential environment.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.26

15597 Support

Summary:

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.26

16134 Object

Summary:

Densification of some employment sites may be appropriate but the value of open space and social areas should not be underestimated and it is important that employees have easy access to such areas. The merits of densification should be considered on a case by case basis rather than being required by a blanket policy.

10 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Question 10.26

16279 Support

Summary:

We believe the densification of existing sites is preferable to an erosion of green spaces and the Green Belt. Only those specific sites to and from which commuting can be achieved without a significant impact on traffic density, congestion and parking should be considered. In order to achieve greater densification under this policy, improvements to cycleways and public transport should be within the policy scope. We do not support a blanket statement endorsing densification across the City, as the City currently suffers from terrible traffic congestion which already threatens the prosperity and quality of life of the City.
