

Appendix F: Section Nine – Policies 83, 84 and 85

Policy 83: Aviation Development

Aviation development at Cambridge Airport will only be supported where it would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment and on residential amenity.

Supporting text:

- 9.32 Cambridge Airport, operated by Marshall, lies within the administrative boundaries of both Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. The area within Cambridge comprises part of the runway and a number of hangars, whilst the terminal building is within South Cambridgeshire. The airport is a base for general aviation as well as aircraft repair.
- 9.33 Consideration needs to be given to airport activity and the approach that would apply to any future aviation development proposals coming forward at Cambridge Airport. This is to ensure that any development would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and residential amenity. Whilst airports have permitted development rights which mean that some types of development in connection with the provision of services and facilities do not need planning permission, other proposals do. These include the construction or extension of a runway, or new passenger terminal above 500m² or increasing the size of the existing building by 15% or more.
- 9.34 Any further aviation development proposals which fall within the scope of this policy will need to be carefully assessed, particularly in terms of impact on noise, air quality, landscape, nature conservation, transport and public safety. It is likely that any planning applications for major works will require an Environmental Impact Assessment, to assess the potential significant impacts of the development on the environment.

How the policy came about:

1. In preparing their local plans, local planning authorities are required to have regard to policies and advice issued by the Secretary of State, including the Aviation Policy Framework as relevant to a particular local authority area. The Aviation Policy Framework (March 2013) may also be a material consideration in planning decisions depending on the circumstances of a particular application.
2. Respondents to the Issues and Options consultation (Summer 2012) commented that the airport, for both employment and aviation reasons, was important to the economic success of the city. However, balancing this importance, respondents also commented on the impact of increased air

traffic on residential amenity, climate change, noise and air pollution, and biodiversity. In the sustainability appraisal which accompanied the Issues and Options report, it was reported that this option should help mitigate adverse impacts of development on the health and well-being of Cambridge residents and upon the environment and biodiversity. It was also noted that the economic effects of this policy approach were uncertain.

3. Land at Cambridge East was taken out of the Cambridge Green Belt in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and Cambridge East Area Action Plan 2008 for the development of a major new urban extension. This was dependent on the current operator relocating, something they were actively seeking to do at the time. In 2010, it became clear that the site operator could not find a new site to relocate to and they announced that they would remain at the Airport for the foreseeable future. This left the councils with decisions to be made as to how to plan for land at Cambridge East, with residential development across the wider site unlikely in the plan period.
4. In June 2012, Cambridge City Council consulted upon three broad options in the Issues and Options consultation as to how Cambridge East should be planned for. These were:
 - Retain the current allocation – this would keep the area as a housing allocation for a major new urban quarter. However, the full level of housing provision would not be relied upon in plans, as it would be unlikely to be developed. This approach would provide flexibility if development could occur in the plan period, although it would also create uncertainty, and residential delivery options elsewhere would still have to be explored.
 - Safeguard the land – this would keep the area as ‘safeguarded land’ that could be developed in the longer term, outside the plan period. This would allow a future review of the plan to consider the wider site again if circumstances change.
 - Return the land to the Green Belt – this would return the site in whole or in part to the Cambridge Green Belt, on the basis that development would not occur.
5. In reviewing the future options for this large site, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council have concluded that it is appropriate that this site remain out of the Green Belt and safeguarded as a strategic reserve of land that may be developed at a later date. There is also potential for residential development for a number of parcels of land while the airport remains on the site. Careful consideration of how the ongoing airport activities will interact with any new residential use will need to be made, to ensure that the new residences have an acceptable level of amenity, and that they do not impede on the ongoing use of the airport. In terms of how any development may impede on the ongoing use of the airport, it will be for the airport operators to demonstrate how the development does this.

Furthermore, any development that comes forward in advance of the wider site will have to be carefully planned such that it is capable of working both with and without the wider development.

Policy 84: Telecommunications

Planning permission will be granted for telecommunications development where it can be demonstrated that:

- a. the proposal does not cause significant and irremediable interference with other electrical equipment, air traffic services or instrumentation that is operated in the national interest;
- b. visual impact is minimised through design and location, with equipment sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate;
- c. pre-application consultation has been undertaken, particularly where a mast is to be installed near a school or college, or within a statutory safeguarding zone surrounding an aerodrome or technical site. The relevant highways authority should be consulted where works are in the highway or in close proximity to the Cambridgeshire guided busway;
- d. applications for an addition to an existing mast or base station are accompanied by a statement that self-certifies that the cumulative exposure, when operational, will not exceed the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection's (ICNIRP) guidelines; and
- e. applications for a new mast or base station are accompanied by evidence that the applicant has explored the possibility of erecting antennas on an existing building, site, mast or other structure and a statement that self-certifies that, when operational, International Commission guidelines will be met.

Supporting text:

- 9.35 New communications technology is continually developing and it is important that residents and businesses have the best access to new technology, making the most of the resulting implications of lifestyle changes, such as reducing the need to travel. It is important that the council supports the growth of telecommunications systems while keeping the environmental impact to a minimum. The National Planning Policy Framework supports this approach, noting that sites for telecommunications should be kept to a minimum consistent with the efficient operation of the network. Existing sites should be used where possible and where new sites are required their design should be sympathetic to context.

How the policy came about:

6. New communications technology is continually developing and it is important that residents and businesses have the best access to new technology. It is important that the Council supports the growth of telecommunications systems while keeping the environmental impact to a minimum. The National Planning Policy Framework supports this aspiration (paragraphs 42 – 46). The

Interim Sustainability Appraisal of the Issues and Options Report (2012) noted that a criteria based policy for the siting, design, appearance, and impact mitigation of telecommunication developments may result in mitigating concerns regarding visual, health and landscape impact concerns. The proposed criteria should also help address issues relating to the quality of the built environment, open spaces and conservation areas across the city.

7. Responses to the Issues and Options consultation were generally supportive of the development of a telecommunications policy, with some suggested additions to the criteria contained within the policy. There was one suggestion that a tighter definition than 'significant interference' should be used. In response to this, the wording of the policy has been changed to 'significant and irremediable interference' to reflect the wording in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 44). Reference to consultation with the relevant highways authority where works are in the highway or close to the Cambridgeshire guided busway has also been added. A separate policy dealing with high speed digital infrastructure will also be added to the local plan.
8. The aim of this policy is to guide and support telecommunications development while keeping the environmental impact to a minimum. While the council is aware of public concerns regarding the health impacts of telecommunications development, the National Planning Policy Framework sets out that it is not the role of local planning authorities to consider further health aspects if a proposal meets the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines for public exposure.

Policy 85: Infrastructure Delivery, Planning Obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy

Permission will only be granted if it can be demonstrated that there is, or will be, sufficient infrastructure capacity to support and meet all the requirements arising from the new development. Where existing infrastructure will be placed under strain due to the impact of new development, improvements to existing infrastructure or compensatory provision should be made such that an appropriate level of infrastructure is maintained.

Infrastructure provision will reflect the council's priorities for infrastructure set out in the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Delivery Study and its successor documents. The council will work positively with neighbouring authorities and Cambridgeshire County Council on infrastructure issues including the introduction of the Cambridge Community Infrastructure Levy. The council is committed to introducing Community Infrastructure Levy in 2014. Until the introduction of Community Infrastructure Levy, and to a lesser degree thereafter, the council will continue to use planning obligations under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to ensure developer contributions towards necessary infrastructure are maximised.

Planning permission for new developments will only be supported/permitted where there are suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision and phasing of infrastructure, services and facilities necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms.

Planning obligations and/or a future Community Infrastructure Levy could be required for the following:

- a. transport infrastructure;
- b. public transport;
- c. drainage and flood protection;
- d. waste recycling facilities;
- e. education;
- f. health care;
- g. leisure and recreation facilities;
- h. community and social facilities;
- i. cultural facilities, including public art;
- j. emergency services;
- k. green infrastructure;
- l. open space; and
- m. Affordable Housing.

The above list is not exhaustive and there may be scope for requiring developer contributions towards a wider range of infrastructure measures.

Contributions could also be used to secure ongoing maintenance where this is deemed appropriate.

The introduction of Community Infrastructure Levy in 2014 will be accompanied by a review of the council's guidance on planning obligations, and will ensure that the range and level of contributions towards local infrastructure needs are kept up to date and maximised in the context of emerging Community Infrastructure Levy practice and guidance.

Supporting text:

Infrastructure Provision

- 9.36 The delivery of new or improved infrastructure and services to support new development in a timely and phased manner will be an important element in ensuring the appropriate and sustainable implementation of new growth in Cambridge and its sub-region. It will be important to ensure that certain infrastructure is provided ahead of development to safeguard against adverse impacts. To facilitate this, it is important that the local planning authority understands the infrastructure needs and costs early on as part of plan making.
- 9.37 Planning for infrastructure provision has been, and continues to be, an ongoing process through the development of Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council Infrastructure Delivery Study (IDS) and partnership working with stakeholders. The IDS has been produced in collaboration with South Cambridgeshire District Council. The IDS examines three infrastructure categories: physical (transport, energy, water and drainage, waste), social (education, health care, leisure and recreation, community and social and emergency services) and green (open space). The IDS includes an infrastructure delivery schedule; the intention is to update the IDS and infrastructure delivery schedule on a regular basis.
- 9.38 The Infrastructure Delivery Study provides an overview of infrastructure required to support new development, an overview of who is responsible for delivery and a broad indication of phasing, costs and funding mechanisms. It will act as a focus for delivery but should not be seen as a detailed investment programme.
- 9.39 In order to aid prioritisation of delivery, the council has categorised the prioritisation of infrastructure in the IDS as critical, necessary and desirable.

Critical Infrastructure

- 9.40 Critical and necessary infrastructure are essential to support development, but the differing factor between them is the timing of their delivery. Critical infrastructure is largely physical and enabling infrastructure, which must be

delivered on time to allow proposed development to proceed. Failure to provide critical infrastructure could result in significant delays to the delivery of development.

Necessary Infrastructure

- 9.41 This infrastructure is required if development is to be achieved in a timely and sustainable manner. Infrastructure in this category is unlikely to prevent physical development in the short term, however failure to invest could lead to delays in the medium term. The most common type of necessary infrastructure is social and community infrastructure such as schools, health facilities and children's play space. The category has the potential to allow infrastructure prioritisation if funding shortfalls occur.

Desirable Infrastructure

- 9.42 This category has been included so more aspirational schemes to support sustainable development could be included within the IDS.

Funding Infrastructure and services

- 9.43 Infrastructure provision will be funded through a number of sources. Mainstream funding, such as council capital programmes, service providers investment programmes, and Government grant, will continue to provide for the bulk of infrastructure spending. However, other initiatives such as planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy can provide a substantial resource for locally determined priorities.

- 9.44 As part of planning for infrastructure provision, the council needs to consider the role that developers can play in helping to provide the physical, social and green infrastructure that is required as a result of new growth. When planning permission is granted for new development, the council can seek contributions from developers towards a range of infrastructure, for example, school places, affordable housing and open spaces.

- 9.45 Infrastructure funded by the development industry will occur either through legal agreements known as 'planning obligations' or the emerging Community Infrastructure Levy, a tariff based charge.

- 9.46 Planning obligations (Section 106 Agreements or S106) are voluntary legal obligations attached to planning applications. A local planning authority normally requests a developer to enter into an obligation to mitigate the impacts of the development being proposed. Any S106 planning obligation must be:

- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- directly related to the development; and

- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development.
- 9.47 The Community Infrastructure Levy will replace planning obligations for many forms of infrastructure, although planning obligations can still be used for site-specific mitigation measures and for affordable housing provision. The Government considers that the Community Infrastructure Levy is a more transparent and simple method of collecting funds for infrastructure to support development than the current system of planning obligations.
- 9.48 The Community Infrastructure Levy takes the form of a standardised charge applied per square metre of new development. Community Infrastructure Levy will allow the council to raise money to support development and the money raised through this charge will assist the funding of a wide range of infrastructure projects needed as a result of development. Community Infrastructure Levy rates will be set out in a charging schedule. The infrastructure to be funded by Community Infrastructure Levy will be defined alongside the Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule in something known as a Regulation 123 list. The Infrastructure Delivery Schedule, which identifies a list of critical, necessary and desirable infrastructure, will form the starting point for the Regulation 123 list.
- 9.49 The council needs to strike a balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential effect of the levy upon the economic viability of development. A viability assessment has been undertaken by the council which will inform the charging schedule and ultimately the amount of Community Infrastructure Levy to be charged. The council seeks to ensure that a Community Infrastructure Levy charge is identified that is of a sufficient level to provide the infrastructure that is required, but which is not too onerous as to make development unviable.
- 9.50 A capped 15% proportion of Community Infrastructure Levy revenue will need to be spent on locally determined infrastructure in areas where development takes place. This will rise to 25% for those areas with an adopted neighbourhood plan in place.
- 9.51 The council will work with South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council to ensure that development is supported by the right infrastructure and that contributions towards infrastructure are collected on an equitable basis.
- 9.52 With the introduction of Community Infrastructure Levy, S106 Agreements will only be used in restricted circumstances. A Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document will be prepared about the use of S106 Agreements in light of Community Infrastructure Levy approval.

How the policy came about:

9. It is important that the council ensures the delivery of new or improved infrastructure to support development in a timely and phased manner. This will be an important element in ensuring the appropriate and sustainable implementation of new growth. As part of planning for infrastructure provision the council needs to consider the role that developers can play in helping to provide infrastructure to support growth.
10. Paragraph 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires local planning authorities to plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area.
11. Paragraph 156 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that Local Plans include policies to deliver:
 - The provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat); and
 - The provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities.
12. Planning for infrastructure provision has been an ongoing process through the development of an Infrastructure Delivery Study (IDS), first commissioned in 2009, and partnership working with stakeholders. The IDS has been produced in collaboration with South Cambridgeshire District Council and will form part of the Council's case at submission and examination of the Local Plan.
13. Paragraph 21 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that in drawing up Local Plans, local planning authorities should identify priority areas for the provision of infrastructure. The Infrastructure Delivery Study (IDS) will set out when and where infrastructure will need to be provided, the scale of funding needed to achieve this and potential sources of funding. The IDS will also identify infrastructure critical to the delivery of the Local Plan.
14. Traditionally, infrastructure funding has been secured from developers through legal agreements known as 'planning obligations.' Planning obligations (Section 106 Agreements or S106) are voluntary legal obligations attached to planning applications. This is the approach currently taken by the council and details of that approach are set out in the Cambridge City Council Planning Obligations SPD – March 2010.
15. More recently the Government has introduced the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The CIL was introduced in the Planning Act 2008 and put into force by the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended) on 6 April

2010. In order to adopt CIL the council needs prepare and adopt a CIL Charging Schedule. The council committed to taking a CIL forward in parallel with its Local Plan Review at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee on 22-03-2011. A six week consultation on the Cambridge CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule concluded on April 29th 2013. The CIL is intended to supplement (not replace) other funding streams. A number of contributions will still be acquired through S.106 Planning Obligations. These include affordable housing requirements and site specific on site infrastructure necessary to make a development acceptable in planning terms.

16. Paragraph 173 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that the sites and scale of development identified in the Local Plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. It states that:

‘In order to ensure viability, the costs of any requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing landowner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.’

17. The potential impacts of this policy on viability have been taken into account in a suite of viability documents produced on behalf of the council. These are The Cambridge City Council Local Plan – Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment; The Cambridge City Council Local Plan - SHLAA and Potential Site Allocations High Level Viability Assessment; and, the Cambridge City Council Local Plan – Student Housing Affordable Housing Study (Summer 2013).
18. At Issues and Options the majority of respondents were in favour of this policy option to continue to seek funding from developers for infrastructure requirements related to new developments. Some concerns were raised about the monitoring and enforcement of this policy and also that there is a lack of transparency with how S.106 monies are collected and spent.
19. The Interim Sustainability Appraisal of the Issues and Options Report (2012) noted that this policy option is likely to contribute to positive effects across multiple sustainability topics and thematic areas. Health, leisure and community facilities can contribute to wellbeing. Improvements to water, and flood protection infrastructure can also bring benefits. Green infrastructure and open spaces provision could enhance biodiversity. Furthermore this option should help maintain cultural facilities and improve the quality of the open and built environment citywide. The sustainability benefits of this option on the transport and renewable energy sustainability topics will depend on the nature of the infrastructure and services provided and therefore it is difficult to appraise them with any certainty at this stage.

7167 Object

Summary: A policy supportive of employment and aviation will help enhance the economic growth of the Cambridge area. The location is sustainable and particularly well served by public transport. Convenient access by air is important to global companies already in Cambridge, and will be a positive factor to attract further similar investment. Marshall is an important employer, in its own right.

12887 Object

Summary: Whilst the airport provides a very important facility in the City, and is an important employer in its own right, I would be concerned about any development that resulted in increased air traffic - we have already had a large and noticeable increase in air traffic in Romsey in recent years. We certainly do not want to lose Marshalls from the City, but any development must be considered with care, for the above reason.

14915 Object

Summary: Development of the airport should be welcomed, not unreasonably restricted.

15295 Object

Summary: Cambridge Airport is here to stay and its development should be supported not opposed. The policy proposal is woolly and not helpful. There is enough environmental legislation and regulatory hoops for any airport development to go through without adding gratuitous ones.

9594 Support

Summary: This seems sensible.

11631 Support

Summary: The air port is located close to housing and increase aviation levels can lead to noise pollution

12179 Support

Summary: Aviation noise is a major pollutant.

12583 Support

Summary: Marshall's is tolerable at present, but it would be bad news if it grew and flights of larger planes increased. After all, the flight paths cross the city.

13026 Support

Summary: I strongly support this proposal. Whilst some aviation development may be beneficial, residential amenities need to be safeguarded. This airport is located close to quite a number of densely populated areas, thus any development could have a significant impact on Cambridge residents.

13320 Support

Summary: CCF opposes airport expansion across the UK for its impact on the global climate. Significant UK expansion in aviation is impossible if we are to meet the 2008 Climate Change Act targets. We strongly oppose any expansion of Cambridge Airport and urge the Council to have a policy preventing this. The impact on the residential areas surrounding the airport would be significant.

A policy in this area is vital in the event that Cambridge Airport does seek to expand. The wider environmental impacts must be fully taken into account.

13430 Support

Summary: I support the policy not to permit aviation development at Cambridge airport. Intensification of activity at the airport would have an adverse impact on residents living nearby.

14357 Support

Summary: Agree. The airport is not in a suitable place for increased activity

14373 Support

Summary: I think the proposal is too restrictive and any adverse effect on the environment and residential amenity should be balanced against economic and wider benefits.

14814 Support

Summary: Support

16787 Support

Summary: It is important that the amount and size of traffic at Cambridge Airport is not permitted to increase substantially.

17796 Support

Summary: The SA identifies that the options relating to promoting and delivering sustainable transport and infrastructure are likely to contribute positively to sustainability issues. Option 198 Cambridge Airport - Aviation development is also likely to help minimise impacts on the local natural environment and biodiversity.

13557 Object

Summary: no need for a specific policy at this time.

18201 Object

Summary: No - seems current policy is sufficient

8511 Support

Summary: yes

8990 Support

Summary: Yes

10990 Support

Summary: Too many flights of large jets would have an extremely detrimental effect

11962 Support

Summary: Yes and I support this option.

13629 Support

Summary: Broadly support a policy along existing lines.

14344 Support

Summary: Yes

14360 Support

Summary: Yes

15793 Support

Summary: Yes there needs to be a policy as a lot can change in the years covered by the Local Plan.

16641 Support

Summary: Yes.

13636 Object

Summary: While we support the need to consider both the environment and nearby residential amenity (most of our Residents Association members are under the Marshalls flight path), we must also consider the economic benefits to the city of a thriving local airport when considering any proposed expansion.

15794 Object

Summary: Option 198 seems rather vague. I believe specific reference could be made to air pollution (there are already considerable fumes in the area), noise pollution, airport opening hours, and frequency of use.

17035 Object

Summary: Cambridge Airport - growth of the engineering, manufacturing and aviation opportunities and also as an important regional airport to encourage inward investment and communications through improved transportation links.

8512 Support

Summary: I am appalled that Marshall's is going to start scheduled flights. Has the city forgotten the tremendous protest when a new terminal building was proposed? All of us living under the flight path suffer; residents off Mill Road, for example, suffer from the revving of engines. School teachers have to wait for noise to subside before they can continue their lessons. Surely Stansted is near enough for Cambridge residents.

9562 Support

Summary: Future national policy might work against local protectionism, and we also need support such an established employer.

10467 Support

Summary: Again this is neither support or objecting but making the comment that current flight options to Jersey and Verona for example help to provide local amenities without disruption to Cambridge and these should be encouraged. Aerobatics causes more disturbance than these commercial flights - do aerobatics above Cambridge country side bring in money?

11658 Support

Summary: The noise caused by aviation activity around Cambridge is a blight on the whole city. There are a large number of light aircraft flying over the city, and for anyone under the flight path the nuisance of these light aircraft is compounded by the noise of passenger jet aircraft.

**CHAPTER: 12 - Promoting and
Delivering Sustainable**

12.33

13693 Support

Summary: "Broadband" is not specific enough. The council should adopt a policy of requiring fibre optic to the premises to be installed in new developments; and should encourage its installation across the city to upgrade the existing infrastructure. The council needs to encourage a competitive market in provision of services over the infrastructure so that residents and businesses can obtain reasonably priced services under reasonable contract terms. The council's plans and strategy in this area need to be developed in much greater detail.

**CHAPTER: 12 - Promoting and
Delivering Sustainable**

12.35

16647 Support

Summary: Yes

**CHAPTER: 12 - Promoting and
Delivering Sustainable**

Option 199 - Telecommunications policy criteria based

14397 Object

Summary: support: We believe it is insufficient to state the "significant interference" should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference and real-world measures need to be included in the policy to remove uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

15734 Object

Summary: We believe it is insufficient to state that 'significant interference' should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference, and real-world measures need to be included in the policy to remove uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

16440 Object

Summary: We believe it is insufficient to state that 'significant interference' should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference, and real-world measures need to be included in the policy to remove uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

8991 Support

Summary: Yes

12584 Support

Summary: Common sense.

15296 Support

Summary: I support this approach as reasonable and proportionate.

16646 Support

Summary: Bullet point 4: agree that consultation should take place before installation near a school or college.

8992 Support

Summary: Yes

13560 Support

Summary: Yes

13642 Support

Summary: we support the need for a policy and the criteria set out seem adequate.

14346 Support

Summary: yes

14399 Support

Summary: We believe it is insufficient to state the "significant interference" should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference and real-world measures need to be included in the policy to remove uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

16643 Support

Summary: Yes, emphatically.

18204 Support

Summary: Yes - as suggested

18498 Support

Summary: Support

9526 Object

Summary: Yes all the hygiene factors are important, but the text misses the point that good provision of telecommunications infrastructure can have a major impact on transport network requirements

10468 Object

Summary: Again neither an objection or support but a question.

Should there not be somewhere a policy that limits the electromagnetic field intensities? I expect that we are no where near the health limit but a policy should exist to ensure that we do not get near health limits with electromagnetic hotspots are prohibited.

13689 Object

Summary:

The council should adopt a policy of requiring fibre optic to the premises to be installed in new developments; and should encourage its installation across the city.

The council needs to encourage a competitive market in provision of services over the infrastructure so that residents and businesses can obtain reasonably priced services under reasonable contract terms.

This would make the city attractive to those working in technology, boost the city's economy, and potentially reduce the amount of travel people need to undertake.

14401 Object

Summary: We believe it is insufficient to state the "significant interference" should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference and real-world measures need to be included in the policy to remove uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

15736 Object

Summary: We believe it is insufficient to state that 'significant interference' should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference, and real-world measures need to be included in the policy to remove uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

16442 Object

Summary: We believe it is insufficient to state that 'significant interference' should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference, and real-world measures need to be included in the policy to remove uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

18499 Object

Summary: Consultation should also include the Highway Authority where appropriate if works may be in the highway or near the guided busway, or a safeguarded line of a highway, and also the SuDs Approval Body in due course.

We would recommend the inclusion of a policy that requires new developments to make provision for communications / broadband infrastructure. New employment and residential development should be served by a high-quality digital infrastructure and a specific reference to the provision of ducting to industry standards should aid transparency and promote delivery. There are economic and social gains for doing so.

9563 Support

Summary: There should also be a bullet point forbidding masts/sites within an agreed distance (say 50 metres) from any residential property.

13562 Support

Summary: Favour a policy as outlined in Option 199.

16645 Support

Summary: Has the impact of existing masts been assessed locally?

14416 Support

Summary: We believe it is insufficient to state the "significant interference" should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference and real-world measures need to be included in the policy to remove uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

8995 Support

Summary: Essential to have robust for funding infrastructure.

9785 Object

Summary: The policy should also ensure Developer contributions to non-vehicular infrastructure should be encouraged, with links to the existing networks

15298 Object

Summary: It is easy to add to the cost of development by levying charges through infrastructure payments. In general major developments should meet their own infrastructure needs and this provision should be completed before the overall scheme is complete, perhaps withholding consent for 20% of the development might encourage early delivery.
I would stress that these costs add directly to the costs of housing inc Cambridge and need to be fully justified and kept within limits.

8996 Support

Summary: These are essential requirements

12589 Support

Summary: Again perfectly reasonable to insist on this.

12761 Support

Summary: agree

13216 Support

Summary: We would support appropriate and relevant provision of infrastructure and services which is derived from demand created by new development. Improvements and provision for infrastructure would need to be proportionate and related to the scale of development proposed taking account of the developments own impact on local infrastructure whilst not providing infrastructure to make up for infrastructure not provided by existing development which generates demand but has not contributed financially to infrastructure provision.

14772 Support

Summary: We support the need for a policy in this respect and that developers should be required to support the provision of infrastructure.

15737 Support

Summary: We support the need for a policy in this respect and that developers should be required to support the provision of infrastructure.

16065 Support

Summary: This appears to be the basis for a necessary policy offering clear conditions relating to development.

16443 Support

Summary: We support the need for a policy in this respect and that developers should be required to support the provision of infrastructure.

16649 Support

Summary: Support strongly. All these points are essential.

17799 Support

Summary: Option 201 Provision of infrastructure and services - green infrastructure and open spaces provision could enhance biodiversity and is therefore welcomed.

13523 Object

Summary: Any policy should ensure that contributions from developers should only be sought where necessary to make a scheme acceptable in planning terms and should be fair and reasonable in both scale and kind.

The level of contributions sought should strike a balance between the need for funding and the impact on the viability of development.

17038 Object

Summary: The Plan should provide a realistic and deliverable strategy which identifies the key infrastructure constraints and highlights how any constraints will be overcome. This should be set out in a delivery and broader implementation plan.

Although planning for a 20 year period, it is essential that the development strategy can be delivered and implemented with reasonable confidence. In assessing development sites we would ask that the Council considers the changing circumstances of sites within the plan area and clearly understands any delivery constraints at both a site and the wider area.

7145 Support

Summary: Yes, I fully support Option 201

8514 Support

Summary: yes

8626 Support

Summary: Based on the experience with the agreed developments in the Southern Fringe, the Trumpington Residents' Association supports Option 201 and the need for a policy to require developers to support the provision of infrastructure.

8997 Support

Summary: yes

10315 Support

Summary: All new developments need infrastructure and services.

10634 Support

Summary: The Wildlife Trust supports such a policy as planning obligations / CIL are one of a number of essential sources of funding to help deliver the 2011 Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy, the 2006 Cambridge Nature Conservation Strategy and the policies within the Local Plan aimed at increasing quality of life for new and existing residents of the city.

13572 Support

Summary: Option 201 to provide adequate cover.

13646 Support

Summary: we support the need for a policy along the lines proposed

14774 Support

Summary: Yes. We support the need for a policy in this respect and that developers should be required to support the provision of infrastructure.

15045 Support

Summary: - Yes. We support the concept of CIL/S106, and it is important to ensure that policies are robust so that they cannot be challenged by developers.

- We do not accept the view of some that such funds constitute a 'bribe'. New developments usually generate traffic and other problems, which create costs to existing users; it is not acceptable for a developer to offload these externalities onto the taxpayer, and so the CIL/S106 payments ensure that these costs are properly accounted for.

- There is a real need to keep Area Corridor Plans updated.

15133 Support

Summary: Yes, support.

15738 Support

Summary: We support the need for a policy in this respect and that developers should be required to support the provision of infrastructure.

16444 Support

Summary: We support the need for a policy in this respect and that developers should be required to support the provision of infrastructure.

16650 Support

Summary: Yes.

18209 Support

Summary: Yes - as suggested

18500 Support

Summary: The County Council supports in principle a policy for the provision of infrastructure and services. The County Council notes that the list given in Option 201 "is not exhaustive and there may be scope for requiring contributions towards a wider range of infrastructure measures".

18539 Support

Summary: Based on the experience with the agreed developments in the Southern Fringe, we support Option 201 and the need for a policy to require developers to support the provision of infrastructure.

CHAPTER: 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable

Question 12.39

8998 Object

Summary: There is no statement about how this policy will be monitored and enforced

12888 Object

Summary: Yes we should ask for developer contributions towards various costs, however I think that exceptions should be made for housing co-operatives and community land trusts. This is because housing co-operatives usually have little money and in any case are not-for-profit. Also, the benefits they provide are usually greater than any perceived initial impact e.g. a housing co-operative would usually seek to develop in a way that is environmentally friendly, innovative, uses renewable and sustainable energy (e.g. solar panels, carbon neutrality) and favours green transport over car-travel.

13652 Object

Summary: a continuing complaint from resident associations is the lack of information and transparency of the amount and use of S106 moneys from developments. The City Council should, in our view, develop a policy on how such information should best be available and communicated

15047 Object

Summary: There is currently a massive democratic deficit with regards to how S106 moneys are spent. For instance, the Arbury Park development resulted in very regressive changes to King's Hedges Road that had no democratic input. By contrast, the Traffic Management Area Joint Committee can easily spend half an hour on discussing a relatively small matter such as single parking space, and it only reaches that committee because the funding is from public funds. There is a high-priority need to ensure both publicly- and privately- funded changes which affect the public highway are subject to the same levels of democratic scrutiny.

15797 Object

Summary: The democratically elected parts of the council must have more control over how such monies from developers are spent. At present, there is insufficient democratic oversight of the spending of private money from developers.

18501 Object

Summary: The services included in Option 201 is not exhaustive, library services should be included because of funding and their use as hubs.
The need for the new HRCs is generally through allocations made in the adopted Minerals and Waste SSP Plan 2012. The Inspector advised that the 3 planning authorities concerned should work together to identify a suitable site for a new HRC to serve Cambridge South.

The County Council considers that 1.30 should still acknowledge the role waste will play in emerging developments, recognizing the district role as collection authority and the County's role as disposal authority.

9564 Support

Summary: Infrastructure must be in place before any of the development is occupied, although phasing may be appropriate for larger developments.

CHAPTER: 14 - Appendices

Appendix E: Figure E.1 Air Quality Management Area

17687 Object

Summary: I note from Appendix E that I live in a "likely to exceed" area. The traffic on this road is very likely to increase with the Science Park Station.

CHAPTER: 14 - Appendices

Appendix F: Criteria for Protecting Open Spaces

9206 Object

Summary: Response to Appendix F as no other opportunity given.
In general we support these criteria, namely a-c for environmental importance and b-e for recreational importance. However, it is unclear whether in order to satisfy any one of the 6 criteria it is necessary to fulfill all of its points with roman numbers.
We propose the following changes to the wording:
specify that "meeting the criterion" (page 341 lines 8-10; page 342 lines 1-3) does not necessarily mean meeting all the numbered points for that particular criterion.