



To: Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change: Councillor Tim Ward
Report by: Head of Planning Services
Relevant scrutiny committee: Environment Scrutiny Committee 14/01/2014
Full Council 13/02/2014

Wards affected: All Wards

CAMBRIDGE LOCAL PLAN 2014 – SUBMISSION STAGE

Key Decision

1. Executive summary

NOTE: Members are asked to bring their copy of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission (July 2013) to the meeting.

- 1.1 This report concerns the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Submission Stage.
- 1.2 The council's Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee has over the last three years considered and commented on the evidence base and individual draft sections of the new local plan, prior to it being approved by Full Council for publication for the purposes of public consultation on 27 June 2013. That 'draft plan' is known as the 'Proposed Submission' plan.
- 1.3 Consultation on that plan has taken place (19 July – 30 September 2013) and 2,995 representations have been received and considered by officers. The council now has to decide whether to continue to progress with the plan, with or without amendments. If so, and if the amendments were not too extensive, the council could agree to formally 'submit' the plan to government for independent examination. If the amendments were extensive (e.g. significant rewording of policies, new sites added or existing ones deleted), then the council may decide to re-consult before 'submitting' the plan for examination.

1.4 The purpose of the report is to present:

- A summary of the Key Issues raised during the consultation on the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission document – see Appendix A;
- A Schedule of ‘Proposed Changes’ to the plan – see Appendix B;
- An evidence report in respect of ‘Duty to Cooperate’ – see Appendix C.

1.5 This report also sets out the options available to the council in order to progress the plan through its final preparation stages.

1.6 For this committee, the key recommendation is that the plan should make its way to Full Council on 13 February 2014.

1.7 If Full Council approves the plan, it will then be submitted to the Secretary of State for public examination by an independent planning inspector.

2. Recommendations

2.1 Environment Scrutiny Committee is recommended to support the following recommendations to the Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change and Full Council:

- a. that the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission document and Proposed Policies Map (as approved by Full Council on 27 June 2013) be ‘submitted’ for examination in accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, together with the sustainability appraisal and associated evidence material in support of the plan, and including the Key Issues (Appendix A) and Schedule of Proposed Changes (Appendix B);
- b. that the Duty to Cooperate Report (Appendix C), be agreed and submitted as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan.
- c. that, in the interests of expediency, delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning Services to undertake appropriate negotiations and make further minor additions to the Schedule of Proposed Changes during the examination of the local plan (i.e. post ‘submission’) if in the opinion of the Head of Planning Services it is appropriate and necessary to do so to facilitate the

smooth running of the plan through the examination period, (except where changes would be of such significance as to substantially alter the meaning of a policy or allocation). The exercise of this delegation to be reported back to Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee through the course of the examination process.

- d. that the Head of Planning Services is authorised to prepare and submit reports, proofs of evidence, technical papers, statements of common ground and other such documents required in the presentation of the local plan through the examination process and reflecting the council's agreed position on these matters and to take such other steps as are conducive or incidental to the submission and examination of the local plan.
- e. that any changes to Appendices A, B and/or C required by Environment Scrutiny Committee be agreed by the Chair and Spokes of Environment Scrutiny Committee and the Executive Councillor for Planning and Climate Change.

3. Introduction

3.1 Members will be aware that the current Cambridge Local Plan was adopted in July 2006 and runs to 2016. There is an urgent need to replace this plan with a new one that:

- makes provision for development over a longer time period (to 2031);
- addresses all of the challenges currently facing Cambridge;
- responds to the new national policy context established by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (published in March 2012); and
- accords with the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Localism Act 2011 and associated Regulations.

3.2 There has been a great deal of preparatory work for the new plan, including consultations on Issues and Options (June – July 2012) and on Issues and Options 2 (January – February 2013), and the collection of evidence and the undertaking of specialist studies to justify and underpin the preparation of policies. All of the 18,000 representations made during those two periods of consultation were

taken into account and greatly assisted in preparing the 'draft plan' which was agreed by Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee on 29 May 2013, and subsequently agreed at Environment Scrutiny Committee on 11 June 2013 and Full Council on 27 June 2013.

3.3 This 'draft plan' was also consulted upon for a period of 10 weeks between 19 July and 30 September 2013. In plan-making terms, this consultation stage was known as the 'Proposed Submission' stage. This means the council thought, subject to the outcome of the consultation, that the plan was 'sound' and should be independently tested in its present form through the examination process prior to adoption. The council also believed that it had undertaken properly all the due legal requirements for plan making, such as:

1. Whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the **Local Development Scheme** and in compliance with the **Statement of Community Involvement** [The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (the Act) sections 19(1) and 19(3) respectively].
2. Whether the plan has had regard to **policies developed by a local transport authority** in accordance with section 108 of the [Transport Act 2000](#) [Reg 10(a)].
3. Whether the plan pursues the objectives of **preventing major accidents and limiting the consequences of accidents** by pursuing those objectives through the controls described in Article 12 of [Council Directive 96/82/EC](#) [The Seveso directive] [Reg 10 (b) (c)].
4. Whether the plan has been subject to a **strategic environment assessment**, and where required an appropriate assessment of impact on any sites falling under the EU Habitat (and Birds) directive [The Act Section 19(5), [EU Directive 2001/42/EC](#), [The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004](#), [EU Habitats and Birds Directives Directive 92/43/EEC](#), [The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010](#)].
5. Whether the plan is compatible with the requirements of the [EU Water Framework Directive](#) and any River Basin Management Plans prepared under that directive [[Directive 2000/60/EC](#)].
6. Whether the plan has regard to the **National Waste Management Plan** [Reg 10(d) and [Waste \(England and Wales\) Regulations 2011](#)].

7. Whether the plan has regard to any **Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS)** for its area; [section 19(2)(f), section 4 of the [Local Government Act 2000](#)].
8. Whether the plan meets the **procedural requirements involving publicity and availability of the development plan document and related documents**; [The Act Section 20(3), prescribed documents Reg 17 and Reg 22, Consultation Reg 18, Submission Reg 22].
10. Whether the plan meets the **Duty to Cooperate** [The Act Section 33A, Reg 4].

3.4 The council also believed that the plan met the soundness tests as set out in the NPPF (paragraph 182):

“A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is “sound” – namely that it is:

- **Positively prepared** – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- **Justified** – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- **Effective** – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- **Consistent with national policy** – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.”

3.5 However, prior to submitting the plan in the form agreed by Full Council on 27 June 2013, the council’s constitution requires the outcome of the consultation which took place between 19 July and 30 September 2013 to be presented to it and to decide whether it still felt the plan contained the appropriate strategy and was sound and fit for purpose to meet Cambridge’s needs.

Options Available to the Council

3.6 Before turning to the consultation findings and a summary of the Key Issues raised during the recent consultation, it is perhaps more

important to firstly understand the options available to the council in terms of how it proceeds.

- 3.7 As was made clear at meetings of Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee, Environment Scrutiny Committee and Full Council in 2013, the plan consulted upon in July to September 2013 was a 'Proposed Submission' plan. The most fundamental point to understand in this respect is that the council is not lawfully permitted to make changes to the plan agreed on 27 June 2013, prior to submitting the plan for independent examination. If it decides it wants to do that, a new 'submission plan' would have to be prepared and re-consulted upon before it could be submitted.
- 3.8 The council therefore now has four options at its disposal, set out below, with each option explained in detail thereafter:
- Submit the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 as agreed at Full Council on 27 June 2013, together with associated evidence material and all duly lodged representations made during the period of 19 July to 30 September 2013; or
 - Submit the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 as above, but also submit a Schedule of minor Proposed Changes to the plan; or
 - To decide not to submit the Cambridge Local Plan 2014, and instead make changes to the plan, consult on those changes, then submit the amended plan; or
 - Abandon the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 in its current form, and commence preparation of a completely new one.

Option 1: Submit the Plan as already agreed (without any changes)

- 3.9 This option means that, having considered the issues raised during the recent consultation, the council decides that the plan it agreed on 29 May, 11 and 27 June 2013 remains fit for purpose and does not require any amendments. The plan would then be submitted to the Secretary of State, defended at a public examination and adopted in the form as submitted unless the Planning Inspector who conducts the subsequent public examination into the plan recommends otherwise.
- 3.10 In practice, the documents are submitted to the Government's Planning Inspectorate, acting on behalf of the Secretary of State. A planning inspector will be appointed to conduct a public examination into the plan, and it is the job of the inspector to take all of the representations into account during the course of the examination.

- 3.11 This inspector will receive and debate evidence from all relevant parties (including, of course, the council) and a major part of the examination will be a series of hearing sessions in public. These hearing sessions are likely to be in the summer of 2014. The process will culminate in the production of the Inspector's Report in which he/she will say if the plan is or is not sound, and legally compliant, with recommended modifications if necessary to make it so.
- 3.12 South Cambridgeshire District Council undertook consultation on their South Cambridgeshire Local Plan: Proposed Submission document from 19 July to 14 October 2013. South Cambridgeshire District Council has received over 7,000 representations to this stage of consultation and officers are currently assessing their representations in detail. Assuming that South Cambridgeshire District Council submit their plan for examination next Spring, it is highly likely that a joint examination of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 could take place, with the same Inspector examining and reporting on both plans. The Planning Inspectorate has indicated as much, though this depends whether the two plans are submitted for examination at broadly the same time. Should one be delayed for whatever reason, it is likely that the two plans will be independently examined. As there are joint issues for the councils, it is unlikely that an Inspector's report would be issued on a single plan in isolation.

Option 2: Submit the Plan as already agreed, but also submit a Schedule of Proposed Changes

- 3.13 If, having considered the issues raised during the recent consultation the council feels the plan as agreed on 27 June 2013 remains fit for purpose, but some minor changes could improve the plan's clarity, then it may follow the procedure set out in option 1 but also submit an additional Schedule of Proposed Changes.
- 3.14 A Schedule of Proposed Changes sets out changes the council would like to make to the plan, predominantly to address concerns raised during the consultation period. The council is not permitted to make these changes directly to the plan and then submit it (because it will then be submitting a plan for examination which has not been consulted upon – which would be unlawful). Instead, what the council is saying to the Inspector is that 'the plan agreed by Full Council on 27 June 2013 is the plan we wish to have examined, but the council thinks the plan can be improved by including the changes as listed in the Schedule of Proposed Changes.

3.15 As part of the examination process, the Inspector will consider these Proposed Changes, and may or may not agree to them. As long as the plan is found by the Inspector to be sound, any changes he/she considers are 'major' ones which he/she supports, will be subsequently recommended back to the council for inclusion in the final (adopted) version of the plan. Any 'major' changes that the Inspector rejects will mean the council will not be permitted to make such a change; and any 'minor' changes will be left to the council to decide whether to make such changes or not (i.e. the council has discretion to make as many 'minor' changes as it sees fit to the plan prior to adoption, though this is a somewhat grey area in case law and tends to be reserved for very minor changes covering typographical errors, tweaks to supporting text and the like. Amending a policy or an allocation is highly unlikely to be regarded as 'minor').

Option 3: Do not Submit. Make amendments, consult, then Submit

3.16 The council is likely to choose this option if it considers one of the following applies:

3.17 First, if the council wants to make a number of changes to the plan so that the plan it subsequently submits has all of the changes embedded within it. In this scenario, there would be no 'schedule of proposed changes' submitted, because such changes would have been made to the Local Plan already and then re-consulted upon for at least the statutory minimum 6 week consultation period.

3.18 Second, if the council wants to make a change(s) to the plan which are of such significance that they could not be dealt with as a minor change covered in the Schedule of Changes. An example of such a change would be the addition or deletion of a site allocation, or a complete re-write of one of the fundamental policies of the plan.

3.19 If the council decides to go down this 'extra consultation' route, then it would likely do so by consulting on an 'Addendum' to the Proposed Submission Plan i.e. the Addendum would identify the changes. If this option were agreed, any comments received on the Addendum would then be added to those comments received from 19 July to 30 September 2013.

3.20 Alternatively, if there are lots of changes of significance, it may be more sensible to effectively abandon the last consultation round and re-consult on a new 'Proposed Submission' plan. This would mean all objectors would have to re-submit their representations, even if the bit

of the plan they were commenting upon had not changed. This sub-option is somewhat messy and confusing for the public.

Option 4: Abandon the Plan

- 3.21 Finally, the council could decide, were it felt this was the appropriate approach, for whatever reason, to simply abandon the plan and start again. Clearly, this would have major implications for the city, as it would have an existing plan rapidly going out of date with no prospect of a new one being adopted for at least 3 years.

4. Findings from Consultation on Proposed Submission Plan (Summer 2013)

- 4.1 A broad range of issues from a wide audience were submitted to the council (701 respondents, 2,995 separate representations). On the whole, the nature of the representations received were not unexpected because many repeated concerns made at earlier consultation stages or were in objection to a proposed site allocation (or lack of allocation). The key messages raised were:

- Range of challenges to homes and jobs forecasts, to the forecast methodology, the proposed development strategy and sequence, objectively assessed housing (and affordable housing) and jobs needs;
- Challenges to the Sustainability Appraisal and Memorandum of Cooperation/Duty to Cooperate approach;
- Not enough land allocated for homes and jobs/too much land allocated for homes and jobs;
- Challenges to proposed sites sequence and allocation (by promoters of Barton Road, Fen Ditton, Waterbeach New Town, Cambridge South, Trumpington Meadows Sporting Village and Cambridge South East sites);
- Green Belt should be protected and sites GB1 – 4 should not be taken forward;
- Green Belt protection is excessive and has led to an unsustainable development strategy being proposed/ Green Belt assessments flawed;
- Major sites – Cambridge Northern Fringe East proposed Area Action Plan approach objected to, support for approach at land south of Coldham's Lane, issues raised regarding redevelopment of Howard Mallett Centre;
- Approach to planning for retail growth both criticised and supported, with public realm improvements especially in the historic core and Market Square supported;

- Retail growth should remain in the historic core rather than at the Grafton;
- Objections from Cambridgeshire County Council on failure to plan for secondary education and household waste recycling centre provision;
- More cycling provision.

4.2 However, through the consultation process, a number of useful suggestions were made, and officers believe minor amendments to the plan can and should be made to accommodate them (see Schedule of Proposed Changes). A number of representations and suggested changes were made by statutory consultees such as the Environment Agency, English Heritage, Natural England and Anglian Water.

4.3 Three petitions were received to the consultation. These petitions related to particular sites proposed for allocation within the plan:

1. Petition signed by 2,025 people opposing sites proposed for allocation, which would require the release of land from the Cambridge Green Belt (Sites GB1 – 4) on the basis of:
 - lack of exceptional circumstances to justify release of Green Belt land;
 - urban sprawl impacting on the historic and compact character of the city, its surrounding villages and countryside and impact on traffic congestion;
 - plans being based on out-of-date growth forecasts and first consideration should be given to greater re-use of existing brownfield sites not in the Green Belt.
2. Petition signed by 130 people and a survey of 10 local residents which raised concerns about the development of Site R10: Mill Road Depot, particularly with regard to the density of development; the provision of open space and community facilities locally; the need to use part of the site as open space and community facilities with a commensurate reduction in housing numbers; access and congestion; and the need for building heights to be no higher than the existing skyline;
3. Petition signed by 527 people objecting to the allocation of Site R12: Ridgeons, 75 Cromwell Road, on the basis of density; the need for family housing for local people; the need for accessible green space; the need for a safe crossing of the railway and a request to change the site to mixed use.

4.4 The petitions with over 500 signatures can be presented to Full Council under the council's petitions scheme. Representations were also received to the consultation in relation to matters affecting the Petersfield area. The concerns raised by a large number of respondents related to:

- Provision of public open space in Petersfield, with particular reference to provision of the Howard Mallett Centre site for open space;
- The Howard Mallett Centre should be provided as a community, sports and leisure facility or it should be returned to public open space with the community facility replaced and relocated nearby;
- The Howard Mallett Centre must not be replaced with residential or office buildings;
- The Petersfield area has reached saturation point for student accommodation and housing in multiple occupation;
- No further Anglia Ruskin University development within Petersfield;
- Specifics should be committed to within the plan to require delivery of facilities by developers;
- The density of development proposed for Site R10 Mill Road Depot is inappropriate and should be halved; open space provision should be increased on the site; access should only be via Mill Road; community facilities should be specified and guaranteed; trees and the library should be retained; development should be car-free; garages to the south of Hooper Street should be retained; and cycle route should be incorporated.
- The proposals for Site R12 Ridgeons, 75 Cromwell Road, are inappropriate due to the proposed density; no provision for the elderly; insufficient provision of affordable or family housing; lack of public open space and inadequate access;
- There should be no more hotel development permitted in the area, due to negative impacts on car parking and poor design of the new hotels on Coldham's Lane/Newmarket Road;
- Need to clarify the requirements of Policy 22 on the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area and the Chisholm Trail;
- The city's infrastructure is not sufficient to accommodate the development.

4.5 The following paragraphs of this report address the level and type of representations to key sections of the plan.

4.6 The vision, strategic objectives and policies within Section Two: The Spatial Strategy (pages 11 to 37) of the plan received a wide range of representations. However, this section was the main focus of

representations from the development industry, particularly from those developers seeking large land allocations on the edge of Cambridge. Representations sought the allocation of land within the Cambridge Green Belt within Cambridge's administrative boundary for the following purposes:

- Commercial Estates Group proposed a site of 170 hectares to accommodate an additional 3,300 to 4,400 homes, 10 hectares of employment land, 60 hectare Country Park and other infrastructure on land between Worts' Causeway and Fulbourn Road (with some of the site within South Cambridgeshire);
- North Barton Road Landowners Group proposed a site of 108 hectares on land to the north of Barton Road, split approximately equally between Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, for up to 1,476 new dwellings (including affordable and key worker housing); local centre; primary school; and substantial new green infrastructure;
- Pigeon Land proposed a site of 180 hectares on land south of Addenbrooke's Road and adjacent to the M11 (site split 80/20 between South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge) for over 40 hectares of B1 (b) research and development science park, 1,250 dwellings, retail and community facilities, primary school, open space and highway and supporting infrastructure;
- Turnstone Estates' Teardrop (approximately 1 hectare) site north of the A14 in Milton (Site lies predominantly in South Cambridgeshire) for housing and transport improvements;
- Grosvenor Developments/Wrenbridge Ltd (15 hectare site split 80/20 between South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge) proposed allocation of land west of Hauxton Road, Trumpington and at the Abbey Stadium, Newmarket Road (2.8 hectare site) for the delivery of a community football stadium, indoor and outdoor sports facilities and enabling residential development.

4.7 Representations were also received from those seeking allocation of land in South Cambridgeshire, namely Quy Estates and RLW Estates regarding their sites at Fen Ditton and Waterbeach respectively. Their proposals are as follows:

- Quy Estates proposed a site on both sides of Horningsea Road between Fen Ditton and the A14 for 450 – 500 dwellings (including 160 – 200 affordable units) on an approximately 25 hectare site with a landscaped buffer to the A14, and provision of open space;
- RLW Estates proposed an allocation of 577 hectares (inclusive of green infrastructure) for a new town at Waterbeach

comprising 9 – 10,000 homes, employment and education provision, transport and green infrastructure.

- 4.8 In seeking the allocation of large areas of land to be released from the Green Belt, these representations raised concerns about the development strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and the objectively assessed needs for housing and employment set out in the plan. These site promoters consider that the figures that are being planned for too low, and believe more housing and employment should be provided. They also raised concerns about the deliverability of housing sites allocated in the draft plan.
- 4.9 Cambridgeshire County Council has objected to the plan in a number of areas, including the council's Policy 4: The Cambridge Green Belt, as they would wish to see provision of a household recycling centre serving the south of the city and a secondary school serving the east of the city. Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council have been involved in discussions with Cambridgeshire County Council about both education and waste provision over a number of years.
- 4.10 The policies in Section Three: City Centre, Areas of Major Change, Opportunity Areas and Site Specific Proposals (pages 41 to 97) of the plan were the subject of significant interest during the consultation. Policy 15: South of Coldham's Lane Area of Major Change was the subject of considerable support. Policy 22 on Eastern Gate Opportunity Area received a large number of objections, predominantly focussed on concerns about the Howard Mallett Centre, student accommodation, Anglia Ruskin University's expansion and hotel development. Policy 23: Mill Road Opportunity Area also received a number of representations raising concerns about proposed allocations such as sites R10 Mill Road Depot, R12 Ridgeons and R21 315 – 349 Mill Road and Brookfields; retail provision; impact on the conservation area and protected open space; transport and community infrastructure. Many people also responded to Policy 26: Site Specific Development Opportunities, which makes specific reference to the four sites allocated for release from the Cambridge Green Belt. The 94 objections and petition signed by 2,025 people expressed a wide range of concerns regarding the proposed allocations, including loss of Green Belt, biodiversity, infrastructure, access and the need to identify land other than Green Belt for development.
- 4.11 The policies in Section Four: Climate Change and Managing Resources (pages 101 to 129) of the plan were supported by many of the respondents, including statutory consultees. Although a few minor

changes are suggested by officers for textual clarity, the Environment Agency also suggested a number of changes to Policy 33: Contaminated Land in order to better protect groundwater. Rewording of the policy and its supporting text is included within Appendix B: Schedule of Changes.

- 4.12 In relation to the policies on climate change and managing resources, it should be noted that the Government's Housing Standards Review was announced in October 2012, with the aim of reducing the range of standards applied to new-build homes. Some of the housing standards that the review considers include the Code for Sustainable Homes, Secured by Design, Lifetime Homes, Standards and Quality in Development and the Homes and Communities Agency's Housing Quality Indicators. The review may impact upon the ability of local planning authorities to set higher standards for sustainability and housing design issues, such as internal and external space standards. Consultation on the Housing Standards Review took place during Summer 2013. Consultation responses to the review are currently being assessed by the Government. This council made a response to that consultation. There is currently no published timetable for changes to the standards regime. As such, it is considered appropriate to proceed with the policies on sustainability and housing design within Sections 4 and 6 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Submission document for the time-being. It should be noted that the Inspector may need to have regard to the results of the Housing Standards Review and that proposed policies may therefore fall away or be amended.
- 4.13 Representations on Section Five: Supporting the Cambridge Economy (pages 133 to 144 of the plan) included responses to Policy 40: Development and expansion of business use raising concern about the council's calculation of employment land required in the plan. An alternative Employment Land Review was submitted to the consultation - this document suggests that the amount of employment land we should plan for is an additional 43.3 hectares rather than 7.4 hectares, as at present. A new business park to the south of the city is suggested to help meet this need. Other representations suggested that new buildings are designed flexibly and allowed to temporarily change use to provide small, low cost employment spaces that can easily change to something else if the business grows or fails. Some representations expressed concern over the move to restrict the change of use for all business uses in the city: it is argued that reducing flexibility will harm the ability of the economy to adapt to changes in circumstances, both on a micro and macro scale. A large number of representations to Policy 43: University Faculty Development raised concerns about the expansion of Anglia Ruskin

University and the number of students in the Petersfield area. Concern was also expressed about different treatment of language and specialist schools, when compared to other educational institutions, and that Policy 44: Specialist colleges and language schools did not allow for evolving ways of providing student accommodation.

- 4.14 The main focus of representations to Section Six: Maintaining a Balanced Supply of Housing (pages 147 to 167) of the plan related to Policy 45: Affordable housing and dwelling mix and Policy 46: Development of student housing. In respect of the affordable housing policy, a number of representations raised concerns about the viability of development within the city. Furthermore, a number of responses stated that the policy should be amended to ensure clarity of approach. As such, the policy has been redrafted in such a way that the content of the policy is not changed, but the information within it is more accessible. This can be found at pages 16 to 18 of Appendix B to this committee report. It should also be noted that the Government announced its intention in the Autumn Statement 2013 to consult on the possibility of introducing a national threshold of 10 units for affordable housing. If brought into force, this threshold would have implications for the council's affordable housing policy as drafted. As with the Housing Standards Review, the council is proposing to retain the current drafting until a decision has been reached by the Government on this matter.
- 4.15 Representations on Policy 46 in Section Six centred around the need for student housing. Whilst education providers were concerned that they should be able to provide additional student accommodation to meet their needs, without the proposed restrictions of the policy, a number of local residents raised concerns about the level of student housing in the city, the quality of that housing and the restrictions on its use, e.g. car parking. Additionally, Policy 48: Housing in Multiple Occupation was the subject of a number of representations relating to concerns about the difficulties of monitoring and controlling housing in multiple occupation and the need to limit this form of housing in some area of the city.
- 4.16 Policy 50: Residential space standards in Section Six also received representations on the impact of these standards on development viability, whilst some respondents wanted to see more demanding requirements for both internal and external spaces. Policies 50 and 51 could potentially be affected by the outcome of the Government's Housing Standards Review, as discussed in an earlier paragraph of this report.

- 4.17 A number of respondents made representations to Section Seven: Protecting and Enhancing the Character of Cambridge (pages 171 to 194) of the plan in relation to the quality of urban design in new developments and the need to preserve and enhance the city's important historic environment. Policy 60: Tall buildings and the skyline in Cambridge was the subject of objections on the basis that respondents were concerned about the height of buildings in the historic core in particular. Respondents, including English Heritage, objected from the point of view that the heights were too restrictive or not restrictive enough. Policy 61: Conservation and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment was also objected to by some respondents on the basis of being unduly restrictive or not restrictive and detailed enough.
- 4.18 Within Section Seven. Policy 67: Protection of open space had a relatively high response rate, with respondents concerned about the need for more protection for sites and about the inflexibility of the policy in the light of the needs of educational institutions in the city. Minor amendments to Policy 68: Open space and recreation provision through new development and Appendix I: Open Space and Recreation Standards are recommended to allow flexibility within the council as to how we apply the open space standards for off-site provision of open space in the light of the threshold for pooling planning obligations introduced through the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010, as amended).
- 4.19 The two policies in Section Eight: Services and Local Facilities (pages 197 to 214 of the plan), which were subject to the highest level of interest during consultation, were policies 73: Community, sports and leisure facilities and 77: Development and expansion of hotels. Representations to policy 73 relate to the provision of a community stadium, with respondents both supporting and objecting to the provision of a site for a community stadium. In relation to policy 77, most of the objections are related to the recent provision of hotels in the Coldham's Lane and Newmarket Road area and concerns about levels of car parking and future hotel provision in this area.
- 4.20 Within Section Nine: Providing the infrastructure to support development (pages 217 to 231 of the plan), Policy 80: Supporting sustainable access to development received representations on the Chisholm Trail and the need for more radical measures to reduce car usage in the city, including provision for cyclists and public transport. Policy 85: Infrastructure delivery, planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy was the subject of some concern, due to respondents' issues with infrastructure delivery for specific sites, including Site GB1 – 4, R10 Mill Road Depot and the Howard Mallett

Centre. Minor amendments to Policy 85 are recommended for clarity and to ensure the Local Plan is compatible with the emerging Cambridge Community Infrastructure Levy and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010, as amended).

Appendices

- 4.21 The majority of representations made on the appendices of the plan relate to Appendix B: Proposals Schedule and Appendix C: Designations Schedule. Representations to Appendix B included proposals for further allocation of land at the Triangle (Cambridge University Press) site (for employment/office use); the former Milton Road Primary School site on the corner of Milton Road and Gilbert Road (for aparthotel use); the Cambridge Tennis and Hockey Club and Emmanuel College Playing Fields sites (for residential use); Newnham College grounds (for college use).
- 4.22 Within Appendix B, the following proposed allocations were the subject of a large number of representations:
- GB1: Land north of Worts' Causeway;
 - GB2: Land south of Worts' Causeway;
 - GB3 and GB4: Fulbourn Road, west 1 and 2;
 - R10: Mill Road Depot;
 - R12: Ridgeons, 75 Cromwell Road.
- 4.23 Most of the representations made to Appendix C related to Protected Open Spaces, with many representations supporting the principle of Protected Open Space designation and specific designations. A large number of representations objected to the designation of St Matthew's Piece (Protected Open Space site P&G20) as they considered that the size of the Protected Open Space should be increased to encompass the Howard Mallett Centre (or to make it a community facility). A number of Colleges objected to the designation of their grounds as Protected Open Space, which in their view could impact on their potential scope for future development.

Sustainability Appraisal

- 4.24 A Sustainability Appraisal of the Proposed Submission Local Plan was made available for consultation at the same time as the plan. A total of 9 representations were made to the Sustainability Appraisal and its associated Non-Technical summary, mostly from the promoters of alternative development sites. For the most part, these representations were concerned with the process by which the appraisal had been undertaken, for example that undue weight had

been given to the importance of the Green Belt and whether an appraisal of the spatial development strategy had been carried out. Natural England made a representation in general support of the appraisal but queried some of the detailed elements of the report. Officers are collating all of the individual elements of the Sustainability Appraisal, which have been carried out at each stage in the preparation of the Local Plan, into one final Sustainability Appraisal report for submission to the Secretary of State. None of the proposed changes to the plan are considered to affect the outcome of Sustainability Appraisal.

5. Key Issues Raised and the Schedule of Proposed Changes

- 5.1 It is a regulatory requirement to publicise a summary of the Key Issues raised during a Proposed Submission consultation exercise such as the one undertaken between 19 July and 30 September 2013. This is attached at Appendix A.
- 5.2 This Key Issues report does not attempt to summarise every point made. It is simply a guide to highlight the most pertinent points made to the plan, sustainability appraisal and policies map. All representations received are available on the council's website at <http://cambridge.jdi-consult.net/ldf/>, and a summary of each representation received is available on the web at https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/ldf/draft_submission/summaries/. Hard copies of the representation summaries are also available in the Members' room or by contacting the planning policy team. The Inspector must read all representations in full.
- 5.3 The principle of such a Schedule is discussed above. Attached at Appendix B is the draft Schedule of Proposed Changes, which also includes the reasoning behind each suggested change.
- 5.4 Having reviewed all the representations received and matters raised, officers consider that Option 2 represents the most appropriate way forward at this time. This is because it is considered that the plan as currently drafted still represents the appropriate strategy approach to meeting the city's needs now and in the future. Some changes could usefully be made to improve clarity, but such changes are not so substantial as to warrant full re-consultation (Option 3), nor so minor that they should, in effect, be ignored (Option 1).
- 5.5 The Proposed Changes are predominantly to address issues of clarity in policy or supporting text wording. No site is proposed to be deleted or amended, and no new site is proposed to be added.

- 5.6 Your officers are recommending that that plan that was agreed at Full Council on 27 June 2013 remains fit for purpose and 'sound' and should be submitted for examination, together with this Schedule of Proposed Changes which the Inspector will be asked to support.
- 5.7 Members are asked to support the Schedule of Proposed Changes.

Procedural Matters that will arise during Examination

- 5.8 Members will need to be aware that the Schedule of Changes is likely to need to be added to throughout the examination period. This is because Inspectors like to come to agreement between parties on amendments to the plan, rather than imposing such changes on a council. Thus, if during the examination period it is becoming clear that the Inspector is not happy with an aspect of the plan, perhaps seeing merit in what an objector has said, then the Inspector urges all parties to come to some form of agreement on a change. This means the council has a degree of control over such a change (and, indeed, may sometimes welcome such a change) rather than wording being imposed upon us by the Inspector. The council does not have to agree to work with parties such on a change and could simply let the Inspector decide, but in the majority of cases it is best to be part of that process of negotiation.
- 5.9 What this means is that a degree of authority needs to be delegated to the Head of Planning Services to agree such additional Proposed Changes as they arise, as it is impractical for such changes to be agreed by committee in the usual way (Note: during the hearing sessions of the examination, changes are likely to be negotiated and added to the Schedule on a daily basis).
- 5.10 The recommendation in this report seeks such appropriate delegation, with reporting back on the exercise of such delegation through Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee during the course of the examination.
- 5.11 Members should be aware that, ultimately, the actual schedule of changes to be made to the plan is (other than minor changes) completely at the discretion of the Inspector. The Inspector can accept or reject as many of the changes on the Schedule of Proposed Changes as he/she sees fit, as well as add any new ones. If major changes arise, it is likely that the Inspector will introduce a consultation period on all of the major changes that he/she has in mind towards the close of the examination period, before finalising his/her report, so that any comments on them can be taken into account.

- 5.12 Provided that the plan is found to be basically sound, the full, Inspector approved, list of changes will ultimately be passed back to the council for incorporation into the plan when it is adopted by the council, though at this stage the council must approve them all or none of them (and if the latter, the plan is effectively abandoned and not adopted).
- 5.13 Officers will also need to prepare a number of documents and technical papers which support the plan, such as the sustainability appraisal, Green Belt and sites documentation, in order to ensure that the story of the development of the plan is told as effectively as possible to the Inspector. This is re-presenting existing technical work for the purpose of clarity only, rather than commissioning new work to be undertaken.

6. Duty to Cooperate

- 6.1 A final element of this report relates to an important obligation introduced by the Localism Act 2011, namely the “duty to cooperate”. This requires the council and a wide range of other bodies to co-operate with one another in certain defined activities relating to plan making. In Cambridge’s case, co-operation between the City Council Cambridgeshire County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council has been, and will continue to be, critical. At the strategic level, the approach to identifying objectively assessed needs for homes and jobs and to strategic issues has been set out in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation and Spatial Approach.
- 6.2 “Cooperation” does not necessarily mean that there must be complete agreement by all parties on every aspect of the plan; but there must be evidence of joint-working wherever appropriate and attempts to agree on such matters as an evidence base, infrastructure needs, cross-boundary development needs etc. This has been achieved through a close working relationship with South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council through the various stages of plan preparation to date. As a result, there will be a high degree of consistency between the proposed new Cambridge Local Plan and the proposed new Local Plan for South Cambridgeshire and the proposed Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.
- 6.3 It is a legal duty on the council to demonstrate it has undertaken appropriate cooperation under the Act. As such, a Duty to Cooperate

report has been undertaken and is attached for Member approval as Appendix C to this report.

7. Changes resulting from Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee on 17 December 2013

7.1 The committee report and its appendices were presented at the council's Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee on 17 December 2013. The sub-committee supported the recommendations that the plan and Appendices A – C be considered by Environment Scrutiny Committee and Full Council, subject to minor changes and the request that the County Council attends Environment Scrutiny Committee and provides greater comfort on the implementation of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. There were a number of very minor changes made to Appendix B: Schedule of Proposed Changes. These changes (numbered as in Appendix B) comprised:

- PM/3/007 – Leave the policy largely unchanged, with only 'and a high quality urban edge' inserted. The change was amended in order to reduce the impact of the original proposed change on the content of the policy;
- PM/3/016 – Inclusion of reference to non-car access to the station area from the east for clarity in order to ensure that the area east of the station does not become more congested with vehicular traffic;
- PM/6/001 – Removal of references to off-site provision of affordable housing as it was considered that the wording was unhelpful in promoting on-site provision where that option proved possible;
- New PM/B/004 – It was considered that the new wording proposed on Site R12 Ridgeons regarding housing typologies and density of development should also be employed in relation to site R10 Mill Road Depot.

8. Next Steps

8.1 Following Environment Scrutiny Committee, the plan will progress to Full Council on 13 February 2014. If Environment Scrutiny Committee agrees the recommendations, Full Council will be recommended to approve the submission of the plan they previously agreed on 27 June 2013, as well as the Schedule of Proposed Changes, Key Issues and the Duty to Cooperate report.

9. Implications

(a) **Financial Implications**

There are both direct and indirect financial implications arising from this report.

The direct financial implications flowing from the approval of the plan relate to the costs of the examination process, including paying the Planning Inspectorate for the fees of a planning inspector in examining the submitted document. There will be some cost savings from holding a joint examination and having a shared programme officer with South Cambridgeshire District Council. However, the costs of preparing a local plan have been budgeted for and included in the budget for 2013-2014 and the medium term financial planning for 2014-2015.

(b) **Staffing Implications** (if not covered in Consultations Section)

There are no direct staffing implications arising from this report. The review of the Local Plan has already been included in existing work plans.

(c) **Equal Opportunities Implications**

There are no direct equal opportunity implications arising from this report. The plan has the potential to impact on different sections of the community, but an Equalities Impact Assessment has been prepared as part of the plan preparation and this demonstrates how potential equalities issues have been, and will be, addressed.

(d) **Environmental Implications**

The new local plan for Cambridge will assist in the delivery of high quality and sustainable new development along with protecting and enhancing the built and natural environments in the city. This will include measures to help Cambridge adapt to the changing climate as well as measures to reduce carbon emissions from new development. Overall, there should be a positive climate change impact.

(e) **Procurement**

There are no direct procurement implications arising from this report.

(f) **Consultation and communication**

The consultation and communications arrangements for the local plan are consistent with the agreed Consultation and Community

Engagement Strategy for the Local Plan Review, 2012 Regulations and the council's Code for Best Practice on Consultation and Community Engagement.

(g) **Community Safety**

There are no direct community safety implications arising from this report.

10. Background papers

The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- Localism Act 2011, which can be accessed at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/contents/enacted>
- National Planning Policy Framework 2012, which can be accessed at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>
- Cambridge Local Plan 2006, which can be accessed at: <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/local-plan-2006>
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 <http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/environment/planning/policies/structure-plan.htm>
- Cambridge Local Plan Towards 2031 – Issues and Options and Issues and Options 2 consultations, which can both be accessed at: <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/local-plan-review>
- Committee papers for 29 May Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee, which can be accessed at: <http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=184&MIId=2438&Ver=4>
- Committee papers for 11 June Environment Scrutiny Committee, which can be accessed at: <http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=177&MIId=1032&Ver=4>
- Committee papers for Full Council, which can be accessed at: <http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=116&MIId=2427&Ver=4>

11. Appendices

- Appendix A: Key Issues;

- Appendix B: Schedule of Proposed Changes;
- Appendix C: Duty to Cooperate Report.

12. Inspection of papers

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Author's Name: Patsy Dell
Author's Phone Number: 01223 457103
Author's Email: patsy.dell@cambridge.gov.uk