

Draft Open Space and Recreation Strategy - June 2011

Public Participation Report

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1.0 Introduction				
1.1				
5601	Comment	Rather more open spaces have been destroyed than created over the last 1000 years.	Comment noted.	
5841 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Comment	<p>General comment about the document:</p> <p>The Strategy fails to stress that the open spaces of Cambridge have a very important transport (including commuting) function, both for cycling and walking. The open spaces form an absolutely key part of the 'cycling culture' of Cambridge, enabling people to travel by bicycle in a pleasant, convenient and safe environment. The Strategy must therefore give more weight to the transport aspect.</p>	Comment noted. However, this strategy's primary focus is not cycling. Whilst cycling is a vitally important sustainable mode of transport, it is considered that sufficient weight has been given to cycling within this strategy.	
5866 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Object	<p>Para 1.1. Cambridge is internationally famous for its ancient university and as a historic city, rather than for the quality of its environment. This is perhaps not necessary to state, and the second sentence could be omitted. This would then lead directly into the legacy of historic buildings (although we suggest the deletion of 'built' in line 3).</p> <p>The final sentence would reflect PPG2 more closely if amended to 'The Cambridge Green Belt seeks to preserve the setting and special character of Cambridge for future generations'.</p> <p>We suggest the third sentence is amended to 'These sites are rich in biodiversity, have historic and cultural associations and identities, and represent important amenities in their own right'.</p>	Concerns noted. However, it is considered that the development of Cambridge's ancient university and the nature of the historic city are directly correlated with the quality of the city's environment. As such, no change is considered necessary to this paragraph.	
5757 - Bidwells	Object	Insufficient time has been allowed to fully consider all the representation made. The Council's intension to take the Open Space and Recreation Strategy to the Environment Scrutiny Committee on 4th October leaves Officers insufficient time to properly consider comments made during the consultation.	Concern noted. However, it is considered that officers will have sufficient time to consider representations appropriately.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5919 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Support	CambridgePPF welcomes the substantial review of the open spaces and recreation strategy covering the city and the tremendous increase of listed open spaces for protection. Cambridge is growing and green spaces and squares are becoming more and more important to local people - particularly in light of more and more residents living in flats with no gardens nor any large or even Juliet balconies. Due to the current economic climate and less available spare cash the need for on the doorstep recreation becomes more and more important to many local people (travel regionally, nationally and internationally is becoming less affordable).	Support noted.	
5918 - North Newnham Residents Association	Support	I would like to record thanks for the work that has gone into producing this very worthwhile document.	Support noted.	
5893 - North Newnham Residents Association	Support	This account of the vital contribution of open spaces to Cambridge's character, and of the importance of green corridors leading to the countryside and establishing the city's setting seems to me exactly right.	Support noted.	
<i>1.2</i>				
5868 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Comment	After the first sentence, it would be helpful to refer to the complementary role that green open space played, and continues to play, in relation to the historic development pattern and townscape of Cambridge, from an aesthetic perspective.	Comment noted.	
5875 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Comment	The matter of the historic associations of open land in the historic core, and in other areas, is underplayed in the document generally.	Comment noted.	
5815 - Hembriar Limited	Object	By stating that 'These qualities are fragile, finite and irreplaceable, and should be safeguarded.' it is to be inferred that all open spaces be protected. That is surely not what this Strategy sets out to achieve thus we suggest the wording of that sentence be amended accordingly.	Concern noted. However, chapter 3 of the strategy clearly sets out the criteria for assessing open spaces for protection. Not all open spaces assessed during the survey phase of the strategy's preparation met the criteria and were not therefore put forward for protection.	
5920 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Object	CambridgePPF considers this to be too grand a statement and certainly some	Concern noted. Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		neighbourhoods have seen significant erosion of greens and wildlife spaces for other community usage such as placement of community buildings (Brownfield, St Matthews Piece; erosion of Green Belt for active sports provision etc). In addition some parks and commons suffer from increased wear and tear partly due to commuter routes based on sustainable transport modes as well as general increased usage for recreational space. Significant improvement and sensitive design need to be undertaken to ensure quality recreational green spaces and facilities. - qualification and/or rephrasing of this sentence is essential to portray a more realistic scene.	the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape.	
5834 - Grosvenor Developments	Object	Para 1.2 makes a number of sweeping statements regarding all open spaces. We acknowledge the importance of open space but it is not the case that all spaces are fragile, finite, irreplaceable or are vital to the character of the city.	Concern noted. However, chapter 3 of the strategy clearly sets out the criteria for assessing open spaces for protection. Not all open spaces assessed during the survey phase of the strategy's preparation met the criteria and were not therefore put forward for protection.	
5811 - Cambridge City Football Ground LLP & Cambridge City Football Club Limited	Object	Object to wording of paragraph 1.2 on the basis that the Draft suggests all open spaces in Cambridge should be protected - that is clearly not the case.	Concern noted. However, chapter 3 of the strategy clearly sets out the criteria for assessing open spaces for protection. Not all open spaces assessed during the survey phase of the strategy's preparation met the criteria and were not therefore put forward for protection.	
5894 - North Newnham Residents Association	Support	As with 1.1, 'hear hear'.	Support noted.	
5698 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Support	We strongly support this whole paragraph. It is crucial that existing open spaces are protected and enhanced, and that new open spaces are created and allowed to mature.	Support noted.	
5572 - Friends of Midsummer Common	Support	FoMC strongly agrees that "With increasing pressure for development in the City, it is particularly important that its green spaces are protected and enhanced"	Support noted.	

1.3

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5602	Comment	While open spaces may be improved by payments, the amount of space per person still goes down, and it is very clear that many of the city open spaces are under pressure.	Comment noted.	
5851	Comment	I think the council should more strongly demand on-site provision of green space and recreational facilities and be less inclined to accept money in lieu. Where money is accepted in lieu I think it is important it is spent on the purchase of permanent assets (ie. new green space, not "development" of existing green space) which will have an enduring impact on the city, for as long as the development continues to have an impact on the city.	Comment noted.	
5921 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Object	The ongoing practice of using financial contributions to upgrade existing open space should only be used in limited fashion. It is essential that in particular in inner urban areas of the city and areas with a high deficiency of open / green spaces new open space is being sought and serious work undertaken to achieve this. Acknowledgement needs to be made to be less minded to take financial contributions to upgrade an existing facility but also to save contributions for the creation of new areas of open space.	Concern noted. However, The Council's position is set out in Policy 3/8 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that "All residential development will provide public open space and sports facilities in accordance with the Open Space and Recreation Standards. Provision should be on-site as appropriate to the nature and location of development or where the scale of development indicates otherwise through commuted payments to the City Council." On site provision is preferred as provision will be close to the development. However, this will not always be possible and in these cases, a commuted sum will be required.	
<i>1.4</i>				
5869 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Comment	The third sentence could also reflect this aesthetic role, as follows '...visit the City, provides a satisfactory environment for nature and enhances the local townscape, complementing the built environment'.	Comment noted. The following text will be inserted at the end of the third sentence of paragraph 1.4 to read "and enhances the local townscape, complementing the built environment."	Insert "and enhances the local townscape, complementing the built environment." at the end of the third sentence of paragraph 1.4.
5491	Comment	Cambridge continues with its planning agenda of building overly high-density accommodation of 'bachelor' living spaces rather than the family accommodation needed. There is apparently no consideration of overall densities, and effects on present and future inhabitants as seen in the accumulation of CB1, the CUP site, etc etc. Yet as recent national events have shown, crowded	Concerns noted. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy highlights the importance of open spaces for a range of reasons and seeks to protect, enhance and provide open spaces across the City.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		social housing contributes to social strife. Open spaces so vital to both physical and mental health as noted in this document seem to be either ignored or compromised to such an extent as to be almost meaningless.		
5603	Comment	Whilst meeting the needs of all those who live in the City is a laudable aim, it is unlikely to be achieved. I would like a lot more open space - you will need to achieve this requirement.	Comment noted.	
5701 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Support	We support this whole paragraph. We suggest that the document should stress the need for existing local people and existing communities (as well as residents of new developments) to be involved in the process of enhancing existing open spaces and suggesting new open spaces.	Support noted.	
<i>1.5</i>				
5895 - North Newnham Residents Association	Comment	Is the 'protection' just of the existence of the space or of its character? I ask because the second bullet point - promotion of new facilities - could come into conflict with protection of, for instance, important natural habitat. Could the wording be revised to cover this?	Comment noted. It is recognised that there are many open spaces with different characters and purposes across the city. Many spaces are multi-functional and there is often the need to strike an appropriate balance between contrasting needs, including our duty to conserve and enhance biodiversity. New facilities can include schemes pertaining to biodiversity. It is considered that this paragraph is sufficiently broad to cover these issues as currently worded.	
5801 - Natural England	Comment	We believe that, well managed, Green Infrastructure can provide the following benefits: *Economic growth and employment - contribution to the green economy, creating attractive and sustainable places to live and work; *Protect and enhance cultural heritage, biodiversity and landscape; *Climate change adaptation and mitigation - contribute to a carbon efficient approach to living, including low food miles; * Community cohesion - community involvement in planting and maintenance, education; * Healthy communities - places for people to meet and gather, contribution to health through diet and	Comment noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		exercise.		
5870 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Object	The strategy does not rely extensively on technical terms and is very clearly written. The use of the terms green infrastructure seems unnecessary and potentially confusing in an otherwise accessible document.	Concerns noted. However, green infrastructure is a recognised term in this area and is explained within the strategy's glossary.	
5519 - Bidwells	Object	While the importance of green infrastructure, and the provision of sport, recreation and biodiversity is acknowledged the use of the Draft Open Space and Recreation Strategy to protect all green spaces within the City in advance of the Local Plan Review is premature. The adoption of the strategy under Policy 4/2 of the 2006 Local Plan needs to be considered holistically and progressed at the same time as consideration of the growth agenda and possible location for growth so as not to prejudice development within the City.	Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	
5922 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Object	The ongoing practice of using financial contribution to upgrade existing open space should only be used in limited fashion. It is essential that in particular in inner urban areas of the city and areas with a high deficiency of open / green spaces new open space is being sought and serious work undertaken to achieve this.	Concern noted. However, The Council's position is set out in Policy 3/8 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that "All residential development will provide public open space and sports facilities in accordance with the Open Space and Recreation Standards. Provision should be on-site as appropriate to the nature and location of development or where the scale of development indicates otherwise through commuted payments to the City Council." On site provision is preferred as provision will be close to the development. However, this will not always be possible and in these cases, a commuted sum will be required.	
5924 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Support	CambridgePPF supports funding directed to retain, enhance and increase open space and recreational provisions. This chapter should deal with Compulsory Purchase	Support noted. However, it is not considered appropriate to include reference to the Council's CPO powers in this strategy. The Local Plan Review will need to explore a number of issues,	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		and include a clear commitment from the Council to compulsory purchase land in areas where under-provision of open space exists. Private (sport fields, old industrial sites etc) and Council-owned land (such as Mill Road Depot) should be scanned for conversion to accessible open space to ensure this medium-term aim is achieved. Intensified usage of open space with facilities being built, may disadvantage local residents seeking tranquil spaces. It can be argued that in some urban quarters such environments are already lost and compensation needs to be achieved.	including opportunities for delivery of different forms of infrastructure, such as open spaces.	
5704 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Support	We support this whole section. It is important to include land owned by the Colleges of the University of Cambridge and any others to whom this land may be sold in future. This should be specified in the strategy.	Support noted. It is considered, however, that the discussion of public and private land in the third sentence of this paragraph is sufficient to encompass the concerns raised.	
5846 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council welcomes and commends the inclusion of green infrastructure throughout the Strategy and the underpinning of its importance in current and new developments.	Support noted.	
1.6 5492	Comment	Sadly much of new Cambridge eg the Leisure Park complex, the Kaleidoscope buildings etc etc with their complete lack of generous open space coupled with architectural sub-mediocrity (notably the Travellodge) contradicts this paragraph of intent.	Concerns noted. It is not the role of the Open Space and Recreation Strategy to require high-quality design in the built environment. This task is dealt with by policies in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and Planning Policy Statement 1. In relation to the main open space at the Leisure Park complex, which includes the Travelodge, this open space provides a significant area of hard and soft landscaping that is very heavily used by visitors to the Leisure Park and students of the nearby sixth form college. With reference to the Kaleidoscope scheme, it was recognised by Planning Committee that the proposed development did not provide sufficient open space on site in 2006. The application was refused on these grounds. It should be noted, however, that the scheme was approved at appeal by the Planning Inspectorate.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5708 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Support	Important to continue to draw inspiration from these sources	Support noted.	
5896 - North Newnham Residents Association	Support	yes	Support noted.	
<i>1.7</i>				
5872 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Comment	The Landscape Character Assessment is not the only document that helps define the special character and setting of Cambridge. For instance, Landscape Design Associates 'Cambridge Green Belt Study' of similar date is also pertinent.	Comment noted.	
5897 - North Newnham Residents Association	Comment	Yes, although 'accessible to all' may exclude major benefits to the community from private space which is just very often accessible to the public (with council tax payers not bearing the maintenance costs) But these spaces and this access are I suppose less secure. (See comment on ward 'weaknesses' below)	Comment noted.	
5711 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Support	High value open spaces such as these are important.	Support noted.	
<i>1.8</i>				
5778 - Bursars' Environment and Planning Sub-Committee	Comment	The Council will appreciate that the BEPSC acknowledges the very important role that open space has to play in providing for healthy and vital communities and a high quality living environment. The BEPSC obviously recognises that the city's open spaces provide for its special open character, which has evolved over hundreds of years. Indeed, many of the Colleges are of course, keepers and stewards of open space across the city. Effective and appropriate protection is therefore critical in protecting the city's special character. However, the city must be allowed to grow and thrive and it is therefore essential that policy is based upon a sound quantitative, as well as qualitative, understanding of the city's open spaces.	Comment noted. Sites were assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.	
			Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5774 - St John's College	<p>Comment The Council will appreciate that the College acknowledges the very important role that open space has to play in providing for healthy and vital communities and a high quality living environment. The College recognises that the City's open spaces provide for its special open character, which has evolved over hundreds of years. Indeed, the College is a keeper and steward of various open spaces in the City. Effective and appropriate protection is therefore critical in protecting the City's special character and opportunities for recreation. However, the City must be allowed to grow and thrive and it is therefore essential that Policy is based upon sound quantitative, as well as qualitative understanding of the City's open spaces.</p>	<p>Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	
5714 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Comment	We support this whole section especially the point that local people should be involved in decisions relating to improving existing open space. There is a danger that in making provision for new developments the needs of existing residential areas may be neglected	Comment noted.	
5863	Comment	I think the sentence on "Local people should be involved in decisions relating to improving and creating open space and their future use and management." ought be spun out into its own section as this is a key part of how the city's green spaces are run.	Comment noted. Cambridge Parks - Managing the City's Asset 2010 to 2014 considers in detail opportunities for engagement.	
5903	Comment	This section states that the city's open spaces should provide opportunities for events. I would like to suggest that the council's policy of charging those organising events on the city's open spaces needs to be reviewed. The current policy of charging only those who make an application to hold an event and turning a blind eye to others is farcical. I suggest reinstating the threshold of 500 people below which no charge is made, and considering which other events ought be exempt from charges eg. charitable and community events which don't result in costs to the council.	Comment noted. The Council sets and reviews charges each year. The criteria for charging based on a classification and definition of events was approved in January 2011. The Event Management Framework for outdoor events considers and addresses these points.	
5925 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	Wildlife sanctuaries and green linkages with the surrounding countryside and other wildlife/ open spaces are essential, too. - a bullet point to that effect needs to be added.	Comment noted. An additional bullet point will be added to read "protection and enhancement of habitat." The sentence below the bullet point will also be amended to read "The aforementioned opportunities need to be balanced..."	Add an additional bullet point to read "protection and enhancement of habitat." The sentence below the bullet point will also be amended to read "The aforementioned opportunities need to be balanced..."
5898 - North Newnham Residents Association	Comment	Might the protection/enhancement of habitat be accorded bullet-point status too so that it does not seem subsidiary? This for its own sake, though it can	Comment noted. An additional bullet point will be added to read "protection and enhancement of habitat." The sentence below the bullet point will	Add an additional bullet point to read "protection and enhancement of habitat." The sentence below the bullet point will also be amended to read "The

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		also support the sport of rambling which particularly benefits the young, elderly, infirm, obese who perhaps less easily enter into competitive sport on playing fields.	also be amended to read "The aforementioned opportunities need to be balanced..."	aforementioned opportunities need to be balanced..."
5923 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	Open space needs also defined in terms of active (perhaps more noisy spaces due to sport or heavily used commuter routes including cycle paths) and tranquil open spaces. The latter is becoming increasingly important as the Cambridge "Town" is population-wise changing into a "City" and with the increased hustle and bustle more relaxing outdoor spaces are required. - this point needs to be made within the Strategy.	Comment noted. It is considered that paragraph 1.8 makes appropriate reference to the need for spaces for active use and for tranquillity and repose.	
5867	Comment	There is regularly confusion over which council is responsible for which paths on the city's green spaces. A clear map showing which paths are considered "highways" and are the responsibility of the county council should be produced (or the councils should agree how to share their responsibilities in some other manner eg. sharing costs).	Comment noted. A map will be produced, showing the delineation in responsibilities for paths between authorities. This will be mounted on the Council's website.	
5845 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Comment	- Cyclists are not disallowed by the landowner from using paths across the commons. We believe the City Council has allocated permissive rights (as marked on the Cambridge Cycle Map). A formal written declaration to this effect, listing these routes, should be made. - Leisure use by private operators needs to be properly regulated, in future planning applications. Strategy should include formal guidance which should stress the importance of the cycling and walking function of open spaces. - Where cars are permitted to be used for deliveries during construction of private events, contractors should be required to park elsewhere immediately after unloading.	Comment noted.	
5871 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Object	The strategy does not rely extensively on technical terms and is very clearly written. The use of the term ecosystem services seems unnecessary and	Concern noted. However, it is considered that an appropriate balance has been struck between the use of technical and non-technical terminology.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		potentially confusing in an otherwise accessible document.		
5604	Object	The protection and enhancement of habitats for plants and animals must be one of the bullet points.	Concern noted. An additional bullet point will be added to read "protection and enhancement of habitat."	Add an additional bullet point to read "protection and enhancement of habitat."
5799 - Natural England	Support	Natural England supports the production of this document and its overall aim to maintain and enhance the quality and accessibility of the City's parks and open spaces. We particularly welcome your authorities aims to ensure that parks and open spaces are multi-functional and provide a wide range of benefits including amenity, recreation, biodiversity and landscape.	Support noted.	
5573 - Friends of Midsummer Common	Support	Strongly agree that "Local people should be involved in decisions relating to improving and creating open space and their future use and management" (para 1.8). For completeness, the list of opportunities (in para 1.8) should include "the right to graze cattle on large tracts of common land" and "Community orchards".	Support noted. The City of Cambridge Act 1985 sets out grazing legislation. However, the bullet pointed list will be amended to include a further bullet point to read "enhancing and creating opportunities for food production and sustainable management regimes, including grazing of land."	Amend list to include a final bullet point "enhancing and creating opportunities for food production and sustainable management regimes, including grazing of land."
<i>1.9</i>				
5715 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Comment	We support for the same reasons as given for 1.8 above. Add to the text that in areas of existing deficit in open space, opportunities should, where at all possible, be sought for enhancement of existing open spaces within the existing built up area, including increased ease of access, rather than relying only on additional open spaces within new developments.	Comment noted.	
5718 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Comment	All existing open spaces within built- up areas should be retained. It is extremely important to ensure that residents of new developments do not contribute to additional pressures on existing open space, particularly in areas in which there is already a shortfall in provision of open space.	Comment noted.	
5873 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Comment	It would be useful to refer to enhancement opportunities that complement townscape character here.	Comment noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5812 - Cambridge City Football Ground LLP & Cambridge City Football Club Limited	Object	Paragraph 1.9 suggests that additional open space over and above Standards should be encouraged in areas where there is a deficit. It needs re-wording to clarify that this is not the case.	Concern noted. However, this paragraph does not suggest going over and above the standards. It merely recognises that developments often do not provide open space in accordance with the standards on site and instead provide Section 106 payments in lieu of on site provision. The Council should attempt to secure on site open space provision wherever possible.	
5820 - Hembriar Limited	Object	By saying [that in areas of deficit] planning officers 'consider opportunities for delivery of additional open space within the proposed development' it appears as though the local planning authority is seeking a higher standard of open space than the standards proposed in the Strategy. In that context this would be an unreasonable imposition on applicants. We suggest the wording of the penultimate sentence be clarified (consistent with Para 1.13) where [in areas of specific deficit] the local authority will seek a higher on site provision of open space as opposed to off site contributions.	Concern noted. However, this paragraph does not suggest going over and above the standards. It merely recognises that developments often do not provide open space in accordance with the standards on site and instead provide Section 106 payments in lieu of on site provision. The Council should attempt to secure on site open space provision wherever possible.	
5926 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Object	CambridgePPF considers that new green spaces and squares need to be provided not only in the new urban extensions but also within the already built up areas within the city. This needs to be strongly worded in this paragraph. - suggest retaining first bullet point but rewording second one: * Creation of new open space within new developments and also inner urban areas with low open space provision	Concern noted. However, it is considered that the paragraph as currently drafted contains sufficient wording on the need for new open spaces within the built-up area.	
5837 - Grosvenor Developments	Object	This paragraph states that in areas of deficit planning officers "consider opportunities for delivery of additional open space within the proposed development" (our emphasis). The wording suggests that in such areas the local planning authority is asking the applicant to provide more open space than the standards put forward in the Strategy. This clearly goes beyond what is reasonable and fails the test of CIL Regulation 122.	Concern noted. However, this paragraph does not suggest going over and above the standards. It merely recognises that developments often do not provide open space in accordance with the standards on site and instead provide Section 106 payments in lieu of on site provision. The Council should attempt to secure on site open space provision wherever possible.	
5787 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	Support	PACT very much welcomes the general strategies, aspirations and standards for protecting and	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		enhancing open space provision in Cambridge as set out in this draft document. (Section 1.9 is excellent!).		
<i>1.10</i>				
5724 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Comment	Bullet point 3. In creating open spaces it is important not to turn every natural habitat into a park.	Comment noted.	
5721 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Comment	We support, and agree that flexibility is important. Add specific mention of provision for older residents.	Comment noted.	
5874 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Comment	While the first bullet may cover this, the opportunity for open space to engender a feeling of community and provide a sense of place, as an integral part of the townscape, might be explicitly included here. The dense neighbourhoods of Georgian or Victorian London and the college courts of Cambridge demonstrate the powerful relationship between open space, built form, aesthetics and community.	Comment noted.	
5847 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council welcomes the requirement to improve and preserve the network of cycling and walking routes. The broad alignments of these are set out in other documents (see for example: http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/Protection_funding_routes_CCN.pdf).	Support noted.	
<i>1.11</i>				
5927 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	Shouldn't the revised Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy be mentioned here as already approved by Cambridgeshire Horizons and to be adopted by the City Council and SCDC? Refer to para 2.15	Comment noted. This document is discussed in Chapter 2 and has not yet been adopted by the Council as a material consideration.	
<i>1.12</i>				
5941 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	The Strategy should be revised at least every 5 years.	Comment noted. The revision period of the whole strategy will be dependent upon resources and the needs of the City. However, the action plan in Chapter 6 will be updated regularly.	
5520 - Bidwells	Object	It is inappropriate for the Open Space and Recreation Strategy to designate open space either public or	Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		private as protected in advance of the Development Plan Review, when the appropriate testing can be undertaken as part of the SEA regulations, along with consideration of different uses for some of the land, particularly the private land that is proposed to be designated in the strategy. A holistic approach to the planning of growth within Cambridge is needed and the City Council risks creating a problem for itself through the premature sterilisation of land within the City.	as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	

1.13

5928 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	Suggest adding 2nd sentence - and other Area Action Plans which may be prepared for other redevelopment sites.	Comment noted. As no further Area Action Plans are anticipated for the time-being, this could be updated if relevant after the Local Plan Review process.	
5521 - Bidwells	Object	<p>The open space and recreation strategy can not be considered in isolation. A holistic approach is needed with the open space strategy being considered at the same time as the growth agenda so as not to prejudice development within the City.</p> <p>Off site section 106 contributions will need to be spent on identified projects in identified areas in close proximity to the site in question in accordance with advice in Circular 05/05 and CIL Regulation 122.</p>	<p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p> <p>With reference to concerns expressed about the use</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			of Section 106 contributions, the Council is cognisant of its duties in relation to spending Section 106 monies in line with the requirements of Circular 05/05 and the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended).	
5836 - Savills	Object	In addition to the above comments regarding the assessment of Ridley Hall, we also express considerable concern regarding the status of the document. PPS12 is clear that only a Development Plan Document can allocate sites for a particular use. Accordingly, whilst we recognise the strategy can form part of the evidence base to inform future planning policy making through the review of the Local Plan, this strategy in itself cannot designate land as open space particularly where representations regarding it cannot be thoroughly tested. Accordingly we consider that the Council cannot place any significant weight on this document until it has been subject to the due process and testing through the Development Plan."	Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	
5905 - North Newnham Residents Association	Support	I just wish to express strong support here.	Support noted.	
<i>1.14</i>				
5605	Comment	What were the sites survey for?	Comment noted. The sites were surveyed against the Council's criteria for environmental and recreational importance and were also assessed qualitatively. Further information on the survey criteria is available in Chapter 3 of the strategy.	
<i>1.15</i>				
5906 - North Newnham Residents Association	Comment	I am anxious over exclusive reliance on PPG 17. This covers sport and recreation but not sufficiently the other aspects of our open spaces mentioned in the introduction (e.g. biodiversity) so for balance other central guidance may surely be relevant? (PPG 2, PPS 23, others?)	Comment noted. However, the strategy is related most closely to the requirements contained within PPG17, hence the references to this document. Other PPGs and PPSs are referred to in Appendix 1.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5522 - Bidwells	Object	The open space and recreation strategy is in direct conflict with the draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which seeks to reduce the burden placed on developers through SPDs. The NPPF will eventually replace PPG17 and the strategy, which is likely to last for six or so years should be compliant with both adopted and emerging national planning policy. The non-compliance with the NPPF highlights the premature nature of the review.	Concern noted. However, as the strategy is not being adopted by the Council as a Supplementary Planning Document, but instead forms part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, the Council does not consider the strategy to be in conflict with the draft National Planning Policy Framework. At the time that the draft Open Space and Recreation Strategy was produced and endorsed for consultation, the draft National Planning Policy Framework had not been issued for consultation. Consultation on both documents commenced on 25th July 2011. References to the draft National Planning Policy Framework will be made in the strategy put forward for adoption. In terms of the need to assess needs, quantitative and qualitative deficits and surpluses, it is considered that the strategy is consistent with the requirements of both the draft framework and existing national planning policy contained in PPG17. As such, the strategy is not considered to be premature.	Insert new paragraph 2.5 to read: Draft National Planning Policy Framework This draft framework was published for consultation in July 2011 and has not yet been adopted. However, it is recognised that the Planning Inspectorate considers that it is capable of being afforded some weight as a material consideration in the planning process. Paragraph 128 of the draft framework recognises the importance of open spaces and requires planning policies to identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. The information gained from assessment of needs and opportunities should be used to set locally derived standards for the provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities.
5806 - Bell Educational Trust	Object	The Draft National Planning Policy Framework will replace all Planning Policy Guidance Notes and Planning Policy Statements when adopted. This effectively makes any work based on the PPGs and PPSs redundant. To develop a Strategy based upon a soon to be redundant PPG Note (17 in this case) is therefore an inefficient use of the Council's time and resources and the Draft Open Space and Recreation Strategy should be withdrawn.	Concern noted. At the time that the draft Open Space and Recreation Strategy was produced and endorsed for consultation, the draft National Planning Policy Framework had not been issued for consultation. Consultation on both documents commenced on 25th July 2011. References to the draft National Planning Policy Framework will be made in the strategy put forward for adoption. Given the status afforded to local assessment in paragraph 128 of the draft framework, it is not considered that the strategy represents inefficient use of the Council's time and resources.	Insert new paragraph 2.5 to read: Draft National Planning Policy Framework This draft framework was published for consultation in July 2011 and has not yet been adopted. However, it is recognised that the Planning Inspectorate considers that it is capable of being afforded some weight as a material consideration in the planning process. Paragraph 128 of the draft framework recognises the importance of open spaces and requires planning policies to identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. The information gained from assessment of needs and opportunities should be used to set locally derived standards for the provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities.
5929 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Object	The National Planning Policy Framework needs to be referred to in the document. This Strategy should make clear strong protection provision to capture the void between the NNPF, Localism Bill and the revision to the Local Plan becoming adopted strategies and/or plans. - wording throughout this Strategy needs to be	Concern noted. At the time that the draft Open Space and Recreation Strategy was produced and endorsed for consultation, the draft National Planning Policy Framework had not been issued for consultation. Consultation on both documents commenced on 25th July 2011. References to the draft National Planning Policy Framework will be	Insert new paragraph 2.5 to read: Draft National Planning Policy Framework This draft framework was published for consultation in July 2011 and has not yet been adopted. However, it is recognised that the Planning Inspectorate considers that it is capable of being afforded some weight as a material consideration in the planning

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		checked to ensure enhanced protection of all open spaces.	made in the strategy put forward for adoption.	process. Paragraph 128 of the draft framework recognises the importance of open spaces and requires planning policies to identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. The information gained from assessment of needs and opportunities should be used to set locally derived standards for the provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities.
2.0 Context				
2.1				
5574 - Friends of Midsummer Common	Comment	<p>Friends of Midsummer Common believe that the following Acts should also be taken into consideration in this chapter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Section 9 of the Countryside Act 1969, which attributes certain powers to Local Authorities when dealing with 'common land', such as providing facilities and services for recreational purposes on such land, or compulsory purchase common land for recreational purposes. * Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 - entitles any person to enter and remain on any Common for the purposes of open-air recreation, if and so long as he observes the general restrictions listed in Schedule 2 (which include nature conservation and heritage preservation) * Cambridge University and Corporation Act 1894 - which gives the Council powers to improve the Commons for the purpose of health and recreation. 	Comment noted. However, the legislation detailed is more pertinent to the management of open space rather than the evidence base for planning policy documents. These Acts influence the Council's management of open space.	
5829	Comment	I would like to suggest that when this document is published links be provided to all the documents mentioned in the "Policy Context" section; and that where any documents cited are not currently available online they get placed online.	Comment noted. Whilst this would be helpful for people attempting to access information, a number of the documents have not been produced by the Council and as such the maintenance of links is not within our control.	
5848 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	The Strategy is underpinned by Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 and the East of England Regional Spatial Strategy, both of which are proposed to be deleted by the Government as part of their overarching review of the planning system. Given this,	Comment noted. At the time that the draft Open Space and Recreation Strategy was produced and endorsed for consultation, the draft National Planning Policy Framework had not been issued for consultation. Consultation on both documents	Insert new paragraph 2.5 to read: Draft National Planning Policy Framework This draft framework was published for consultation in July 2011 and has not yet been adopted. However, it is recognised that the Planning Inspectorate

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		it would be helpful if the Strategy makes reference to the emerging National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which in paragraph 128 highlights the need to identify "specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area."	commenced on 25th July 2011. References to the draft National Planning Policy Framework will be made in the strategy put forward for adoption.	considers that it is capable of being afforded some weight as a material consideration in the planning process. Paragraph 128 of the draft framework recognises the importance of open spaces and requires planning policies to identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. The information gained from assessment of needs and opportunities should be used to set locally derived standards for the provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities.
5879 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Object	We suggest that the Council's Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans should be referred to in the policy review. The Cambridge Green Belt Study (LDA September 2002) could also be included for the analysis it provides of the character and setting of Cambridge (whilst acknowledging that parts are now out of date).	Concern noted. However, this list of documents is not intended to be exhaustive and cannot hope to cover every document produced by the Council or by other organisations. Conservation area appraisals and management plans are important tools within the planning process and are subject to change.	
5577 - Bidwells	Object	Protected open space designations should be reviewed alongside the Local Plan Review and not in advance thereof. The adoption of the document ought to be delayed to allow proper consideration of the implications.	Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	
2.2 5523 - Bidwells	Object	No reference is made to the emerging National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which will replace	Concern noted. At the time that the draft Open Space and Recreation Strategy was produced and	Insert new paragraph 2.5 to read: Draft National Planning Policy Framework This draft framework

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		PPG17. The Strategy ought to be compliant with both adopted and emerging policy.	endorsed for consultation, the draft National Planning Policy Framework had not been issued for consultation. Consultation on both documents commenced on 25th July 2011. References to the draft National Planning Policy Framework will be made in the strategy put forward for adoption.	was published for consultation in July 2011 and has not yet been adopted. However, it is recognised that the Planning Inspectorate considers that it is capable of being afforded some weight as a material consideration in the planning process. Paragraph 128 of the draft framework recognises the importance of open spaces and requires planning policies to identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. The information gained from assessment of needs and opportunities should be used to set locally derived standards for the provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities.
<hr/>				
2.3				
5907 - North Newnham Residents Association	Comment	As in the comment on 1.15, I am concerned about exclusive reliance on PPG 17 as this may lead to some lack of balance between the important sport and recreation considerations and other open space benefits to the character of the city as outlined in the initial context sections. (E.g will due weight be given to biodiversity and sustainability through reliance on PPG 17 only? Paragraphs 19 and 20 of PPG 17 help but are they sufficient to ensure due balance?	Comment noted. PPG17 is currently the main planning guidance note dealing with open space. In dealing with any application which would have impacts on biodiversity or sustainability, the Council's specialist officers in these areas would be consulted. These specialist officers were involved in the process of developing the criteria and quality questionnaire, and the Council's ecologist undertook a number of the site assessments.	
<hr/>				
2.14				
5802 - Natural England	Comment	Natural England supports the inclusion of accessible natural greenspace standards (ANGSt) in section 2.14, however there seems to be no further mention of these standards in the assessment stage or implementing the policy. Natural England would therefore recommend that assessment results are included. Further information on accessible natural greenspace standards (ANGSt) can be found in our recent publication 'Nature Nearby - Accessible Natural Greenspace Guidance', March 2010. http://naturalengland.etraderstores.com/NaturalEnglandShop/NE265	Comment noted. However, it is considered that ANGSt is based on flawed evidence base and is not entirely appropriate within such a densely built-up area.	
<hr/>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>2.16</i>				
5835	Support	<p>I support this strategy, particularly its sub-regional priorities for the Cambridge area of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Ice Rink * Multi-lane rowing facility * 50m swimming pool <p>I note though the strategy is rather out of date, being pre-olympics.</p>	Support noted.	
<i>2.17</i>				
5878 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Comment	<p>Cambridge can boast some of the best examples of imaginative open space management - in particular the maintenance of meadowland in the city by the grazing of cattle, lending a rural ambience in very central locations. Protection and enhancement of existing open space is often dependant on the management regime. We note that the policy review in section 2 refers to a strategic management framework for Cambridge's parks (para 2.17). It may be that this could be referred to more extensively in the document. However, it would be useful to underline the importance of good management of open spaces beyond those in local authority control.</p>	Comment noted.	
5902 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Comment	<p>1. Issue of charging for using the commons as meeting points</p> <p>The commons as public places are important as assembly points for walkers and cyclists. There should be no requirement to obtain the Council's permission or to pay fees for this usage except where posts, tents or other structures are to be erected.</p> <p>2. Cycle parking at events</p> <p>Good quality cycle parking should be required for all commons events where structures are put up on the commons, especially those events for which planning permission is required.</p>	Comment noted. The Event Management Framework for outdoor events considers and addresses these points.	

2.18

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5617 - Excel Tennis and Victoria Falls Adventure Golf	Support	ROOM FOR A MINIATURE GOLF COURSE IN PARKS OF CAMBRIDGE: We run an adventure golf course in Bath's Royal Victoria Park. Our site is an 18 hole all natural course with rushing streams, waterfalls and an abundance of flowers and plant life. With our constant careful attention, it is the ambience of the course which makes the experience so enjoyable. I feel there should be room for a similarly landscaped course in Cambridge. Possible locations next to tennis courts in Jesus Green, next to bowling green in Christ's Pieces or on the overgrown vegetation at the millpond. www.victoriafallsadventuregolf.co.uk	Support noted. A recent consultation on future activities on Jesus Green has highlighted no support for this type of activity. Additionally, a recent Heritage Lottery Fund Bid has considered and discounted such projects. Such schemes require careful consideration and are not likely to be suitable for common land within the City.	
<i>2.19</i>				
5930 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	Suggest adding a paragraph on the role of green spaces to mitigate climate change effects etc.	Comment noted. However, this paragraph is intended as a brief description of the document.	
<i>2.20</i>				
5931 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	Also refer linkages with neighbouring district for wildlife/ biodiversity (ref SCDC Biodiversity Strategy)	Comment noted. This list of documents is not intended to be exhaustive and is not dealing with land outside the City's administrative boundaries.	
<i>2.23</i>				
5881 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Comment	The management of trees, including street trees, is highly relevant to this document, and we note that a strategy exists to cover this aspect (para 2.23). Some trees, such as those planted by the Cambridge Preservation Society at the southern entrance to Cambridge have strong historical associations; others have clear architectural value - for instance, those lining Barton Road. Mature specimen trees within open space make an important contribution to the city's townscape. It would be appropriate to emphasise the overlap between the strategies and the value of setting management regimes for both open space and trees.	Comment noted. The Council's forthcoming Tree Strategy will complement and sit alongside this strategy.	
5827	Support	I think it is positive that the council is accepting that it doesn't have a current tree policy. I think it is really	Support noted. The Council's forthcoming Tree Strategy will complement and sit alongside this	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>important to get a consistent approach to making decisions with respect to all trees in the public realm in the city in an open and democratic fashion.</p> <p>If a new Arboricultural Strategy is agreed by the City Council will it automatically become part of this open space and recreation policy? Can this policy be written in such a way so that it does, or can a mechanism for fast-tracking it in be created?</p>	strategy.	

3.0 Protecting Open Spaces

3.2

5807 - Bell Educational Trust	Object	<p>The full database which details which criteria each site meets has not been published; thus how the Quality % score allocated to each site has been calculated is not known. Protected Open Spaces should supported by local people who should be given the opportunity to understand the criteria for the assessment of the open spaces. The method used to identify sites in the Open Space Strategy is contrary to the Government's indicated direction for the planning system and the aims of the Localism Bill. The Strategy should be withdrawn.</p>	<p>Concern noted. Whilst a technical document detailing the individual assessments of sites was not provided during the consultation, the Council has made available these assessments to those individuals and companies who approached the Council for further information during the consultation period. It was considered that the sheer size of the technical assessment would render the consultation unmanageable as this would include over 1,200 pages of assessments. It is not considered that the methodology used to identify sites is contrary to either PPG17 or the draft National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	
-------------------------------	--------	--	--	--

3.3

5784 - Conservators of the River Cam	Comment	<p>The City Council should commit to making periodic reviews of the number of Mooring Licences issued to residential boat owners with an overall view of reducing numbers over time. In-line mooring has prevented members of the public from accessing the riverbanks along the Cam in certain Wards. The City Council must seriously give consideration to the development of a marina for Cambridge. Anglers in particular have become disaffected by the reduction in availability of riverbanks for their recreation. Angling is the largest participation sport in the country and the City Council needs to recognise the needs of this large, but largely silent, recreational group.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The River Moorings Policy is regularly reviewed and the next scheduled review is in 2012/13. The Cambridge Local Plan 2006 includes an allocation (3.01) for off-river residential moorings, although it has not yet come forward for development. This issue will also need to be considered through the review of the Local Plan. The Angling Association is a recognised stakeholder and is consulted whenever policy is reviewed.</p>	
--------------------------------------	---------	---	---	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5858 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The classification of school sites, especially their playing fields, as protected open space needs to be reconsidered. It raises a number of issues: *Places development constraints on the site *Makes responding to changing demography difficult *Insufficient weight is given to open space used by schools e.g. Parker peice	Concern noted. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured. Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.	
5726 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Support	We agree that it is essential to recognize sites which are of environmental importance to the locality and may also have recreational importance for a College.	Support noted.	
3.4				
5861 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	The use of this designation for school sites doesn't take account of existing legislation and restrictions on the development of school sites and playing fields, such as the role of Sport England, although in	Comment noted. However, Sport England's role regarding playing pitches is referred to in paragraphs 5.8 and 5.9.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		paragraph 3.4 the Strategy takes account of other legislative protection when considering the River Cam.		
5779 - Conservators of the River Cam	Support	Section 3.4. Amend sentence to read 'the River Cam itself is protected by the Land Drainage Act and the Environment Agency's and Conservancy's byelaws'. We agree that the River Cam should be subject to the development of a strategy in its own right in the form of a 'waterspace strategy'.	Support noted. It is agreed that the sentence should be amended to read "the River Cam itself is protected by the Land Drainage Act and the Environment Agency's and Conservancy's byelaws"	Amend sentence to read "the River Cam itself is protected by the Land Drainage Act and the Environment Agency's and Conservancy's byelaws."
3.5				
5764	Comment	Light pollution, noise and visual clutter on and surrounding parks have a detrimental effect. Maybe I've missed these ? Are there high standards for litter bins, lights etc ? Proximity to major roads reduces tranquility (Byrons pool (esp at Milton Country Park, although outside this survey).	Comment noted. The quality assessment represents a snapshot in time. If any project to enhance an open space were to be undertaken, it is considered important for those involved in the development of the project to consider a wide range of issues and revisit the open space to recognise the key issues which can be dealt with. Whilst it is recognised that major roads can have a detrimental effect on tranquillity, tranquillity is difficult and subjective issue to measure.	
5854 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	If protected open spaces are to be further classified as public and private, then it would be helpful if the Strategy could present a clear definition of what these represent. Currently, although reference is made occasionally within the text to some types of space being public or private, there is no overarching definition, which would help provide clarity.	Concern noted. This issue is explained in paragraph 4.16 of the strategy.	
5808 - Bell Educational Trust	Object	The criteria for determining how 'major' environmental or recreational importance is defined are not stated within the document. The definition of 'local area' is also unclear. Given the undefined nature of key elements of the assessment criteria, it is therefore not possible to make a meaningful assessment of whether a site meets the criteria for environmental or recreational importance. The robust methodology underpinning the criteria for assessing sites' importance should be published.	Sites have been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. the criteria are included in Chapter 3 of the strategy.	
5883 - English Heritage (East of	Support	We very much welcome the inclusion of a qualitative	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
England Region)		assessment of open space in the audit process, and particularly consideration of the contribution open space makes to the setting and character of the city, and local areas.		
<hr/>				
3.6				
5644 - Bidwells	Object	It is considered that the criteria set out for assessing the environmental importance are too subjective and do not therefore provide sufficient guidance on whether an open space is considered to be of environmental importance.	Concern noted. This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach.	
<hr/>				
5809 - Bell Educational Trust	Object	The criteria for determining how 'major' environmental or recreational importance is defined are not stated within the document. The definition of 'local area' is also unclear. Given the undefined nature of key elements of the assessment criteria, it is therefore not possible to make a meaningful assessment of whether a site meets the criteria for environmental or recreational importance. The robust methodology underpinning the criteria for assessing sites' importance should be published.	This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. The criteria are set out clearly in Chapter 3.	
<hr/>				
5825 - Savills	Object	The Council's assessment sheet under Environmental Importance identifies that the open space has significant historical, cultural or known archaeological interest. This is clearly not the case in relation to the Principal's Garden. This view that this Garden has no heritage value was supported by the Council's Conservation Team who responded as such during the recent consultation on planning applications at Ridley Hall. The assessment sheet needs to be amended to reflect this assessment.	Concern noted. The Principal's Garden and the rest of the Ridley Hall grounds are intrinsically part of the same site and form a considerable proportion of the overall site. If the planning permission, which has been granted for the expansion of college, were to be implemented, the site would be subject to re-assessment of the level of Protected Open Space.	
<hr/>				
a				
5525 - Bidwells	Object	The details of the character assessments, which it is assumed have been undertaken in relation to each site's contribution to the character of the City, must be provided as part of the consultation so as to allow	Concern noted. Whilst a technical document detailing the individual assessments of sites was not provided during the consultation, the Council has made available these assessments to those	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		critical review of the evidence gathered by the Council to justify its designations.	individuals and companies who approached the Council for further information during the consultation period. It was considered that the sheer size of the technical assessment would render the consultation unmanageable as this would include over 1,200 pages of assessments.	
<i>b</i>				
5526 - Bidwells	Object	The details of the character assessments, which it is assumed have been undertaken in relation to each site's contribution to the character of the Local Area, must be provided as part of the consultation so as to allow critical review of the evidence gathered by the Council to justify its designations.	Concern noted. Whilst a technical document detailing the individual assessments of sites was not provided during the consultation, the Council has made available these assessments to those individuals and companies who approached the Council for further information during the consultation period. It was considered that the sheer size of the technical assessment would render the consultation unmanageable as this would include over 1,200 pages of assessments.	
<i>c</i>				
5648 - University of Cambridge	Comment	Reference to geodiversity value should be included in this part of the Strategy. The environmental importance of the Traveller's Rest Pit SSSI is its geological value.	Concern noted. However, it is considered that the Traveller's Rest Pit's Site of Special Scientific Interest designation is sufficient.	
5527 - Bidwells	Object	The details of the ecological assessments, which it is assumed have been undertaken in relation to each site's contribution to the wildlife and biodiversity of the City, must be provided as part of the consultation so as to allow critical review of the evidence gathered by the Council to justify its designations.	Concern noted. Whilst a technical document detailing the individual assessments of sites was not provided during the consultation, the Council has made available these assessments to those individuals and companies who approached the Council for further information during the consultation period. It was considered that the sheer size of the technical assessment would render the consultation unmanageable as this would include over 1,200 pages of assessments.	
<i>3.7</i>				
5765	Comment	Can't find any mention of dog walking - probably involving the largest and most regular users of parks throughout the year and many in the 55 plus age group often poorly catered for in other recreational	Comment noted. Reference is made to dog-walking in the Abbey Ward Profile; Coleridge Ward Profile, paragraphs 5.30 and 6.10.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		activities. As well as providing strong sense of ownership of open spaces.		
5645 - Bidwells	Object	It is considered that the criteria set out for assessing the recreational importance are too subjective and do not therefore provide sufficient guidance on whether an open space is considered to be of recreational importance.	Sites have been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach.	
5830 - Savills	Object	P&G 37 - Question (e) relates to the recreational importance of the area. It asks does the site make a "major contribution" to the recreational resources of the area? The assessment identifies that owing to its size and accessibility the people who live, work or study in a local area could use it for recreational purposes. The Principal's Garden cannot be said to make a major contribution to the recreational resource of the local area. Accordingly, this should be amended to "no".	Concern noted. The Principal's Garden and the rest of the Ridley Hall grounds are intrinsically part of the same site and form a considerable proportion of the overall site. If the planning permission, which has been granted for the expansion of college, were to be implemented, the site would be subject to re-assessment of the level of Protected Open Space.	
5833 - Savills	Object	P&G 37 - In terms of recreational value, there is no quantitative assessment of recreational needs. We cannot see how seeking to designate land for a recreational importance can be achieved without any assessment of recreational requirements.	Concern noted. The strategy includes both qualitative and quantitative assessment. In terms of playing pitches, it is recognised that further up to date information is required and that a study should be commissioned. This is referred to in the strategy.	
<i>d</i>				
5762	Comment	One of the largest groups of recreational users are dog walkers, who use parks daily, who are often in the 55 plus age group and who use parks early morning and evening thereby providing adult surveillance. Little mention of their requirements- seems to be organised sport that is referred to ?	Comment noted. Reference is made to dog-walking in the Abbey Ward Profile; Coleridge Ward Profile, paragraphs 5.30 and 6.10.	
5528 - Bidwells	Object	The details of the recreational resource contribution assessments, which it is assumed have been undertaken in relation to each site, must be provided as part of the consultation so as to allow critical review of the evidence gathered by the Council to justify its designations.	Concern noted. Whilst a technical document detailing the individual assessments of sites was not provided during the consultation, the Council has made available these assessments to those individuals and companies who approached the Council for further information during the consultation period. It was considered that the	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			sheer size of the technical assessment would render the consultation unmanageable as this would include over 1,200 pages of assessments.	
<i>3.8</i>				
5781 - Conservators of the River Cam	Comment	Open space needs to include the waterscape of the City. The Council needs to recognise the land-water interface, used by kayakers, canoeists etc. This usage is increasing in line with population. There is currently a shortfall in the provision of facilities to enable the commercial punting industry to be put on a proper footing, e.g. inadequate landing facilities and no storage areas for operators' equipment. The Council owns public access points to the river and these seem to have been overlooked in its assessment. For example, there are slipping facilities for boats at the Water Street slipway in Chesterton but the slipway design does not accommodate proper road trailers with the effect of restricting visiting day boats from making access to the Cam within the City boundaries. There is absolutely no mention of rowing in this document.	Comment noted. The strategy considers access to open space, recreation and sport. The Council agrees that recreational river activity should be considered, but not the requirements of commercial activities such as punting through this strategy.	
<i>3.9</i>				
5814 - Cambridge City Football Ground LLP & Cambridge City Football Club Limited	Comment	Agree with the Council that it is extremely difficult to achieve replacement provision within the city for recreational open space.	Comment noted.	
5844 - Hembriar Limited	Comment	The Council acknowledges the difficulties '...to achieve replacement provision within Cambridge's administrative boundaries due to constraints on the availability and costs of large sites...'. However, this statement does not go far enough. Where Policy 4/2 has already been tested against the 2006 Strategy (the loss of playing fields) it is clear that other arrangements, e.g. financial contributions to enhance existing open spaces, is an accepted alternative means of policy compliance. In addition discretion should prevail if there is no demonstrable demand for any re-provision. Furthermore, there should be clear guidance in situations where a protected site is allocated for development. allocated.	Comment noted. However, the onus is on the applicant to show that the options for acceptable replacement provision have been thoroughly investigated.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5733 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Comment	<p>3.9 Add to the list of functions that should be replaced: the "green lung" function of the existing open space in the existing local area.</p> <p>3.9 e Add that it is important, especially in an area that has an existing shortfall of open space, to retain existing open space even if some of the previous uses are no longer relevant or if new uses could be developed.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The ward profiles allow for consideration of the level and importance of existing open space provision in a specific area of the City. If an area of open space, whether public or private, has been recognised as having environmental and recreational importance, it would be likely to be more difficult to replace successfully.</p>	
<hr/>				
<i>3.12</i>				
5734 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Comment	We support. Add that it is important in all cases to assess open spaces against all the criteria.	Comment noted.	
<hr/>				
<i>3.13</i>				
5908 - North Newnham Residents Association	Comment	Does 'character' include contribution to biodiversity?	Comment noted. Biodiversity is considered both in the criteria for assessment and in the second bullet point of this paragraph, in terms of enhancing biodiversity.	
<hr/>				
5788 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	Support	We applaud the clear expression of a presumption against development of any open space that is of environmental and/or recreational importance (Section 3.13), and we feel that the environmental and/or recreational importance of specific sites that we know well has been assessed fairly.	Support noted.	
<hr/>				
<i>3.14</i>				
5816 - Cambridge City Football Ground LLP & Cambridge City Football Club Limited 5864 - Hembriar Limited	Object	We have doubts about the veracity of the quality assessments and what they purport to address. The methodology in Para 3.16 is vague and no evidence is provided by way of data gathering and interpretation. Given that the quality assessments are expected to redress 'qualitative deficiencies' there must be robust and consistent mechanisms in place to enable proper analysis and comparisons to be made. We are not convinced that introducing an additional subjective test will achieve the stated aims particularly as the appended scores highlight wide and unexplained disparities between spaces. Our view is that the quality assessment be deleted.	Concern noted. However, this is in accordance with the approach taken in PPG17, which specifically mentions the need for quantitative and qualitative assessment. This approach has been taken by many local planning authorities and planning consultancies specialising in leisure and recreation. The use of criteria to assess environmental and recreational importance is well-established in the City. Sites have been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach.</p> <p>Whilst a technical document detailing the individual assessments of sites was not provided during the consultation, the Council has made available these assessments to those individuals and companies who approached the Council for further information during the consultation period. It was considered that the sheer size of the technical assessment would render the consultation unmanageable as this would include over 1,200 pages of assessments.</p>	
5524 - Bidwells	Object	It is inappropriate to derive a quantitative judgement in terms of a quality percentage from a qualitative and therefore subjective questionnaire. The quality assessment is therefore fundamentally flawed and the sites need to be re-assessed as being of either good, average or poor quality. The designation of sites as 0% or 90+% quality is meaningless. The relative weight given to each question is also unclear and casts a significant doubt over the methodology used to assess the quality of the sites.	Concern noted. However, this is in accordance with the approach taken in PPG17, which specifically mentions the need for quantitative and qualitative assessment. This approach has been taken by many local planning authorities and planning consultancies specialising in leisure and recreation. The use of criteria to assess environmental and recreational importance is well-established in the City. Sites have been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach.	
5885 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Support	Para 3.9 states that development and replacement of open space will only be considered where it is solely of recreational value. We agree that where open space makes a positive contribution to, for instance, the character of the city, or local townscape, trading open space would be inappropriate.	Support noted.	
5859 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Paragraph 3.13 is supported, but it needs to reflect the recently published Policy Statement on Planning for Schools Development (15 August 2011) which states that "The Government wants to enable new schools to open, good schools to expand and all schools to adapt and improve their facilities." The	Support noted. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be	Insert new paragraph 2.5 to read: Draft National Planning Policy Framework This draft framework was published for consultation in July 2011 and has not yet been adopted. However, it is recognised that the Planning Inspectorate considers that it is capable of being afforded some

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>Statement goes on to state that "Local authorities should make full use of their planning powers to support state-funded schools applications" and that this applies to both change of use development and development necessary to the operational needs of the school. The Strategy needs to acknowledge the presumption in favour of state-funded schools as expressed in the Policy Statement and recently published draft National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	<p>satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>At the time that the draft Open Space and Recreation Strategy was produced and endorsed for consultation, the draft National Planning Policy Framework had not been issued for consultation. Consultation on both documents commenced on 25th July 2011. References to the draft National Planning Policy Framework will be made in the strategy put forward for adoption.</p>	<p>weight as a material consideration in the planning process. Paragraph 128 of the draft framework recognises the importance of open spaces and requires planning policies to identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. The information gained from assessment of needs and opportunities should be used to set locally derived standards for the provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities.</p>
<p>3.16 5735 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee</p>	<p>Comment It is good to assess open spaces against all the criteria. Add that, in addition, the detail behind absolute scores must also be examined in each particular case in order to take into account any special circumstances, not revealed in the scoring.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The scores for the quality assessment represent a snapshot in time. Prior to any decision being taken to proceed with the development of any project to enhance an open space, the open space should be revisited in order</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5590 - Bidwells	Object	There is no distinction drawn between sites based on ownership as part of the Quality Assessment, which is an omission. It would seem logical that the level of access afforded to the general public ought to carry significant weight when judging the contribution a site makes to the open space and recreation opportunities across the City. Public spaces ought to score more highly than private spaces as they are more accessible.	Concern noted. However, whilst accessibility to the public is highly desirable and should be increased where possible and this is reinforced throughout the strategy, there are many private spaces throughout the City which perform an important duty in providing open space and recreational opportunities for their users.	

4.0 Provision of Open Space across the City

4.1

5738 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Support	Sections 4.1-4.3 We strongly support this analysis of the distribution of Open Spaces across the city.	Support noted.	
--	---------	---	----------------	--

4.3

5768 - St John's College 5777 - Bursars' Environment and Planning Sub-Committee	Comment	The playing pitch assessment needs to inform the Open Space and Recreation Strategy, rather than being carried out at a later date. To put the current standard of 1.2 ha per 1000 people for sports provision in context, Table 1 at Paragraph 4.3 of the Strategy, identifies a total of 217.52 ha of Outdoor Sports Facilities, equating to provision of 1.84 ha of Outdoor Sports Facilities provision per 1000 people. We are concerned that the effective protection of open space through a SPD is inappropriate. The identification of protected sites should be considered and examined through DPD preparation. Paragraph 6.1 of PPS 12 states: "SPD's should not be prepared with the aim of avoiding the need for the examination of a Policy which should be examined".	Comment noted. It should be noted, however, that this strategy is not a Supplementary Planning Document, instead forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. The development of a new playing pitch study will also inform the development of the Local Plan Review. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are	
--	---------	--	--	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<p>aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>				
<p>4.4 5822</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Residents of Cambridge's urban extensions can end up paying twice for the upkeep of the city's open spaces, both through their council taxes, and through management charges for the maintenance of open spaces in their development. I think this policy ought make clear the City Council (and South Cambs District Council) policy towards adopting green space in new developments. I suggest that as a general principle publicly accessible green space on new developments should be adopted by the council and its upkeep should be funded by general taxation and not management charges on particular properties. There</p>	<p>Comment noted. This strategy is not expressed as policy as it cannot set policy. The setting of new planning policies has to be undertaken through the Local Plan Review process. In terms of the upkeep of the City's open spaces, the strategy does not contain information on the need for the City Council to manage each and every open space delivered, as it is considered that each site should be considered on its merits and particular issues.</p>	
<p>4.5 - Cambridge Southern Fringe: Trumpington Meadows</p>				
<p>5932 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>9th sentence - north of M11 should be either east or west. Allotment provision must be more detailed in relation to each urban extension.</p>	<p>Comment noted. It is not the role of this strategy to provide further detail on allotment provision in the urban extensions.</p>	
<p>4.8 - Cambridge Southern Fringe: Glebe Farm</p>				
<p>5933 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Allotment provision must be more detailed in relation to each urban extension.</p>	<p>Comment noted. It is not the role of this strategy to provide further detail on allotment provision in the urban extensions.</p>	
<p>4.9 - Cambridge Southern Fringe: Addenbrooke's 20:20</p>				
<p>5934 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Allotment provision must be more detailed in relation to each urban extension.</p>	<p>Comment noted. It is not the role of this strategy to provide further detail on allotment provision in the urban extensions.</p>	
<p>4.10 - North West Cambridge: Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road (NIAB 1)</p>				

4.10 - North West Cambridge: Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road (NIAB 1)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5935 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	Allotment provision must be more detailed in relation to each urban extension.	Comment noted. It is not the role of this strategy to provide further detail on allotment provision in the urban extensions.	
<i>4.11 - North West Cambridge: Land between Madingley Road and Histon Road</i>				
5936 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	Allotment provision must be more detailed in relation to each urban extension.	Comment noted. It is not the role of this strategy to provide further detail on allotment provision in the urban extensions.	
5649 - University of Cambridge	Comment	Delete 'Histon Road' and replace with 'Huntingdon Road'	Comment noted. This error will be corrected.	Amend "Histon" to read "Huntingdon"
5636	Comment	(Submitted on behalf of the Nineteen Acre Field RA) As part of the planning process, additional publicly-accessible protected spaces should be zoned and particular care taken to ensure appropriate (1) variety and (2) management	Comment noted. The proposed development at North West Cambridge includes a significant level of publically accessible open space in line with policy requirements in the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan.	
<i>4.12 - Cambridge East</i>				
5937 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	Allotment provision must be more detailed in relation to each urban extension.	Comment noted. It is not the role of this strategy to provide further detail on allotment provision in the urban extensions.	
5842	Support	I strongly support the creation of strategic routes connecting Green Infrastructure in the City with the surrounding districts. In particular I would like to see more footpaths made accessible to cyclists to promote recreational cycling opportunities around the city.	Support noted.	
<i>4.13</i>				
5838 - Grosvenor Developments	Object	We consider that the ward assessment is over-simplistic in terms of assessing open space provision. It takes no account of accessibility and ward boundaries (as the strategy identifies) are arbitrary. The Council should reconsider this approach.	Concern noted. The Council has noted that ward boundaries can be arbitrary within the strategy itself, but believes that this way of representing information does allow local communities to access information at an appropriate scale.	

4.15

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5850 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	It would be beneficial if a summary of the Strategy could be produced to go with the separate ward profiles, which would be helpful for local communities to use in the neighbourhood planning process.	Comment noted. However, the document should be read as a whole. It remains usable with the neighbourhood planning process.	
5938 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Object	Additional bullet point required: * Opportunities for new open space CambridgePPF welcomes the detailed information however considers such to be put into better context now and in any future reviews: In addition each table should have more detailed summary information: * Total area of ward in hectares * Total area of private open space in hectares * Total area of public open space in hectares * Special box highlighting provision of allotments etc - hectares per 1,000 population and if underused or demand in area etc	Concern noted. However, it is considered that the area of the ward in hectares is not relevant , whilst the other data is already present within each ward profile. It is not the role of this strategy to provide significant additional detail on allotments, particularly when information on demand and usage may become outdated very quickly. In order to provide overall clarity, the Council has prepared an additional table of ward data to allow easier comparison in Chapter 4.	Insert collated table of ward data in Chapter 4 of strategy.
4.16				
5843	Comment	I think if the phrase "green lung" is to be used it ought be defined.	Comment noted. Insert definition of green lung into the glossary to read "Green spaces are the 'green lungs' of our towns and cities contributing to improving people's physical and mental health by providing pleasant views and places for informal recreation - walking, cycling, sitting, socialising and children's play - and 'breathing spaces' to take time out from the stresses of modern life."	Insert definition of green lung into the glossary to read "Green spaces are the 'green lungs' of our towns and cities contributing to improving people's physical and mental health by providing pleasant views and places for informal recreation - walking, cycling, sitting, socialising and children's play - and 'breathing spaces' to take time out from the stresses of modern life."
5739 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Support	We strongly support the need to consider the supply of open spaces which provide a green lung to surrounding built areas.	Support noted.	
4.18				
5740 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Support	Support and comment. It is particularly important in areas of the city where there is a clear deficiency in publicly accessible open space that in any site put forward for residential development in the area, there should be high quality provision of sufficient open space on site, to provide for both the new residents on that site and for the nearby existing residents in the area, and with public access. This needs to be specified.	Support noted. However, aspirations for full delivery of open space on site will need to be balanced with scheme viability, given the need to deliver affordable housing and other development within the City.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
4.19 5968	Object	<p>We do wish to emphasise that we object to the way that you have "consulted" on our properties as part of this recent consultation, and as a result we strongly object to the inclusion of our properties in the draft strategy document. We therefore make the following requests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask you to remove all reference to our properties from Clause 4.19 of the Draft document before it is submitted to the committee. 2. Alternatively, if you cannot accede to this request, we ask you to clearly state the reason(s) why these properties are included in this document. We would then expect you to restart the consultation with all the affected property owners being directly contacted in advance as part of that consultation. 	<p>At Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee (DPSSC) on 12th July 2011, the draft Open Space and Recreation Strategy was discussed and it was agreed that it should be issued for consultation. Consultation was planned for and took place between 25th July - 2nd September 2011. The document will form part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review and will become a material consideration in due course. Unfortunately, the consultation deadline cannot be extended further due to the need to move forward with the adoption of the document on 4th October 2011 at Environment Scrutiny Committee, which will feed into the review of the Local Plan.</p> <p>At DPSSC in July 2011, Councillor Znajek requested that officers consider a further number of private gardens next to the River Cam against the criteria for designation of Protected Open Space. Officers included paragraph 4.19 in the consultation document, and undertook to assess the sites in question during the consultation period.</p> <p>During the consultation period, officers assessed the gardens of the five houses from the river and from the streets in question. It was considered that the group of gardens met a number of the criteria for environmental importance, but did not meet the criteria for recreational importance. The site has been named NAT 39 River Cam Residential Gardens, which comprises the gardens of the five houses mentioned in paragraph 4.19. The site meets the criteria for environmental importance in terms of its contribution to the character and environmental quality of the area and its proximity to the River Cam, a site with a nature conservation designation. If a site is designated as Protected Open Space of environmental importance, this has some implications for future developability of the site. In terms of redevelopment of the entire site, this would be very difficult, but not necessarily insurmountable dependent on the scheme proposed. If a householder were to wish to construct an extension to their house, this designation would not necessarily prevent an extension being granted</p>	Remove paragraph 4.19 from the strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>planning permission. Consideration would need to be given to the overall impact on the area of Protected Open Space. Other policy issues such as flood risk, conservation area and listed building status could potentially have far more significant impact than the Protected Open Space designation. In terms of de-designating this area of land, if the Council were to take this approach, it would lay the Council open to the risk of loss of other Protected Open Spaces in private ownership and use, e.g. the Master's Garden for Gonville and Caius College, Finella, The Pightle and Principal's Lodge, Newnham College.</p> <p>In response to the residents' concerns, paragraph 4.19 has been removed from the strategy, although NAT 39 appears in the ward profile table and map for East Chesterton and in Appendix 2 of the strategy. With regard to further consultation, the consultation period cannot be extended further due to the need to move forward with the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. However, it should be noted that residents will be able to input into the stages of consultation undertaken for the Local Plan Review.</p>	
5939 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Object	Other sites to be listed as protected open space: Pubs, Squares, all District or Local Centres throughout the city, School and other educational institutions, churches and other religious organisations gardens and open space areas. Additionally, series of further open spaces need to be assessed against the criteria.	Concerns noted. In relation to public houses, the Council recognises the growing issue of the loss of public houses across the city. This is a matter which will have to be considered during the Local Plan Review. However, it is considered that the gardens, parking areas and patios of public houses do not fall within the categories for open space set out in PPG17. In relation to squares, the Council recognises that civic spaces do fall with the categories set out in PPG17 and will be assessed. Many of the district and local centres within the City do not have space which could be considered to be civic in nature. However, as part of the Local Plan Review, the District and Local Centre survey work will pick up on the value of any spaces within the centres. Highway verges have not normally been included in the strategy unless they are very large and capable of meeting the criteria. It is not the role of the Council to undertake an exhaustive survey of all highway land. If they were to meet the criteria, but had not been specifically surveyed, then they	Analysis of further sites undertaken prior to adoption of the strategy. Further sites inserted into the ward profiles and Appendix 2 of the strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>would fall within the caveat in Policy 4/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and its supporting text.</p> <p>In relation to as yet unconstructed development, these sites will be assessed once completed. The strategy does acknowledge the considerable range of open spaces to be provided within the urban extensions and links to the countryside and other open spaces and the built-up area of the city.</p> <p>The existing allocations in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 will be reviewed as part of the Local Plan Review and this will consider the importance of the site A26 Peverel Road Allotments for allotment use.</p> <p>In relation to the specific sites put forward in this representation, further analysis has been undertaken prior to the adoption of the strategy and a number of additional sites have been included in the strategy.</p>	
<i>Abbey Ward Profile</i>				
5839 - Grosvenor Developments	Object	We do not agree that the "potential loss" of the pitch at Cambridge United FC is a threat. The site is protected by the adopted local plan as open space - albeit it has no wider community access as it functions as a professional football pitch. The relocation of the football club is linked to the Cambridge Sporting Village and Community Stadium which represents an opportunity to improve the outdoor sports facilities available for the residents of Cambridge.	Concern noted. However, the impact of development can lead to the loss of Protected Open Space within a locality.	
5575 - Bidwells	Object	It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature	Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	sterilisation of land.	<p>to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Protected Open Spaces in Abbey Ward</i>	5529 - Bidwells	<p>Object</p> <p>It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p> <p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Abbey Ward Map</i>	Object	<p>It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Arbury Ward Profile</i>			
5576 - Bidwells	<p>Object</p> <p>It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p> <p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	
		<p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	

Protected Open Spaces in Arbury Ward

5531 - Bidwells	Object	<p>It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open</p>
-----------------	--------	---	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Arbury Ward Map</i>				
5532 - Bidwells	Object	It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
<i>Castle Ward Profile</i>				
5741 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Comment	<p>We support but add under "opportunities": The size of open spaces on the NIAB and NW Cambridge sites is calculated on the basis of the number of new dwellings on those sites. Thus, the result of the existing residents in Castle Ward using those new open spaces on the new developments, will be their over-use. This will not really alleviate the existing under-provision in Castle Ward. Although there will be better access to the countryside beyond, there will be loss of "green lung" by what is currently "countryside beyond".</p>	Comment noted.	
5637	Comment	<p>(Submitted on behalf of the Nineteen Acre Field RA) Although the NW part of Castle is fairly well off for open space, most of the spaces are private, and much of it not even protected. This has led to a loss of open space in recent years (Wychfield, NIAB1) and further loss is anticipated (NIAB2, NWC). Important open space was removed from the Green Belt, contributing to the above. Consequently, a rigorous approach to the remaining protected open spaces is required, ensuring that little or no further development on these spaces is permitted</p>	Comment noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5909 - North Newnham Residents Association	Comment	See comment on vision 1.7. Is there some understatement of the degree of access for the public afforded by colleges to their grounds and gardens?	Comment noted. It is difficult to assess the level of access afforded to the public by Colleges, which appears to vary considerably.	
5618 - Trinity Hall	Object	The statement that the expansion of Colleges is a threat to sports pitch provision and College gardens is misguided and should be deleted.	The strategy does not state that the expansion of Colleges is a threat to sports pitch provision and College gardens. It states that threats to open spaces in the ward include the loss of or deterioration of existing open spaces and the loss of College sports pitches. Open spaces lost or diminished in quality could include both private and public Protected Open Spaces and may not actually involve the expansion of Colleges specifically.	
5533 - Bidwells	Object	It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.	Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured. Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
5624 - Lucy Cavendish College	Object	The statement that the expansion of Colleges is a threat to sports pitch provision and College gardens should be deleted.	The strategy does not state that the expansion of Colleges is a threat to sports pitch provision and College gardens. It states that threats to open spaces in the ward include the loss of or deterioration of existing open spaces and the loss of College sports pitches. Open spaces lost or diminished in quality could include both private and public Protected Open Spaces and may not actually involve the expansion of Colleges specifically.	
5828	Support	I wish to support the continuation of the policy designation of the the Oxford Road Playing Fields as a protected open space.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		These fields provide part of the balance of land uses which support the sustainable development of the area, notably by providing opportunities for sports and leisure activities, contributing to a SUDS and cooling of the city heat island effect.		
<i>Protected Open Spaces in Castle Ward</i>				
5910 - North Newnham Residents Association	Comment	Why not the natural space on the astronomy site (valuable for walking and biodiversity)?	Comment noted.	
5606	Comment	The Council seems unaware that the Royal Observatory is no longer in Cambridge. I presume you mean Cambridge University Observatories.	Comment noted. References to P&G 24 as the Royal Observatory will be amended to read "Cambridge University Observatory"	Amend references to P&G 24 on Castle Ward Table of Protected Open Spaces and on mapping to read "Cambridge University Observatory."
5719 - Trinity College	Object	The designation of Trinity College Fellows' Garden (P&G 54) as protected in relation to environment and quality should be revised as no evidence has been presented to justify this position. The Open Space and recreation strategy is premature and should be progressed along with the review of the Local Plan. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.	<p>This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy.</p> <p>Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
5722 - Trinity College	Object	Trinity College - Burrell's Field (P&G 55) was not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. P&G 55 should therefore be excluded from the document.	<p>This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p>	
5625 - Lucy Cavendish College 5650 - Fitzwilliam College	Object	The sites P&G42 and P&G43 were not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. Both should therefore be excluded from the document. The continued success of the University and Colleges must be recognised and flexibility must be maintained to allow for sensitive expansion of institutions. Either detailed evidence needs to be provided so that its validity can be assessed or the site should be excluded from the Open Space and Recreation Strategy. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.	<p>These sites were overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but were protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. They have been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	
5534 - Bidwells	<p>Object It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from</p>	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5651 - Fitzwilliam College	<p>Object Fitzwilliam College would like to reiterate its position regarding the suggested protection of SPO19 as expressed during the Local Plan 2006 consultation. The blanket designation of open space within the City is not supported by a sound evidence base and as such is premature, in advance of the Local Plan Review where the growth of the City as well as the existing and new open space provision should be looked at in a holistic manner. The need for open space provision in the Ward should be reconsidered in light of the proposed developments at North West Cambridge.</p>	<p>2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p> <p>The development at North West Cambridge does not give rise to the need to reassess provision in Castle ward as the new development at North West Cambridge will provide for the users and occupiers of the new development. Open space is not being provided on the North West Cambridge site to meet a local deficit.</p>	
5656 - University of Cambridge	Object	The Traveller's Resst Pit SSSI (NAT24) is not described or shown correctly in the Strategy. The northern part of the site has been denotified by Natural England and the SSSI is now 2.25ha in size.	Concerns noted. The site boundaries will be amended to reflect Natural England's designation.	Amend the boundaries of NAT24 to reflect Natural England's amendments to the designation.
5619 - Trinity Hall	Object	The designation of Trinity Hall Playing Fields (SPO 51) as protected in relation to environment and quality should be revised as no evidence has been presented to justify this position. The potential benefits that could derive from development should not be pre-judged in this manner. The Open Space and recreation strategy is premature and should be progressed along with the review of the Local Plan. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	
5810	Support	In particular, I support the continued protection of SPO19 to resist further loss of existing open space in Castle ward. In general, the open spaces associated with the University of Cambridge colleges provide much needed glimpses of green and wildlife in our ward.	Support noted.	
5901	Support	I support the continued protection of SPO 19 (Fitzwilliam College Playing Fields), given that this part of Cambridge is fairly densely populated already and lacking in green space. Were it to be developed for housing, the problematic access would lead to increased congestion in the area and the relative lack of amenities within easy walking distance of the site would in all likelihood put more traffic on local roads.	Support noted.	
5904	Support	Support of continued protection of SPO 19, Fitzwilliam College Playing Fields. Great value added to Cambridge by the presence of such fields; suggest caution rather than turning these into yet more accommodation. Concern at the behaviour of the colleges in objecting, when this seems to run contrary to the interests of their own students.	Support noted.	
<i>Castle Ward Map</i>				
5771 - St John's College	Comment	P & G 23 - St. John's College Gardens The value of the College's Gardens as an open space amenity and the contribution it makes to the character of the City and the wider Backs area is clearly very important. However, numbers 24 - 38, Merton House and Merton College, Northampton Street are included within the site. We do not consider these properties serve an open space function and we therefore consider that they should be excluded from the St. John's College Gardens site.	Comment noted. This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. The site was assessed as a part of P&G 32 in the 2006 strategy process. This area of Protected Open Space has been split up to more effectively reflect the	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			boundaries of the individual Colleges and has been renamed as P&G 23. However, the areas of land included within the strategy have not changed since 2006. Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles.	
5626 - Lucy Cavendish College	Object	The Lucy Cavendish College Gardens (P&G 42) were not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. Either detailed evidence needs to be provided so that its validity can be assessed or the site should be excluded from the Open Space and Recreation Strategy.	This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.	
5723 - Trinity College	Object	Trinity College - Burrell's Field (P&G 55) was not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. P&G 55 should therefore be excluded from the document.	This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.	
5657 - University of Cambridge	Object	The Traveller's Resst Pit SSSI (NAT24) is not described or shown correctly in the Strategy. The northern part of the site has been denotified by Natural England and the SSSI is now 2.25ha in size.	Concerns noted. The site boundaries will be amended to reflect Natural England's designation.	Amend the boundaries of NAT24 to reflect Natural England's amendments to the designation.
5620 - Trinity Hall	Object	The designation of Trinity Hall Playing Fields (SPO 51) as protected in relation to environment and quality should be revised as no evidence has been presented to justify this position. The potential benefits that could derive from development should not be pre-judged in this manner. The Open Space and recreation strategy is premature and should be progressed along with the review of the Local Plan. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5536 - Bidwells	Object	It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.	<p>needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p> <p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.	
			Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	
5652 - Fitzwilliam College	Object	Insufficient evidence has been provided for the designations of P&G 43 and SPO 19. The introduction of P&G 43 is introducing a policy restriction on a site outside of the development plan review and as such is unacceptable and should be removed. No detailed evidence of the environmental or quality designation of SPO 19 has been provided and as such these restrictions should be removed until the basis upon which the allocation is suggested can be analysed to establish its validity.	Whilst P&G 43 was overlooked during the last assessment in 2006, SPO 19 has been specifically designated for a number of years. However, P&G 43 was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. Both sites have been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.	
5720 - Trinity College	Object	The designation of Trinity College Fellows' Garden (P&G 54) as protected in relation to environment and	This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		quality should be revised as no evidence has been presented to justify this position. The Open Space and recreation strategy is premature and should be progressed along with the review of the Local Plan. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.	<p>Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
<i>Cherry Hinton Ward Profile</i>				
5856 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	The former landfill site west of Railway Street Cherry Hinton also offers the opportunity of completing the vital Tins cycle and pedestrian path. This will require the removal and replanting of a hedge to give the required width for a pleasant facility that can offer a viable alternative to travel by car.	Comment noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5537 - Bidwells	Object	It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	

Protected Open Spaces in Cherry Hinton Ward

5538 - Bidwells	Object	<p>It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be</p>
-----------------	--------	---	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5773 - Anderson Group	<p>Object Anderson object to the proposed designation of Land to the west of Norman Way (NAT37) as Private Open Space and the existing designation of Land to the East of Norman Way (NAT38) as Private Open Space, and considers this to be unrepresentative of the site's development plan history, and unnecessarily</p>	<p>replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. On the basis of recently collected information, the site meets the criteria for the protection of open space. If acceptable proposals were to come forward for the site, relocation, re-provision and mitigation would need to form part of those proposals. For clarification, the Council has</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>prohibitive in the context of the wider contribution that the site is capable of making to the City.</p> <p>PLEASE REFER TO THE LETTER SENT VIA EMAIL (BY ICENI PROJECTS) TO JOANNA GILBERT-WOOLDRIDGE 2/9 FOR MORE DETAIL</p>	<p>not confirmed that NAT 38 is capable of being remediated at all, let alone viably remediated to a standard suitable to accommodate residential development, therefore overcoming the issues identified during the inquiry into the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. The Council considers that there remain a number of significant issues outstanding on this site, which would need to be dealt with in order to bring any development forward and this will require a substantial amount of work.</p>	

Cherry Hinton Ward Map

5539 - Bidwells

Object

It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.

Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.

Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
<i>Coleridge Ward Profile</i>			
5795	<p>Comment need for high open space content in all major new developments.</p> <p>What a ludicrous system you have that requires a summary for a comment of 128 words. Bureaucracy gone mad again</p>	Comment noted.	
5890	<p>Comment I agree with the county council representation that the pits East of Burnside and West of Cherry Hinton are not a weakness but a huge opportunity for new public open space and recreation.</p>	<p>Concern noted. However, in its current state, NAT 28 certainly represents a weakness. The opportunities section is not intended to be exhaustive and were the appropriate scheme to come forward to enhance this site, this would be</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5540 - Bidwells	Object	It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.	<p>supported by the Council.</p> <p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
5855 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>The Coleridge section specifically points to the pits East of Burnside and West of Cherry Hinton as a weakness. However, it is considered that they have great potential as a leisure resource for an urban park that adjoins the newly improved Tins cycling route. This part of Cambridge does not enjoy much public open space and there is a real opportunity in the Strategy to put this into policy.</p>	<p>Concern noted. However, in its current state, NAT 28 certainly represents a weakness. The opportunities section is not intended to be exhaustive and were the appropriate scheme to come forward to enhance this site, this would be supported by the Council.</p>	
<i>Protected Open Spaces in Coleridge Ward</i>				
5541 - Bidwells	Object	<p>It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Coleridge Ward Map</i>			Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	
5857 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	In Coleridge Ward the map shows a triangle of land (immediately west of the Territorial Army assault course and east of the Newmarket railway line) as being in private ownership. This land has been in County Council ownership since 2010.	Concern noted. However, the references to public and private within the document relate to accessibility, not solely the nature of the landowner.	
5542 - Bidwells	Object	It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.	Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.	Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>East Chesterton Ward Profile</i>	5543 - Bidwells Object	<p>It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating</p>	<p>importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.	<p>to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	
5607	Object	Putting recreation pitches on an area designated as a LNR is not going to improve its condition.	Only part of AGS 61 Pye Meadow site is intended to provide for the expansion of the Local Nature Reserve, whilst the remainder is retained for ongoing sporting use.	

Protected Open Spaces in East Chesterton Ward

5544 - Bidwells	Object	It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of</p>	
-----------------	--------	--	---	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
<i>East Chesterton Ward Map</i>			
5545 - Bidwells	<p>Object It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council</p>	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>		
<i>King's Hedges Ward Profile</i>	5546 - Bidwells	Object	<p>It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	
		<p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	

Protected Open Spaces in King's Hedges Ward

5547 - Bidwells	Object	<p>It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site</p>
-----------------	--------	---	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>King's Hedges Ward Map</i>	5548 - Bidwells	<p>Object It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p> <p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
<i>Market Ward Profile</i>			
5892	<p>Comment I think the council should seek greater public access to the open spaces owned and controlled by the colleges. Such access could be negotiated in lieu of s106 payments or on-site provision in developments.</p>	<p>Comment noted. However, The Council's position is set out in Policy 3/8 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that "All residential development will provide public open space and sports facilities in accordance with the Open Space and Recreation Standards. Provision should be on-site as appropriate to the nature and location of development or where the scale of development indicates otherwise through commuted payments to the City Council." The Council seeks on site delivery of open space where possible so that it can best meet the needs of the residents/users of the new development.</p>	
5580 - Jesus College	<p>Object Insufficient evidence has been submitted to justify the designation of SPO 24. The quality assessment is fundamentally flawed as no weight has been given to the accessibility of the sites. The open space and recreation strategy is premature and ought to be</p>	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>delayed to allow it to be progressed jointly with the Local Plan Review ensuring a joined up approach to the City's growth. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.</p>	<p>of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p>	
		<p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
<p>5549 - Bidwells</p>	<p>Object It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------

the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.

Protected Open Spaces in Market Ward

5627 - Christ's College

Object

Insufficient evidence has been provided and the designation of site P&G 33 as protected should be reconsidered until the full review of the Local Plan is underway. All buildings should be excluded from any designation and the protection afforded by Conservation Area and Listed Buildings Policies ought to be considered to be sufficient protection of the open space, while maintaining a degree of flexibility. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.

This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.

Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5684 - Emmanuel	<p>Object</p> <p>Insufficient evidence has been provided and the designation of site NAT 29 as protected should be reconsidered until the full review of the Local Plan is underway. All buildings should be excluded from any designation and the protection afforded by</p>	<p>circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	<p>This site was assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>Conservation Area and Listed Buildings Policies ought to be considered to be sufficient protection of the open space, while maintaining a degree of flexibility. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.</p>	<p>of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5945 - Sidney Sussex College	<p>Object</p> <p>One of the major attractions of Cambridge as a city is the combination of historic buildings with gardens and open spaces. This makes Cambridge a good place for Sidney's residents to live. I completely understand that consideration or the provision of open spaces & recreational facilities should be taken into account in planning decisions. But I am concerned that a rigid approach would arbitrarily halt necessary & sensitive development. Colleges and their grounds have changed over hundreds of years in order to meet changing needs. Any future development at Sidney would be done with great care, because for us our garden is a vital asset and a source of huge pride. I would hope that planning applications would be reviewed on their merits.</p>	<p>there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	<p>Concern noted. Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.	
5550 - Bidwells	Object	It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5629 - Sidney Sussex College	<p>Object Sidney Sussex College Gardens (P&G52) were not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. P&G 52 should therefore be excluded from the document. The continued success of the University and Colleges must be encouraged and flexibility must be maintained to allow for sensitive expansion of institutions. Either detailed evidence needs to be provided so that its validity can be assessed or the site should be excluded from the Open Space and Recreation Strategy. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.</p>	<p>recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	<p>This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5703 - Pembroke College	Object Pembroke College Gardens (P&G36) were not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. P&G36 should therefore be excluded from the document.	<p>understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5632 - Peterhouse	<p>Object Peterhouse Gardens (P&G 34) were not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. P&G 34 should therefore be excluded from the document. The continued success of the University and Colleges must be recognised and flexibility must be maintained to allow for sensitive expansion of institutions. Either detailed evidence needs to be provided so that its validity can be assessed or the site should be excluded from the Open Space and Recreation Strategy. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.</p>	<p>development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p>	<p>This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5581 - Jesus College	<p>Object The Jesus Lane Car Park and the Old Hockey Pitch should be excluded from the open space and recreation strategy given the minimal contribution they currently offer in terms of recreational or environmental importance.</p>	<p>the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Market Ward Map</i>	<p>5630 - Sidney Sussex College Object Sidney Sussex College Gardens (P&G52) were not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. P&G 52 should therefore be excluded from the document. The continued success of the University and Colleges must be encouraged and flexibility must be maintained to allow for sensitive expansion of institutions. Either detailed evidence needs to be provided so that its validity can be assessed or the site should be excluded from the Open Space and Recreation Strategy. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.</p>	<p>separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. This site has been reassessed this year, but the boundaries have remained the same as previously assessed.</p>	<p>This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	
5947 - Sidney Sussex College	Object	On a more detailed pointed I find the marking of the protected area at Sidney (page 48, P&G52) somewhat confused. You have omitted from the protected open space some of the buildings, but not others. The Mong Auditorium, buildings in Hall & Chapel Court, the bike sheds in Cloister Court, the squash courts and greenhouses have all been shown as open space. Would there be an opportunity for the College's surveyor to agree the demarcation with the planners?	Concern noted. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. In terms of final designation of Protected Open Space through the Local Plan Review process, consideration can be given to any final reassessment.	
5551 - Bidwells	Object	It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.	Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5628 - Christ's College	Object	Insufficient evidence has been provided and the designation of site P&G 33 as protected should be reconsidered until the full review of the Local Plan is underway. All buildings should be excluded from any designation and the protection afforded by Conservation Area and Listed Buildings Policies ought to be considered to be sufficient protection of the open space, while maintaining a degree of flexibility.	<p>across the City.</p> <p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5582 - Jesus College	<p>Object</p> <p>Insufficient evidence has been submitted to justify the designation of SPO 24. The quality assessment is fundamentally flawed. The open space and recreation strategy is premature and ought to be delayed to allow it to be progressed jointly with the Local Plan Review ensuring a joined up approach to the City's growth. Jesus Lane Car Park and the land to the rear of Park Street ought to be excluded from the designation to encourage growth of this successful institution. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations</p>	<p>permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. This site has been reassessed this year, but the boundaries have remained the same as previously assessed.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5633 - Peterhouse	Object	Insufficient evidence has been submitted to justify the designation of P&G34. As the site was not included in the previous strategy and no evidence has been provided the designation should be removed. The quality assessment is fundamentally flawed. The open space and recreation strategy is premature and ought to be delayed to allow it to be progressed jointly with the Local Plan Review ensuring a joined up approach to the City's growth. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.	<p>This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
5685 - Emmanuel	<p>Object Insufficient evidence has been provided and the designation of site NAT 29 as protected should be reconsidered until the full review of the Local Plan is underway. All buildings should be excluded from any designation and the protection afforded by Conservation Area and Listed Buildings Policies ought to be considered to be sufficient protection of the open space, while maintaining a degree of flexibility. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.</p>	<p>This site was assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5705 - Pembroke College	Object	Pembroke College Gardens (P&G 36) were not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. P&G 36 should therefore be excluded from the document.	This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.	

Newnham Ward Profile

5772 - St John's College	Comment	SPO 52 - University Athletics Track The assessment of this site should recognise the importance of allowing built development to be brought forward, associated with the outdoor sports use of the site. For sites such as this which are identified for their contribution to recreational resources, it is important to recognise that the loss of open space per se, need not necessarily be unacceptable if leading to a qualitative and quantitative improvement of sports facilities provision. This ought to follow through in to development plan policy relating to recreational open space.	This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the	
--------------------------	---------	---	---	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
5891	Comment	I think the council should seek greater public access to the open spaces owned and controlled by the colleges. Such access could be negotiated in lieu of s106 payments or on-site provision in developments.	Concern noted. However, The Council's position is set out in Policy 3/8 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that "All residential development will provide public open space and sports facilities in accordance with the Open Space and Recreation Standards. Provision should be on-site as appropriate to the nature and location of development or where the scale of development indicates otherwise through commuted payments to the City Council." The Council seeks on site provision where possible in order to meet the needs of the residents/users of the development.	
5913 - North Newnham Residents Association	Comment	Also: Cobbett's Corner, Maths Site, Clare Hall grounds? (May these meet the environmental standard? - biodiversity contributions, streams, green corridor significance) Some sites rightly entered in the sports category, e.g. SPO 52, also have an environmental significance that should be recognised - somehow!	Comment noted. Following consultation, assessments have been undertaken of Cobbett's Corner, the Maths Site and Clare Hall grounds. These sites were considered to meet the criteria for assessment and will be included in the strategy for adoption. In terms of SPO 52, please note that this has been assessed as being of both environmental	Assess Cobbett's Corner, the Maths Site and Clare Hall grounds prior to adoption of the strategy. These assessments were carried out in the week commencing 5 September 2011.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			and recreational importance. The numbering system merely denotes the main use of the site.	
5911 - North Newnham Residents Association	Comment	Captures open space character of ward very well although same comment as for Castle and in 1.7 regarding extent of public access to private spaces - which can be considerable and very beneficial to the community	Comment noted. It is difficult to assess the level of access afforded by colleges, which appears to vary considerably.	
5877 - North Newnham Res.Ass	Comment	On behalf of NNRA (North Newnham residents Association), we feel the document should provide better guidelines for outdoor lighting of sports areas with timing controls and technical specifications and design. Applications for external dark-time lighting for the Athletics track, Rugby ground and tennis Clubs have raised objections. Even when issues of localised light spillage have been resolved the strong lighting on raised poles has changed the character of the area, from late Autumn to late Spring, from 4.0'clock onwards. The balance between recreational benefits and environmental intrusion needs exploring.	Comment noted. The concerns raised regarding the impact of floodlighting are recognised. Policy 4/15 Lighting within the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 requires the lighting of new developments to be carefully designed to ensure that areas are appropriately lit, whilst avoiding or minimising light pollution. This includes minimising impacts on residential amenity, wildlife and landscape.	
5695 - King's College 5796 - Clare College	Object	The statement that the expansion of Colleges is a threat to sports pitch provision and College gardens should be deleted.	Concern noted. However, the cumulative expansion of the Colleges over time can lead to the loss of Protected Open Spaces, including sports pitches and College gardens.	
5591 - Newnham College 5599 - Gonville and Caius College 5674 - Queens College	Object	The statement that the expansion of Colleges is a threat to sports pitch provision and College gardens is misguided and should be deleted.	Concern noted. However, the cumulative expansion of the Colleges over time can lead to the loss of Protected Open Spaces, including sports pitches and College gardens.	
5552 - Bidwells	Object	It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.	Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	
5860 - North Newnham Res.Ass	Support	On behalf of the NNRA (North Newnham Residents Association) and wider neighbourhood (which includes University members), we generally support the SWOT analysis and in particular the Threats. The college and University playing pitches have significant recreational value and contribute immeasurably to the open green spaces that underpin the character of the Conservation Area, and are visible to passersby. The grass pitches also have environmental significance, being part of the mosaic of mature green, undeveloped, unlit, spaces that reach into the City centre, and provide important connectivity routes for wildlife.	Support noted.	
<i>Protected Open Spaces in Newnham Ward</i>				
5805 - North Newnham Res.Ass	Comment	NAt 19. The NNRA and neighbourhood welcome NAT 19 as a protected open space with environmental significance. You may want to check ownership of land which we think is private and currently farmed by University Farm who take at least one hay crop off it a year. Is farming value or grazing value a criteria in this strategy?	Comment noted. The site is labelled as public as it is publically accessible. This has no bearing on landownership. Farming or grazing of land is not considered within the criteria.	
5730 - Trinity College	Object	Trinity College Old Fields (SPO 50), while included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy, no evidence has been provided as to why the area is included as environmentally important nor has any explanation been given as to how the site was scored in relation to quality. Please refer to Bidwells' general representations regarding the prematurity of the document and concerns regarding the methodology.	This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
5692 - King's College	Object	King's College School (SPO 26), while included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy, no evidence has been provided as to why the area is included as environmentally important nor has any explanation been given as to how the site was scored in relation to quality. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.	<p>This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p>	
5709 - Trinity College	Object	Trinity College New Fields (SPO 35), while included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy, no evidence has been provided as to why the area is included as environmentally important nor has any explanation been given as to how the site was scored	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		in relation to quality. Please refer to Bidwells' general representations regarding the prematurity of the document and concerns regarding the methodology.	<p>of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
5592 - Newnham College	Object	<p>The Principal's Lodge and Pightle (AGS 62) was not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. AGS 62 should therefore be excluded from the document. The continued success of the University and Colleges must be encouraged and flexibility must be maintained to allow for sensitive expansion of institutions.</p> <p>Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.</p>	<p>This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5736 - Trinity College	<p>Object Trinity College Hockey Field (SPO 66) was not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. The site is no longer used for hockey and is not publically</p>	<p>the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	<p>This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		accessible; it therefore fails to offer recreational or environmental provision and ought to be excluded.	recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed. Any current lack of use does not mean that the site is incapable of being used for recreational purposes.	
5596 - St Catharine's College	Object	I object to the report's underlying argument that green spaces on the edge of the City, which are themselves next to other green space, should be treated in the same way as more central spaces close to the University/ 'tourist Cambridge' core areas of Newnham and Market wards. The expansion of the City's housing capacity is often occurring at its borders today, and, subject to adequate alternative provision being made for leisure uses etc, then I would argue that the City should be more flexible in considering any future proposals for appropriate development of such 'edge of city' green spaces.	Concern noted. The open spaces across the City are important and are a vital component of Cambridge's character. This applies to open spaces within the built-up area of the City and on the edge. The urban extensions have been part of a planned process to bring forward housing to meet the established housing need with suitable supporting infrastructure, which does not impact on the setting and qualities of the City. These urban extensions include significant amounts of open space.	
5597 - Gonville and Caius College	Object	Finella(AGS 26) was not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. AGS 26 should therefore be excluded from the document. The continued success of the University and Colleges must be recognised and flexibility must be maintained to allow for sensitive expansion of institutions. Either detailed evidence needs to be provided so that its validity can be assessed or the site should be excluded from the Open Space and Recreation Strategy. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.	This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5672 - Queens College	<p>Object Insufficient evidence has been provided and the designation of site P&G 31 as protected should be reconsidered until the full review of the Local Plan is underway. All buildings should be excluded from any designation and the protection afforded by Conservation Area and Listed Buildings Policies ought</p>	<p>those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	<p>This site was assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>to be considered to be sufficient protection of the open space, while maintaining a degree of flexibility. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.</p>	<p>subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.	
5702 - Pembroke College	Object	Pembroke College Playing Fields (SPO 35), while included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy, no evidence has been provided as to why the area is included as environmentally important nor has any explanation been given as to how the site was scored in relation to quality. Please refer to Bidwells' general representations regarding the prematurity of the document and concerns regarding the methodology.	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5598 - Gonville and Caius College	Object	The Gonville and Caius Fellows Garden (P&G 38) was not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. Either detailed evidence needs to be provided so that its validity can be assessed or the site should be excluded from the Open Space and Recreation Strategy. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.	This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.	
5642 - Trinity College 5712 - Trinity College	Object	Objection is made to the suggestion that site SPO41 is protected for its environmental importance. The environmental quality of the site is derived through its mature planted boundaries, which can be retained through a site re-development. The environmental protection would unreasonably blight the site for development. The assessment criteria used to consider environmental importance for both the adopted and draft revision Strategy is set out at Appendix B of the Local Plan. The criteria nor the site (SPO41) nor its surroundings have changed; the conclusion of the adopted Strategy should therefore stand; the site is not denoted for environmental importance.	This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.	Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5595 - Newnham College	<p data-bbox="421 544 479 568">Object</p> <p data-bbox="528 544 1039 762">The Newnham College Playing Fields (SPO 33), while included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy, no evidence has been provided as to why the area is included as environmentally important nor has any explanation been given as to how the site was scored in relation to quality. The designation of this area ought to be revised to exclude the environmental and quality designations as no justification has been provided.</p> <p data-bbox="528 791 1039 911">The continued success of the University and Colleges must be encouraged and flexibility must be maintained to allow for sensitive expansion of institutions. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.</p>	<p data-bbox="1070 268 1563 515">recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p>	<p data-bbox="1070 544 1563 911">This site was assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p data-bbox="1070 940 1563 1409">Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			area is secured.	
			Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.	
5594 - Newnham College	Object	<p>The Newnham College Gardens in their entirety (P&G 40) was not included in its entirety in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why the area included should be extended in the current revision. P&G 40 should therefore be excluded from the document. The continued success of the University and Colleges must be recognised and flexibility must be maintained to allow for sensitive expansion of institutions.</p> <p>Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.</p>	<p>Part of this site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. The site as a whole has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5793 - Clare College	<p>Object Clare College Playing Fields (SPO 11,)while included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy, no evidence has been provided as to why the area is included as environmentally important nor has any explanation been given as to how the site was scored in relation to quality. Please refer to Bidwells' general representations regarding the prematurity of the document and concerns regarding the methodology.</p>	<p>which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
5688 - Emmanuel	Object	<p>SPO16 comprises hard tennis courts as well as a grass sports pitches and pavillion. An ecological survey has been undertaken on behalf of Emmanuel College, which concluded that the well mown grass and non-grass sports pitches were of limited ecological value. No evidence has been provided to support the environmental designation and while the recreational value is not disputed the environmental designation is. No evidence has been provided to justify the designation and as such it ought to be removed. The quality assessment is flawed and takes no account of the restricted access and ought to be reconsidered.</p>	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed. The site's environmental importance is not solely based on ecological assessment. Please see Chapter 3 for the criteria used for assessment.</p>	
5690 - King's College	Object	<p>The designation of King's College(P&G 35) as protected in relation to environment and quality should be revised as no evidence has been presented to justify this position. The Open Space and recreation strategy is premature and should be progressed along with the review of the Local Plan. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.</p>	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
5823 - Savills	Object	<p>The Draft Strategy suggests that the central lawn area within the grounds of Ridley Hall along with the Principal's Garden are designated as open space. Discussion has taken place regarding these spaces on previous occasions with the Council through the Development Control process. We acknowledge that the central lawn area performs an open space function. However, we disagree that the Principal's Garden meets the criteria for designation and therefore the request that this designation is removed from the Draft Strategy. We set out our consideration of the Strategy below.</p>	<p>Concern noted. The Principal's Garden and the rest of the Ridley Hall grounds are intrinsically part of the same site and form a considerable proportion of the overall site. If the planning permission, which has been granted for the expansion of college, were to be implemented, the site would be subject to re-assessment of the level of Protected Open Space. It is not the role of this strategy to designate land. This work will be undertaken as a part of the Local Plan Review. However, it does form a key piece of evidence base for the review and, once adopted, will be a material consideration.</p>	
5634 - Gonville and Caius College	Object	<p>SPO 06 comprises hard and grass tennis courts as well as a redundant grass hockey pitch. An ecological survey has been undertaken on behalf of Gonville and Caius College, which concluded that the well mown grass, non-grass sports pitches and car park was of limited ecological value. No evidence has been provided to support the environmental</p>	<p>This site was assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		designation and while the recreational value is not disputed the environmental designation is. No evidence has been provided to justify the designation and as such it ought to be removed.	This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed. The criteria for environmental importance are not purely based on ecological value, but also consider environmental quality and value to the locality and the city as a whole.	
5553 - Bidwells	Object	It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
5803 - Clare College	Object	The designation of Clare College Gardens (P&G 50) as protected in relation to environment and quality should be revised as no evidence has been presented to justify this position. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy is premature and should be progressed along with the review of the Local Plan. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.	This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
<i>Newnham Ward Map</i>				
5824 - Savills	Comment	The Principal's Garden and the central lawned area are distinctly different and separate. No explanation is given within the document as to how these spaces function as one. It is clear from the architects original intention, as set out in our Heritage Assessment submitted with the planning application, that it was always the intention to deliver a traditional quadrangular Cambridge college. The Principal's Garden has never been intended as open space, although has recently been used in association with the Lodge as a private garden. It is apparent from the information supplied that the Council has considered these areas as one. We consider that the Council needs to assess the value of these spaces separately.	Concern noted. The Principal's Garden and the rest of the Ridley Hall grounds are intrinsically part of the same site and form a considerable proportion of the overall site. If the planning permission, which has been granted for the expansion of college, were to be implemented, the site would be subject to re-assessment of the level of Protected Open Space. It is not the role of this strategy to designate land. This work will be undertaken as a part of the Local Plan Review. However, it does form a key piece of evidence base for the review and, once adopted, will be a material consideration.	
5804 - Clare College	Object	The designation of Clare College Gardens (P&G 50) as protected in relation to environment and quality should be revised as no evidence has been presented to justify this position. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy is premature and should be progressed along with the review of the Local Plan. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.	This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
5554 - Bidwells	Object	It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.	Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5737 - Trinity College	Object	Trinity College Hockey Field (SPO 66) was not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. The site is no longer used for hockey and is not publically accessible; it therefore fails to offer recreational or environmental provision and ought to be excluded.	<p>across the City.</p> <p>This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed. Any current lack of use does not mean that the site is incapable of being used for recreational purposes.</p>	
5691 - King's College	Object	<p>The designation of P&G 35 and SPO 26 should be reconsidered following the production of supporting evidence. Flexibility must be maintained to allow the continued success of the College and University.</p> <p>The blanket designation of open space within the City is not supported by a sound evidence base and as such is premature, in advance of the Local Plan Review where the growth of the City as well as the existing and new open space provision should be looked at in a holistic manner.</p>	<p>These sites have been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	
5731 - Trinity College	Object	Trinity College Old Fields (SPO 50), while included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy, no evidence has been provided as to why the area is included as environmentally important nor has any explanation been given as to how the site was scored in relation to quality. Please refer to Bidwells' general representations regarding the prematurity of the document and concerns regarding the methodology.	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
5593 - Newnham College	Object	No supporting evidence has been provided to justify the designation of SPO 33, AGS 62 and P&G 40. The protection of open space both public and private in this manner is considered premature, in advance of the Local Plan Review and may result in the restricted	These sites have been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>success of Newnham College, the University and Cambridge's ability to adapt and grow.</p>	<p>as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.	
			Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	
5710 - Trinity College	Object	Trinity College New Fields (SPO 35), while included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy, no evidence has been provided as to why the area is included as environmentally important nor has any explanation been given as to how the site was scored in relation to quality. Please refer to Bidwells' general representations regarding the prematurity of the document and concerns regarding the methodology.	This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.	
			Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5600 - Gonville and Caius College Object	The Gonville and Caius Fellows Garden (P&G 38) and Finella (AGS 26) sites were not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. Either detailed evidence needs to be provided so that its validity can be assessed or the sites should be excluded from the Open Space and Recreation Strategy.	stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	<p>These sites were overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but were protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	
5673 - Queens College	Object	Insufficient evidence has been provided and the designation of site P&G 31 as protected should be reconsidered until the full review of the Local Plan is underway. All buildings should be excluded from any designation and the protection afforded by Conservation Area and Listed Buildings Policies ought to be considered to be sufficient protection of the open space, while maintaining a degree of flexibility. The Buildings of Queens College should be excluded from the designation as should the adjacent land to enable sensitive expansion. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
5794 - Clare College	Object	Clare College Playing Fields (SPO 11,)while included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy, no evidence has been provided as to why the area is included as environmentally important nor has any explanation been given as to how the site was scored	This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		in relation to quality. Please refer to Bidwells' general representations regarding the prematurity of the document and concerns regarding the methodology.	<p>of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
5713 - Trinity College	Object	Objection is made to the suggestion that site SPO41 is protected for its environmental importance. The environmental quality of the site is derived through its mature planted boundaries, which can be retained through a site re-development. The environmental protection would unreasonably blight the site for development. The assessment criteria used to consider environmental importance for both the adopted and draft revision Strategy is set out at Appendix B of the Local Plan. The criteria nor the site (SPO41) nor its surroundings have changed; the conclusion of the adopted Strategy should therefore stand; the site is not denoted for environmental importance.	This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p>	
5689 - Emmanuel	Object	<p>SPO16 comprises hard tennis courts as well as a grass sports pitches and pavillion. An ecological survey has been undertaken on behalf of Emmanuel College, which concluded that the well mown grass and non-grass sports pitches were of limited ecological value. No evidence has been provided to support the environmental designation and while the recreational value is not disputed the environmental designation is. No evidence has been provided to justify the designation and as such it ought to be removed. The quality assessment is flawed and takes no account of the restricted access and ought to be reconsidered.</p>	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed. The site's environmental importance is not solely based on ecological assessment. Please see the criteria contained in Chapter 3 of this strategy.</p>	
5706 - Pembroke College	Object	<p>Pembroke College Playing Fields (SPO 35), while included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy, no evidence has been provided as to why the area is included as environmentally important nor has any explanation been given as to how the site</p>	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>was scored in relation to quality. Please refer to Bidwells' general representations regarding the prematurity of the document and concerns regarding the methodology.</p>	<p>of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p>	<p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>

Petersfield Ward Profile

5791 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)

Comment With regard to Petersfield in particular (Section 4.29), the consultation document acknowledges that there is no publicly accessible outdoor sports provision at all. There is not even a general 'kick-about' area for youngsters, and this deficit has led to what the police calls 'vandalism' in the area (in the form of playing informal football in 'unauthorised' areas and occasionally breaking nearby windows). We urge that the area to the east of the Howard Mallet Centre (currently - and we believe illegitimately - blocked off by the current leaseholders of the Howard Mallett building) be formally designated as a public space for outdoors

Comment noted. However, the strategy cannot designate an area of land for outdoor sports provision, which does not meet the criteria for environmental and/or recreational importance. You are advised the pursue this issue through the Local Plan Review process in seeking the allocation of land.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		sports.		
5621 - Hughes Hall	Object	Expansion of institutions within the Ward should be seen as an opportunity rather than a threat. It must be recognised that the ability of the College's to expand on land they own within the City is essential to their continued success which is vital to the retention of the quality of the open spaces.	Concern noted. However, this cumulative expansion of the Colleges can lead to the loss of Protected Open Spaces, including sports pitches and College gardens.	
5555 - Bidwells	Object	It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	

Protected Open Spaces in Petersfield Ward Profile

5622 - Hughes Hall	Object	Hughes Hall Amenity Green Space (AGS 66) was not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. In light of the above the suggested designation should be removed unless evidence is presented and notes of what has changed in the intervening period are published to justify its inclusion.	<p>This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps</p>	
--------------------	--------	---	--	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.	
5557 - Bidwells	Object	It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Petersfield Ward Map</i>	5558 - Bidwells	Object	<p>It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>
		<p>unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5623 - Hughes Hall	Object AGS 66 should be excluded from the proposed designation as no evidence has been submitted to	<p>majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	Amend Petersfield Ward Map and Appendix 4 map to show AGS 66 as private.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		justify its inclusion in this review. If AGS 66 is included it should be noted that it is incorrectly designated as public open space on the ward map where the table on page 54 correctly identifies it as privately owned. The map needs updating for accuracy if the designation is to remain.	Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.	
				In terms of the differences between the map and the table on page 54, the map will be amended to reflect that the site is privately owned.
<i>Queen Edith's Ward Profile</i>				
5647 - Hills Road Sixth Form College	Comment	SPO 59 is designated as Cantabrigian Rugby Club which is incorrect and requires amendment. This area is actually divided into playing fields that belong to Hills Road Sixth Form College and land owned by a Trust held for the benefit of Cantabrigian Rugby Club and the College. The Trust land is at the south end, bounded by Long Road and the railway line and divided from the College's ground roughly in a line immediately south of 23 Sedley Taylor Road up to the railway line. The Trust land is approximately 2 acres; the College land is approximately 9.5 acres.	Comment noted. The Council is grateful for your clarification regarding ownership. As the site operates as a single entity, the overall site assessment will remain as originally assessed. However, the Council notes the ownership of the site for future reference.	
5646 - Hills Road Sixth Form College	Comment	SPO 22 Hills Road Sports Centre (Tennis Courts) is a wholly owned subsidiary of Hills Road Sixth Form College. The Tennis courts (and the rest of the Centre) are open to the public	Comment noted.	
5635 - Perse School	Object	The statement that the expansion of the local schools is a threat to sports pitch provision and open space should be deleted and seen as an opportunity to enhance the quality of the provision.	Concern noted. However, the cumulative expansion of schools can lead to the loss of Protected Open Spaces or parts of those spaces, including sports pitches.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5813 - Bell Educational Trust	Object	The designation of the Bell School of Language as a Protected Open Space (P&G 17) is inappropriate for the site. The proposed POS boundary does not reflect the site's 'on-the-ground' situation and its recreational importance has been incorrectly assessed. The proposed POS designation unnecessarily restricts the school's development which is contrary to the Draft National Planning Policy Framework and the Written Ministerial Statement 'Planning for Growth'. Site P&G 17 should not be included as a Protected Open Space.	<p>Concern noted. This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces. It is not considered that the designation of the site as Protected Open Space is in conflict with the draft</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5559 - Bidwells	Object	It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.	<p>National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	

Protected Open Spaces in Queen Edith's Ward

5560 - Bidwells	Object	<p>It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could</p>
-----------------	--------	---	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
5631 - Peterhouse	Object	SPO 31 is incorrectly labelled as public open space associated with Netherhall School. The Freehold on this land is held by Peterhouse and as such is privately owned. The site is within the green belt	SPO 31 is labelled as public Protected Open Space as Netherhall School makes it available for public access. The overall freehold ownership of the site is not an issue for the strategy. The document does	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>which offers it sufficient protection. The document must recognise that development can bring with it advantages in open space and recreation provision; as such the review ought to take place alongside that of the Local Plan to ensure a holistic approach is achieved. Please refer to the Bidwells general representations for further commentary.</p>	<p>recognise that development can bring with it advantages in open space and recreation provision, and seeks to secure this through open space and recreation standards.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
<hr/>				
<i>Queen Edith's Ward Map</i>				
5683 - Peterhouse	Object	<p>Insufficient evidence has been submitted to justify the designation of SPO 31. The quality assessment is fundamentally flawed. The open space and recreation strategy is premature and ought to be delayed to allow it to be progressed jointly with the Local Plan Review ensuring a joined up approach to the City's growth. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.</p>	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
5561 - Bidwells	Object	<p>It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	

Romsey Ward Profile

5508	<p>Comment I would like to object to the cheerful description of Romsey Recreation Ground and raise an important issue that is of serious concern to a number of local residents. While the recreation ground does provide extensive play facilities for toddlers and older children, the play area adjoined to the playing field -- which is used by children as young as 3-4 -- is not enclosed by a fence, and as such the children playing there are</p>	<p>Comment noted. The setting out and renovation of Romsey Recreation Ground was completed after and extensive local consultation. It was requested that play areas are not enclosed.</p>
------	--	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		vulnerable to intimidation and attack by dogs run on the lawn by irresponsible owners. The play area requires fenced enclosure to be safe.		
5763	Comment	<p>1. Need to protect corner green spots and verges and to add to them (nothing since GIA in 1980s)</p> <p>2. Encourage tree planting.</p> <p>3. Protect front gardens</p> <p>4. Protect rear gardens</p> <p>5. Create pedestrian friendly access to adjoining green space at Cherry Hinton Brook and Coldhams Common.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council recognises the limited open space provision in some parts of the city, due to the nature of those areas, but considers that it is not the role of this strategy to protect front and rear gardens. The Council's forthcoming Tree Strategy will encourage tree planting. The need to create a pedestrian friendly access to adjoining green space at Cherry Hinton Brook and Coldhams Common will be mentioned in the opportunities in the Ward Profile.</p>	<p>Insert reference to the need to create a pedestrian friendly access to adjoining green space at Cherry Hinton Brook and Coldhams Common in the opportunities in the Ward Profile for Romsey.</p>
5562 - Bidwells	Object	<p>It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	

Protected Open Spaces in Romsey Ward

5563 - Bidwells	Object	<p>It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council</p>	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted</p>
-----------------	--------	---	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	
<hr/>				
<i>Romsey Ward Map</i>				
5564 - Bidwells	Object	It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.	Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.	
			Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
<i>Trumpington Ward Profile</i>				
5583 - Peterhouse	Object	<p>Insufficient evidence has been submitted to justify the designation. The quality assessment is fundamentally flawed. The open space and recreation strategy is premature and ought to be delayed to allow it to be progressed jointly with the Local Plan Review ensuring a joined up approach to the City's growth. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.</p>	<p>This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5565 - Bidwells	<p>Object</p> <p>It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
5759 - Andrew Roberts	Support	Trumpington Residents' Association welcomes the references to the importance of open spaces in the	Support noted. However, in terms of protecting new open spaces in the urban extensions, the Council	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>urban extensions, specifically Trumpington Ward. However, we are concerned that the new open spaces in Trumpington Meadows, Clay Farm and Glebe Farm have not yet been listed as Protected Open Spaces and urge that these are incorporated in the policy now.</p> <p>We are alarmed that the green-belt field to the north of Long Road between Hobson's Brook and the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway which is the subject of a planning application (11/0818/REM) is not included as a Protected Open Space and urge that it is included.</p>	<p>cannot assess them against the criteria for protecting open space until they are delivered. Paragraph 1.14 of the strategy makes reference to the need for sites in the urban extensions to be surveyed after completion. In relation to both the open spaces within the urban extensions and the field north of Long Road, it should be noted that Policy 4/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 protects areas designated as Green Belt on the Proposals Map and undesignated areas which fulfill at least one of the criteria for protecting open space. As such, the areas mentioned are already afforded some protection, despite not having been specifically surveyed. Planning application 11/0818/REM pertains to a sports pavilion and ancillary facilities. Whilst this application has not yet been determined by the local planning authority and the Council would not wish to respond prematurely on this issue, it should be noted that sports and recreation facilities within the Green Belt are supported by both Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts and the draft National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	

Protected Open Spaces in Trumpington Ward

5566 - Bidwells	Object	<p>It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open</p>
-----------------	--------	---	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	

5584 - Peterhouse

Object

Insufficient evidence has been submitted to justify the

The site was considered to meet criteria b (i) to (iv).

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>designation of SPO 36 as environmentally important. The site was included in the 2006 strategy but not for its environmental value. Nothing has changed substantially in the intervening five years to justify such a designation and as no justification has been given the environmental designation ought to be removed from SPO 36. The open space and recreation strategy is premature and ought to be delayed to allow it to be progressed jointly with the Local Plan Review ensuring a joined up approach to the City's growth. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.</p>	<p>This site has been assessed again in 2011 against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
5727 - Trinity College	Object	<p>There is no justification for the designation of SPO 45 as an area of environmental importance; no ecological or landscape and visual appraisals have been undertaken to support such a designation. The consultation is premature in advance of the Local Plan Review and should be delayed so a holistic growth review can take place.</p>	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
<hr/>			
<i>Trumpington Ward Map</i>			
5567 - Bidwells	<p>Object It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			across the City.	
5585 - Peterhouse	Object	Insufficient evidence has been submitted to justify the designation of SPO 36. The quality assessment is fundamentally flawed. The open space and recreation strategy is premature and ought to be delayed to allow it to be progressed jointly with the Local Plan Review ensuring a joined up approach to the City's growth. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
5728 - Trinity College	Object	There is no justification for the designation of SPO 45 as an area of environmental importance; no ecological or landscape and visual appraisals have been undertaken to support such a designation. The consultation is premature in advance of the Local Plan Review and should be delayed so a holistic growth review can take place.	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
<i>West Chesterton Ward Profile</i>			
<p>5818 - Cambridge City Football Ground LLP & Cambridge City Football Club Limited 5884 - Hembriar Limited</p>	<p>Object It is extremely concerning to note that the loss of the football ground site is listed as a threat in view of (i)the pending determination of a planning application on this site,(ii)the allocation of the site in the Local Plan 2006 for residential development,(iii) the Council's acknowledgment of the paucity of replacement sites(iv) the aspirations of the football club (having disposed of the ground)to secure its future in a sustainable way elsewhere. It is both unwarranted and unreasonable to introduce negative sentiment and we believe the threat reference should be removed.</p>	<p>Concern noted. However, it is considered reasonable to make reference to the potential loss of protected open space given the paucity of open space in this area.</p>	
<p>5568 - Bidwells</p>	<p>Object It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is</p>	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	

Protected Open Spaces in West Chesterton Ward

5569 - Bidwells	Object	<p>It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient</p>	
-----------------	--------	---	---	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>West Chesterton Ward Map</i>	Object	<p>It is inappropriate to designate buildings as protected Open Space either public or private. The development or re-development of buildings within the City is already restricted. The inclusion of buildings prevents institutions and landowners from redeveloping existing buildings restricting the future success of the City. All buildings should be excluded from protected open</p>	<p>area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p> <p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>space designation. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy must not designate open space as protected before the Local Plan Review. A holistic approach to growth within Cambridge is needed. The City Council risks creating a problem through the premature sterilisation of land.</p>	<p>separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	
5.0 Open Space and Recreation Standards				
5.1				
5766 - St John's College 5775 - Bursars' Environment and Planning Sub-Committee	Comment	It is of concern that there is an apparent omission of quantitative assessment of open space requirements. We are therefore concerned that the strategy focuses upon qualitative assessment, with a methodology of protecting open space if the Council's quality assessment criteria are met. There then appears to be no scope within the methodology to apply those sites which meet the Council's criteria, to any assessment of the overall levels of open space that are required in the City. In this regard we notice that Paragraph 2.3 of the Strategy states that: "PPG 17 includes a requirement for Local Authorities to undertake an Assessment of the existing and future needs of their communities for open space, sports and recreational facilities".	Concern noted. However, the strategy does include both qualitative and quantitative assessment.	
5509 - Bidwells	Object	PPG17 is soon to be replaced with the National Planning Policy Framework and as such the Open Space and Recreation Strategy is premature.	At the time that the draft Open Space and Recreation Strategy was produced and endorsed for consultation, the draft National Planning Policy Framework had not been issued for consultation. Consultation on both documents commenced on 25th July 2011. References to the draft National Planning Policy Framework will be made in the strategy put forward for adoption. In keeping with PPG17, the draft framework makes reference to the need for local planning authorities to assess needs and quantitative and qualitative deficits and surpluses in order to set locally derived standards. The Council is required to move forward with	Insert new paragraph 2.5 to read: Draft National Planning Policy Framework This draft framework was published for consultation in July 2011 and has not yet been adopted. However, it is recognised that the Planning Inspectorate considers that it is capable of being afforded some weight as a material consideration in the planning process. Paragraph 128 of the draft framework recognises the importance of open spaces and requires planning policies to identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. The information gained from

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			developing an evidence base for the Local Plan Review, of which this strategy forms a part. It is not considered premature to adopt the strategy at this time.	assessment of needs and opportunities should be used to set locally derived standards for the provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities.
5742 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Support	We support the proposals in section 5 for open space and recreation standards.	Support noted.	
<i>5.2</i>				
5510 - Bidwells	Object	There is no justification for a new standard for the provision of open space and as such it should remain unchanged so as to encourage development which will deliver economic prosperity to the City.	Concern noted. Justification for the proposed standards is included in Chapter 5 of the strategy.	
<i>5.3</i>				
5638	Support	(Submitted on behalf of the Nineteen Acre Field RA) Unimpeded public access to open space is in short supply in NW Cambridge. Future developments should pay particular attention to this, and to the variety of open spaces provided	Support noted.	
<i>5.5</i>				
5639	Support	(Submitted on behalf of the Nineteen Acre Field RA) The provision of unimpeded public access is critical to future developments	Support noted.	
<i>Table 2: The City Council's Open Space and Recreation Standards</i>				
5511 - Bidwells	Object	The City's Open Space and Recreation Standards required by new developments should reflect those nationally recognised standards established by Fields in Trust (formerly NPFA) to provide greater certainty for developers who work in many local authority areas while ensuring that provision requirements does not become so onerous as to prevent development within and adjoining the City.	The city's open space and recreation standards are set locally in line with the requirements of PPG17 and the draft National Planning Policy Framework in order to meet the needs of the city.	

5.11

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5512 - Bidwells	Object	The City's Open Space and Recreation Standards required by new developments should reflect those nationally recognised standards established by Fields in Trust (formerly NPFA) to provide greater certainty for developers who work in many local authority areas while ensuring that provision requirements does not become so onerous as to prevent development within and adjoining the City. The City's existing wealth of open space provision must be recognised as a surplus which has the capacity to accommodate the open space and recreational need generated by future development and population increase, rather than as a baseline.	The City's Open Space and Recreation Standards required by new developments should reflect those nationally recognised standards established by Fields in Trust (formerly NPFA) to provide greater certainty for developers who work in many local authority areas while ensuring that provision requirements does not become so onerous as to prevent development within and adjoining the City.	
<i>5.13</i>				
5513 - Bidwells	Object	The recognition that the loss of open space can result in improved sports and recreation facilities which can be used more intensively is welcomed. Sufficient flexibility must be built in to ensure that the focus is on usability rather than simply the number of hectares provided recognising that smaller open space provision does not mean fewer recreational opportunities. Development can and will continue to deliver open space and recreation opportunities but must not be restricted by excessive standards similar to those proposed. A standard of 1.8 hectares per 1000 population is considered acceptable.	Concerns noted. This revised standard has come forward as a result of the assessment work undertaken and is intended to ensure that the city has a sufficient stock of informal open space for its residents. This is consistent with the approach that the Council has taken in the past.	
<i>5.14</i>				
5514 - Bidwells	Object	If the Council feels that an up to date assessment of playing pitches is essential as part of the review of the Local Plan it follows that the open space and recreation strategy SPD is premature. The strategy ought to be put on hold and assessed as part of a more holistic approach to the evolution of the City. The current document allocations and revised standards prejudge the outcome of the playing fields assessment, the Local Plan Review and could potentially prevent the Council progressing development within the City.	The strategy is not a Supplementary Planning Document and is not considered to be premature as it forms evidence base for the Local Plan Review. Evidence base and frontloading are key elements of the plan-making system. Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. The playing pitch study will also inform the development of the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document)	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	
<hr/>				
<i>5.15</i>				
5767 - St John's College 5776 - Bursars' Environment and Planning Sub-Committee	Comment	Taking the example of sports pitches, it is acknowledged that the hiring of private sports pitches is a particular characteristic of sports pitch supply in Cambridge. However, no assessment of the level of sport pitches provision currently exists and we consider that a proper, city-wide assessment of sports pitches is required. We notice that Paragraph 5.14 of the Strategy states that: "It is recommended that an up-to-date playing pitch assessment is produced for the City as part of the review for the Local Plan. Any changes to the current standard of 1.2 hectares per 1000 population should only be made by the current understanding of the number and types of sport clubs operating in Cambridge and the number and type of playing pitches, courts and greens available and their level of usage."	Comment noted. The strategy suggests that a playing pitch study is important to inform the development of the Local Plan Review.	
<hr/>				
<i>5.16</i>				
5914 - North Newnham Residents Association	Comment	Might this section also mention sustainability (energy use/climate change) considerations as a constraining factor on lighting provision?	Comment noted. The concerns raised regarding the impact of floodlighting are recognised. Policy 4/15 Lighting within the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 requires the lighting of new developments to be carefully designed to ensure that areas are appropriately lit, whilst avoiding or minimising light pollution. This includes minimising impacts on residential amenity, wildlife and landscape. Additionally, the Council's Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document considers the issues of lighting.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>5.20</i>				
5915 - North Newnham Residents Association	Comment	Again might sustainability considerations be mentioned since some sitings within the city would imply more travelling with consequent implications for congestion and pollution.	Comment noted. Any application for such a development would need to be supported by a transport assessment.	
<i>5.22</i>				
5515 - Bidwells	Object	It is inappropriate to base the level of future demand on the existing level of provision. Detailed consideration of the existing usage, capacity and demand for such facilities is essential to avoid the over provision of sites. Better to provide fewer high quality facilities which are used heavily rather than many low-quality, underused facilities, with insufficient membership to maintain them.	Concern noted. However, the existing provision meets the level of demand experienced in the City. If the population is to increase, consideration must be given to increased demand.	
<i>5.23</i>				
5831	Comment	The City Council should work closely with the University of Cambridge over its proposals for a new University Sports Centre. I suggest the city council should invest some s106 funds into the project, boosting the range of facilities provided, seeking in return to ensure public access to the facilities. I think the council should change its current position of waiting for the university to take the lead and work with staff and students at the university who are urging the institution to take the project forward. I have expanded on these views at: http://www.rtaylor.co.uk/west-cambridge-sports-centre.html	Comment noted.	
<i>5.32</i>				
5517 - Bidwells	Object	The revision of the informal open space standard required by the strategy is unjustified, contrary to the NPPF and will hinder delivery of development within the City. No evidence or justification has been given as to why the revised standard, which the Council acknowledges as being high, is appropriate and therefore the standard should remain at 1.8 hectares per 1000 population.	Concerns noted. This revised standard has come forward as a result of the assessment work undertaken and is intended to ensure that the city has a sufficient stock of informal open space for its residents. This is consistent with the approach that the Council has taken in the past. Paragraph 128 of the draft National Planning Policy Framework recognises the importance of open spaces and	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			requires planning policies to identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. The information gained from assessment of needs and opportunities should be used to set locally derived standards for the provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities. Viability work as part of the Local Plan Review and the Community Infrastructure levy charging schedule work will take into account open space requirements along with other policy requirements.	
5840 - Grosvenor Developments	Object	The draft Strategy cannot be used to introduce new open space standards. Changes in standards need to be subject to scrutiny and testing through the Development Plan process.	Concern noted. Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	
5819 - Cambridge City Football Ground LLP & Cambridge City Football Club Limited 5889 - Hembriar Limited	Object	Object to suggested increase in informal open space on development sites purely on the basis of earlier research which in our view does not sit comfortably with reference to deficit earlier in the document. An increase in standard places greater strain on deliverability of sites and questions about where contributions will be targetted. In addition further policy context needs to be written into the document to clarify the weight of this strategy document.	Concerns noted. This revised standard has come forward as a result of the assessment work undertaken and is intended to ensure that the city has a sufficient stock of informal open space for its residents. This is consistent with the approach that the Council has taken in the past. Paragraph 128 of the draft National Planning Policy Framework recognises the importance of open spaces and requires planning policies to identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. The information gained from assessment of needs and opportunities should be used to set locally derived standards for the provision of open	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			space, sports and recreational facilities. Viability work as part of the Local Plan Review and the Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule work will take into account open space requirements along with other policy requirements.	
5743 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Support	It is particularly important that existing sites should not be ignored and that there is funding to increase the amount and quality of open space, particularly in regions with poor provision at present.	Support noted.	
<i>5.35</i>				
5882	Comment	Play area installation and opening needs to be timed to coincide with residents moving into new developments.	Comment noted.	
<i>5.36</i>				
5518 - Bidwells	Object	The provision for children and teenagers should be in line with the Fields Trust. There is no justification for the 20% increase above the national standard.	Concern noted. The open space and recreation standards are set locally in line with the requirements of PPG17 and the draft National Planning Policy Framework. The Fields in Trust (formerly NPFA) standard is purely advisory. There is not considered to be any local evidence to reduce the standard.	
<i>5.37</i>				
5886 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Comment	We have not assessed these parts of the strategy. Our comments on earlier sections have general applicability here however. The importance of well designed and sited play equipment should be underlined in terms of reducing potential impacts on local amenity and townscape.	Comment noted.	
<i>5.55</i>				
5744 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Support	Support. Comment It is as important to provide allotments in existing built-up areas as it is in the proposed new developments.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>5.57</i>				
5608	Object	The biodiversity of many of the churchyards is degrading due to poor management.	Concern noted. The final sentence of this paragraph supports the qualitative enhancement of the closed churchyards, which includes habitat management.	
<i>5.59</i>				
5782 - Conservators of the River Cam	Comment	If development is proposed in or adjacent to one of the green corridors then s106 monies should be available for their ongoing maintenance, e.g. the costs of grass mowing and tree reduction works and the phased re-planting of specimen trees, the maintenance of public rights of way and the provision of street furniture including park benches and interpretation boards.	Comment noted.	
5916 - North Newnham Residents Association	Object	5.59 This assessment of green corridors is welcome but did not lead to an associated standard. There is mention of how proposals for development 'adjacent to' green corridors should be treated, but this could allow them comparatively low weight in planning decisions. In Newnham, there is significance of some of the zones where large gardens not classified as open space on Clarkson, Adams and Cranmer Roads link to designated open spaces adjacent to them, forming an essential part of the network. It should be ensured through 5.59 that their contribution will be a material planning consideration.	Concern noted. The Council does give strong consideration to the network of open spaces formed within the city and on its edges. Weight is given to the need to support the network of green infrastructure in the draft National Planning Policy Framework, the Green Infrastructure Strategy for Cambridgeshire and in this strategy itself. The Council is aware of the issue of loss of private gardens and will be considering this matter as a part of the Local Plan Review. Policy 3/10 of the existing Cambridge Local Plan 2006 does address a number of issues including the impact of loss of gardens on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.	

Table 4: Application of the Open Space and Recreation Standards

5880	Comment	<p>I would like suggest clarification of the definition of college. Will commercial, speculative, development of student accommodation be treated differently in terms of S.106 taxes when compared to one developed by a college of the University of Cambridge?</p> <p>I note the university doesn't have a swimming pool; so why should it be exempt from contributing to public pool provision? I suggest best option is to encourage the development of a pool and related facilities by the university and to use S.106 exemption and planning</p>	<p>Comment noted. Colleges are defined within the glossary to this strategy. The university and its Colleges are not exempt from paying for indoor sports provision, including swimming pools, unless they have their own proven provision. Only a very small number of Colleges have swimming pool provision and this is often not available to students.</p>	
------	---------	--	--	--

Table 4: Application of the Open Space and Recreation Standards

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		policy to obtain public access to the facilities.		
<hr/>				
5.65 5821	Comment	<p>I am concerned that s106 tax income is being spent on "improvements" to open spaces which may not last as long as the developments.</p> <p>As a basic principle I suggest that councillors consider if any improvements made will be truly permanent or not and ensure that they are confident what they are spending the money raised on will be of enduring value to the city over the very long term. I think councillors should be reminded of this whenever they make a decision on spending s106 income.</p>	Comment noted.	
<hr/>				
5745 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Support	We strongly support. It is as important to find funding to make good the shortfall in existing residential areas as it is to fund provisions in new developments.	Support noted.	
<hr/>				
5.67 5643 - Bidwells	Object	There is no justification for the provision of open space as part of retail, employment or community developments, despite Policy 3/7 in the adopted Local Plan, or any justification in suggesting that this requirement should apply in particular to named locations such as Addenbrooke's Hospital and University development or large employment sites.	Concern noted. However, this paragraph supports Policy 3/7 in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. Successful places should be attractive and enjoyable and this should not be underrated in supporting the continued growth of the city. In relation to employment, this is supported by the recent findings of the Cambridge Cluster study, which emphasises the importance of providing good social spaces as a part of development. This can include open spaces. Furthermore, in relation to health, open spaces can contribute both physical and mental well-being.	
<hr/>				
6.0 Implementing the Strategy				
6.1				
5653 - University of Cambridge	Comment	The Strategy should include a section on the provision of off-site provision of facilities (e.g. a new swimming pool), the mechanism for generating contributions through a future CIL for Cambridge, and the programme for bringing forward a CIL proposal.	Comment noted. However, it is considered that this strategy is not the place to include this kind of information. Work on the Community Infrastructure Levy will be undertaken in tandem with the Local Plan Review process.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5876	Comment	Many ward profiles list problems arising from criminality. Cambridge's green spaces are often the locations of crimes; many people feel unsafe using them in the dark. I think there should be a section in this policy dedicated to safety and perceptions of safety. It should address the council's approach to policing, CCTV, lighting and related matters and how safety is considered at a design stage in relation to new green spaces. It should also describe how opportunities for the council, and councillors to influence policing and other elements of the criminal justice system to help implement this strategy.	Comment noted. Whilst this strategy does make reference to the need to consider safety in designing open spaces, it is not the role of this strategy to address the Council's approach to policing, CCTV, lighting and related matters.	
5746 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Support	We strongly support. It is as important to consider open space and recreation facilities in the existing built-up areas as in the urban extensions and the urban fringe.	Support noted.	
6.2				
5747 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Comment	Support. Comment. These are essential criteria. Add to bullet point 3 the improvement of open space for informal enjoyment by all ages, including the elderly.	Comment noted.	
5792 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	Comment	Such criteria are needed especially in relation to new development in densely built-up areas. In Petersfield, we have a great deal of experience of developers offering commuted sums in lieu of providing on-site open space. (And, as the consultation document confirms, Petersfield is one of Cambridge's least well endowed areas for protected - let alone public - open space). More often than not, there have been no opportunities to spend these commuted sums within the ward. We therefore feel strongly that the local planning authority would benefit from having at its disposal formal criteria by which to assess whether commuted sums are/are not acceptable.	Comment noted.	
5917 - North Newnham Residents Association	Comment	The third bullet point includes possible provision for biodiversity which is welcome to me - but does it sufficiently protect biodiversity from possible erosion by other schemes that are being encouraged this relates back to initial comments about the balance	Comment noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		between the different valued functions of the city's open spaces.		
5609	Object	Nature is rarely tidy, and schemes which concentrate on appearance will do nothing to foster biodiversity. The fourth bullet point has a typo, but for some open areas public access is not appropriate, eg parts of an LNR.	Concern noted. This is a generic paragraph which deals with all forms of new open space. It is recognised that the needs of biodiversity may be very different from human recreational needs. Whilst many open spaces are multifunctional, this paragraph does not indicate that spaces must be multifunctional. With reference to the fourth bullet point, this point will be amended to read "Schemes should have unimpeded public access and feel part of the public realm, where suitable."	Amend the fourth bullet point of paragraph 6.2 to read "Schemes should have unimpeded public access and feel part of the public realm, where suitable."
5640	Support	(Submitted on behalf of the Nineteen Acre Field RA) Particularly support unimpeded public access to open spaces as part of new developments in Castle	Support noted.	
6.3				
5789 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	Support	We Support Section 6.3	Support noted.	
5748 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Support	It is essential to improve existing spaces and to address deficits.	Support noted.	
6.4				
5790 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	Comment	We have one general concern: we would like to see included clear criteria for the circumstances under which commuted sums in lieu of on-site open space provision in new developments are/are not Acceptable. While we appreciate that there will be grey areas, the draft document is too ambiguous on this basic lissue, with different sections pointing in different directions. For example, there is potential tension between the aims of paragraph 6.3 (which we very much support) and paragraph 6.4 - which also seems reasonable, but, in terms of specific planning applications, could seriously undermine the aims of paragraph 6.3.	Comment noted. It is considered that each planning application must be considered on its merits and in relation to its locality.	
5780 - Conservators of the River Cam	Comment	The City Council must include capacity in its financing of services to deal with rubbish associated with the	Comment noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		use of its open spaces by a growing population into the future.		
5852 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The section on implementing the policy does not indicate how monies arising from development will be made available to support local communities. In view of the emerging emphasis on supporting localism and community ownership of development proposals and plans, it would be beneficial to examine this further.	Concern noted. This is not the role of this document. This information is indicated in the Council's Planning Obligations Strategy SPD and will also need to be considered as the Council brings forward its Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule in tandem with the Local Plan Review.	
5749 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Support	It is essential to find funding for improvements and extra provision for existing residents. As we understand the situation, developers cannot be expected to provide financial contributions that are not related to the new developments.	Support noted.	
6.5				
5853 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	It is unclear from the Strategy how requirements for open space will be determined in considering overall development viability, and how this will be prioritised against any assessment of development proposals including that of need. While the Strategy does set out expected requirements and the justification for these in Section 5, this is not related to consideration of other requirements that might be made on development, especially within limited development parcels. It would be helpful if this could be clarified.	Concern noted. Information on open space and recreation requirements has been fed into the Council's ongoing Infrastructure Study work, which considers development viability and will feed into the Council's development of its Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule in tandem with the Local Plan Review.	
6.6				
5611	Support	An ice rink would be a welcome addition to the facilities in the city.	Support noted.	
6.7				
5783 - Conservators of the River Cam	Support	We fully agree with statement 6.7.	Support noted.	
5750 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Support	Support. Comment. It is important to explore all possible sources of finance. We note that if access is too easy, it may be to the	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		detriment of the countryside.		
<hr/>				
6.8				
5826	Comment	The location of open space and recreational facilities on new developments should be designed to aid integrating the new development, and its residents with the rest of the city. Public access should be encouraged.	Comment noted.	
<hr/>				
5751 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Support	It is essential that these possibilities be explored in existing open spaces as well as in the new developments. [Note typo "on" to "off"]	Support noted. The typographical error will be corrected to read "of" instead of "on."	Amend "on" to read "of"
<hr/>				
<i>Table 5: The provision of open space and recreation facilities</i>				
5752 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Comment	This should be regarded as flexible. If larger areas of existing open space, currently with only private access, become publicly accessible then, depending on the area involved, these sites could be used for many of the provisions listed in the table (eg outdoor sports facilities, provision for children and teenagers, and informal open space).	Comment noted.	
<hr/>				
6.10				
5900	Comment	I would like to support the comment from the cycling campaign.	Comment noted.	
<hr/>				
5849 - Cambridge Cycling Campaign	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paths often poorly maintained. - On too many occasions, officials have frustrated attempts to widen paths moderately, e.g. New Bit. - 2.5m paths are below national standards for shared use paths and can result in conflict that could be avoided. - Segregation does not always reduce conflict; in fact, it can sometimes create conflict by creating a "this is *my* space" view amongst users, especially where widths are narrow. What is far more important is that the width is made adequate (minimum 3m), which will avoid conflict. - For these reasons the term 'adequate width' is vague and needs to be better defined. 	Comment noted. Existing path layout and widths are based on historical need. Paragraph 6.10 reflects the need to consider cycling in the context of our open spaces and identifying any future investment which might be required.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5899	Comment	I'd like to see roads adjacent to open spaces, and running through open spaces, given special status and appearance of "park roads"; the aim would be to create a safer and more pleasant environment. I would suggest using coloured roads (perhaps bonded gravel, or red roads) and gates on the entrances. Such "park roads" can be found in many places eg. Bath and the Royal Parks in London. I think it would be easier to enforce 20 MPH limits in such roads, creating a safer environment for all road users and perhaps discouraging through traffic from these areas.	Comment noted. An additional bullet point will be added to paragraph 6.10 to read "Consideration should be given to creating access to a network of open spaces by siting new open spaces to create better linkages with existing sites. Access routes between new and existing open space sites should be considered."	Add an additional bullet point to paragraph 6.10 to read "Consideration should be given to creating access to a network of open spaces by siting new open spaces to create better linkages with existing sites. Access routes between new and existing open space sites should be considered."
5753 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Comment	Support. Comment. We support this section in general. However, bullet point 7 is not clear. What is meant by the "religious and social sensitivities".	Comment noted. This sentence will be deleted.	Delete sentence ".They should be designed to take account of religious and social sensitivities."
5610	Object	Whilst trees may be appropriate in some areas, they often grow and then become inappropriate. Many open areas in the city have suffered from too much tree planting. Lighting often detracts from enjoyment of open space - eg it makes it impossible to view the night sky.	Concerns noted. However, paragraph 6.10 only states which factors should be taken into account in planning new provision of open space or making improvements, it does not enforce requirements regarding either trees or lighting provision. Both of these issues should be considered as a part of the design process.	
5887 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Support	- The management of open space should feature strongly in planning new provision - We welcome the reference to Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans. - A reference should be made to the need for archaeological assessment prior to determining the location of open land in new development and the nature of planting. Open land can be planned to ensure the preservation of archaeological remains; however, depending on the nature of the remains, formal recreational facilities could be damaging to them as could tree planting. - Bullet 11: flood lighting can be very damaging in terms of the potential impact on local townscape as well as landscape.	Support noted.	
6.11				
5612	Support	Delivery will require an LNR officer, yet you are in the process of making this post redundant. Clearly this	Support noted. The Local Nature Reserves officer role has been considered in the restructuring for	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		draft strategy requires you to reconsider.	Streets and Open Spaces and the proposed new structure reflect the future need.	
<i>Row 1</i>				
5755 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Comment	Make sure the "Lead section" includes a group not confined to considering New Neighbourhoods. Is this covered by "City Development" ?	Comment noted. Whilst New Neighbourhoods covers the urban extensions, City Development deals with the existing built-up area of the City.	
5888 - English Heritage (East of England Region)	Comment	Issues relating to the future management of new and existing open space, and funding of management regimes, should be included here.	Comment noted. Additional wording will be included in Line 1, Column 2 of the table to read "Consideration of planning proposals/applications and the long-term management of sites"	Additional wording to be included in Line 1, Column 2 of the table to read "Consideration of planning proposals/applications and the long-term management of sites"
<i>Row 2</i>				
5756 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Support	We strongly support the need to balance new homes with provision of adequate open space, especially near areas of existing deficiency in open space provision, given the variation between wards in existing provision.	Support noted.	
<i>Row 3</i>				
5758 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Comment	Support and comment. We strongly support this section and the need to improve existing open space. Add to "Lead section" the words: "Urban design". It is important that section 106 money (and similar contributions) should be spent locally and not commuted in the case of areas that are already deficient in open space. Consider involving local residents to help lack of staff time.	Comment noted.	
<i>Row 5</i>				
5785 - Conservators of the River Cam	Comment	p.90 table, column 1, row 3 contains a typographic error and it needs to be rewritten.	Comment noted. Delete "." from the sentence "To fund and provide major areas of open space sites and new sports facilities. which are outwith	Delete "." from the sentence "To fund and provide major areas of open space sites and new sports facilities. which are outwith development."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			development."	
<i>6.12</i>				
5754 - Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE) committee	Support	It is important to have active involvement and support of local communities.	Support noted.	
<i>Appendices</i>				
<i>Appendix 1: Additional policy Context</i>				
5571 - Bidwells	Object	Consideration must be taken of the draft National Planning Policy Framework.	Concern noted. At the time that the draft Open Space and Recreation Strategy was produced and endorsed for consultation, the draft National Planning Policy Framework had not been issued for consultation. Consultation on both documents commenced on 25th July 2011. References to the draft National Planning Policy Framework will be made in the strategy put forward for adoption.	Insert new paragraph 2.5 to read: Draft National Planning Policy Framework This draft framework was published for consultation in July 2011 and has not yet been adopted. However, it is recognised that the Planning Inspectorate considers that it is capable of being afforded some weight as a material consideration in the planning process. Paragraph 128 of the draft framework recognises the importance of open spaces and requires planning policies to identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. The information gained from assessment of needs and opportunities should be used to set locally derived standards for the provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities.
5800 - Natural England	Support	Natural England believes that all new and existing homes and communities should have easy access to a hierarchy of publicly accessible open space or 'green infrastructure'. Natural England is pleased to see the specific reference to the draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for Cambridgeshire 2011 ensuring that this policy reflects the aims and aspirations of the wider strategy.	Support noted.	
<i>Classification</i>				
5786 - Conservators of the River Cam	Comment	The Open Space and Recreation Strategy offers the opportunity to look at the City's open spaces in an holistic and integrated way. On p.96, the categorisation of land types (using PPG17 guidelines)	Comment noted. However, in terms of including the river itself within the strategy, the Council considers that the extent of the river Cam and its importance to the City is so significant that it would be better suited	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>should include waterspaces (NAT) within the overall area calculation of open space per Ward in the tables listed in Appendix 2, i.e. the surface area of the River Cam, not just specific isolated ponds or lakes.</p>	<p>to the development of a strategy on the river itself. This could include recreational use of the river, moorings, navigation and commercial activities.</p>	
<i>Row 44</i>				
5666 - Gonville and Caius College	Object	<p>Finella(AGS 26) was not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. AGS 26 should therefore be excluded from the document. The continued success of the University and Colleges must be recognised and flexibility must be maintained to allow for sensitive expansion of institutions. Either detailed evidence needs to be provided so that its validity can be assessed or the site should be excluded from the Open Space and Recreation Strategy. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.</p>	<p>This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p>	
<p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient</p>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	

<i>Row 79</i>	Object	<p>The Principal's Lodge and Pightle (AGS 62) was not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. AGS 62 should therefore be excluded from the document. The continued success of the University and Colleges must be encouraged and flexibility must be maintained to allow for sensitive expansion of institutions.</p>	<p>This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	
<i>Row 83</i>				
5669 - Hughes Hall	Object	Hughes Hall Amenity Green Space (AGS 66) was not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. In light of the above the suggested designation should be removed unless evidence is presented and notes of what has changed in the intervening period are published to justify its inclusion.	This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.	
<i>Row 132</i>				
5614	Object	Bramblefields is an LNR	Concern noted. The description will be amended to read "Bramblefields Local Nature Reserve."	Amend to read "Bramblefields Local Nature Reserve"
<i>Row 133</i>				
5615	Object	Byrons Pool is an LNR	Concern noted. The description will be amended to read "Byron's Pool Local Nature Reserve."	Amend to read "Byron's Pool Local Nature Reserve"
<i>Row 138</i>				
5865 - Membership Secretary	Support	As a group, we support all efforts to protect and enhance the green spaces of Cambridge, and so support the goals of the policy document. Could I add that, as part of that protection effort, we are very keen to see Stourbridge Common designated as a Local Nature Reserve (it is on the potential LRN list), and hopefully Ditton Meadows, too, a kind of 'sister space' to Stourbridge. We are also hoping that at some point a Management Plan can be developed for the Common, and that we would be consulted as part of that .	Support noted. The concerns raised regarding the status of Stourbridge Common and the potential for Local Nature Reserve designation are understood. If the Council were to progress a management plan for Stourbridge Common, the Friends of Stourbridge Common would be a key consultee in this process. The Council would not be able to designate Ditton Meadows as a Local Nature Reserve as the land is not within the City's ownership. The Council is aware that the land at Ditton Meadows is being managed with the needs of biodiversity in mind, having recently entered into Defra's Higher Level Stewardship Scheme.	
<i>Row 150</i>				
5769 - St John's College	Object	NAT - 19 The site is a distinct, separate entity and we do not agree with the Council that this site forms an 'important green break', nor a significant part of a 'network of green space in the area'. We consider the site to meet only meet 5 of the 19 site quality assessment criteria (with the Council considering that it meets 7). In terms of those 5 criteria, we do not consider these to warrant protection of the site on qualitative grounds and neither do we consider protection warranted on quantitative grounds.	Concern noted. However, in line with the requirements of the adopted Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and the strategy itself, the site meets one or more of the criteria for protection and has therefore been included within this strategy.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Consequently, we object to the identification of this site as protected open space.		
<i>Row 154</i>				
5654 - University of Cambridge	Object	The Traveller's Resst Pit SSSI is not described or shown correctly in the Strategy. The northern part of the site has been denotified by Natural England and the SSSI is now 2.25ha in size.	Concern noted. The boundaries of the SSSI will be amended to indicate Natural England's changes to the designation.	Amend the boundaries of the SSSI to indicate Natural England's changes to the designation.
<i>Row 158</i>				
5686 - Emmanuel	Object	Insufficient evidence has been provided and the designation of site NAT 29 as protected should be reconsidered until the full review of the Local Plan is underway. All buildings should be excluded from any designation and the protection afforded by Conservation Area and Listed Buildings Policies ought to be considered to be sufficient protection of the open space, while maintaining a degree of flexibility. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.	<p>This site was assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<p><i>Row 198</i> 5675 - Queens College</p>	<p>Object Insufficient evidence has been provided and the designation of site P&G 31 as protected should be reconsidered until the full review of the Local Plan is underway. All buildings should be excluded from any designation and the protection afforded by Conservation Area and Listed Buildings Policies ought to be considered to be sufficient protection of the open space, while maintaining a degree of flexibility. The buildings of Queens College should be excluded from the designation as should the adjacent land to enable sensitive expansion. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.</p>	<p>environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	<p>This site was assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Row 200</i>				
5670 - Christ's College	Object	Insufficient evidence has been provided and the designation of site P&G 33 as protected should be reconsidered until the full review of the Local Plan is underway. All buildings should be excluded from any designation and the protection afforded by Conservation Area and Listed Buildings Policies ought to be considered to be sufficient protection of the open space, while maintaining a degree of flexibility. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.	<p>This site was assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	
<hr/>				
<i>Row 201</i>				
5681 - Peterhouse	Object	<p>Peterhouse Gardens (P&G 34) were not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. P&G 34 should therefore be excluded from the document. The continued success of the University and Colleges must be recognised and flexibility must be maintained to allow for sensitive expansion of institutions. Either detailed evidence needs to be provided so that its validity can be assessed or the site should be excluded from the Open Space and Recreation Strategy. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.</p>	<p>This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It was assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	
<i>Row 202</i>	<p>Object The designation of King's College(P&G 35) as protected in relation to environment and quality should be revised as no evidence has been presented to justify this position. The Open Space and recreation</p>	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		strategy is premature and should be progressed along with the review of the Local Plan. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.	<p>Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
<hr/>				
<i>Row 203</i>				
5699 - Pembroke College	Object	Pembroke College Gardens (P&G36) were not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. P&G36 should therefore be excluded from the document. Please refer to Bidwells' general representations regarding the prematurity of the document and concerns regarding the methodology.	This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
<i>Row 204</i>				
5832 - Savills	Object	<p>P&G 37 - Worksheet scores. suggested revisions: Trees - 1 Planted Areas - 1 Grass (Principals Garden) - 1 Hard Landscaping (Principals Garden) - N/A Entrance (Principals Garden) - 1 Getting there - 1 Disabled Access - 1 External Lighting (Principals Garden) - 1 Criterion 17 (Principals Garden) - 1 Seating (criterion 21 - (Principals Garden)) - 1</p> <p>Why is there no assessment after criterion 22? The Principals Garden should score 1 for all of these and the assessment should be completed. Suggest the score for the Principals garden would be</p>	<p>Concern noted. However, the quality assessment represents a snapshot in time. The survey of the Ridley Hall site was undertaken by officers who visited in excess of 300 open spaces across the city to ensure consistency of approach. The questions were not completed post question 22 as they were not considered relevant to that specific site. This issue of calculating the qualitative survey results is covered in paragraph 3.16 of the strategy. Even if the Council were to revisit the site for a third survey (the first having been undertaken during the planning application process and the second having taken place as part of the strategy development), the Council would still consider Ridley Hall worthy of protection as it meets the core criteria for environmental and recreational importance.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		37/165 = 22% and therefore should not be designated open space.		
<i>Row 205</i>				
5667 - Gonville and Caius College	Object	The Gonville and Caius Fellows Garden (P&G 38) was not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. Either detailed evidence needs to be provided so that its validity can be assessed or the site should be excluded from the Open Space and Recreation Strategy. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.	This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.	
<i>Row 207</i>				
5661 - Newnham College	Object	The Newnham College Gardens in their entirety (P&G 40) was not included in its entirety in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why the area included should be extended in the current revision. P&G 40 should therefore be excluded from the document. The continued success of the University and Colleges must be recognised and flexibility must be maintained to allow for sensitive expansion of institutions. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.	Part of this site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. The whole site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	
<i>Row 209</i>	Object	Lucy Cavendish College Gardens (P&G42) were not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. P&G42 should therefore be excluded from the document. The continued success of the University and Colleges	This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>must be recognised and flexibility must be maintained to allow for sensitive expansion of institutions. Either detailed evidence needs to be provided so that its validity can be assessed or the site should be excluded from the Open Space and Recreation Strategy. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.</p>	<p>assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Row 210</i>	Object	<p>Fitzwilliam College Gardens (P&G43) were not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. P&G43 should therefore be excluded from the document. The continued success of the University and Colleges must be encouraged and flexibility must be maintained to allow for sensitive expansion of institutions. Either detailed evidence needs to be provided so that its validity can be assessed or the site should be excluded from the Open Space and Recreation Strategy. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.</p>	<p>appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	
5677 - Fitzwilliam College			<p>This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p>	
			<p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<p><i>Row 217</i> 5797 - Clare College</p>	<p>Object The designation of Clare College Gardens (P&G 50) as protected in relation to environment and quality should be revised as no evidence has been presented to justify this position. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy is premature and should be progressed along with the review of the Local Plan. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
<hr/>				
<i>Row 219</i>				
5658 - Sidney Sussex College	Object	<p>Sidney Sussex College Gardens (P&G52) were not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. P&G 52 should therefore be excluded from the document. The continued success of the University and Colleges must be encouraged and flexibility must be maintained to allow for sensitive expansion of institutions. Either detailed evidence needs to be provided so that its validity can be assessed or the site should be excluded from the Open Space and Recreation Strategy. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.</p>	<p>This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	
5946 - Sidney Sussex College	Object	I question how Sidney's gardens meet your criteria of making a contribution to the environmental quality or recreational resources of the area, as they are private, without public access and nor are they generally visible from public areas or streets.	<p>Concern noted. This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. The Council has an established approach of assessing both public and private open spaces as both make a valuable contribution to the environmental and recreational qualities of the City.</p>	
<i>Row 221</i>				
5716 - Trinity College	Object	The designation of Trinity College Fellows' Garden (P&G 54) as protected in relation to environment and quality should be revised as no evidence has been presented to justify this position. The Open Space and recreation strategy is premature and should be progressed along with the review of the Local Plan. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
<i>Row 222</i>	<p>Object</p> <p>Trinity College - Burrell's Field (P&G55) was not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. P&G55 should therefore be excluded from the document. The continued success of the University and Colleges must be encouraged and flexibility must be maintained to allow for sensitive expansion of institutions. Either detailed evidence needs to be provided so that its validity can be assessed or the site should be excluded from the Open Space and Recreation Strategy. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations for more information.</p>	<p>This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.	
			Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	
<i>Row 229</i>				
5668 - Gonville and Caius College	Object	SPO 06 comprises hard and grass tennis courts as well as a redundant grass hockey pitch. An ecological survey has been undertaken on behalf of Gonville and Caius College, which concluded that the well mown grass, non-grass sports pitches and car park was of limited ecological value. No evidence has been provided to support the environmental designation and while the recreational value is not disputed the environmental designation is. No evidence has been provided to justify the designation and as such it ought to be removed.	This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. The environmental criteria are not solely based on ecological value, but also relate to the site's contribution to the environmental quality of the area and the City as a whole.	
<i>Row 233</i>				
5798 - Clare College	Object	Clare College Playing Fields(SPO 11,)while included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy, no evidence has been provided as to why the area is included as environmentally important nor has any explanation been given as to how the site was scored in relation to quality. Please refer to Bidwells' general	This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		representations regarding the prematurity of the document and concerns regarding the methodology.	<p>subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
<i>Row 238</i>				
5687 - Emmanuel	Object	SPO16 comprises hard tennis courts as well as a grass sports pitches and pavillion. An ecological survey has been undertaken on behalf of Emmanuel College, which concluded that the well mown grass and non-grass sports pitches were of limited ecological value. No evidence has been provided to support the environmental designation and while the recreational value is not disputed the environmental designation is. No evidence has been provided to justify the designation and as such it ought to be removed. The quality assessment is flawed and takes no account of the restricted access and ought to be reconsidered.	This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			deficiencies might need to be addressed. The criteria for environmental importance are not purely based on ecological value, but also consider environmental quality and value to the locality and the city as a whole.	
<i>Row 241</i>				
5676 - Fitzwilliam College	Object	Fitzwilliam College would like to reiterate its position regarding the suggested protection of SPO19 as expressed during the Local Plan 2006 consultation. The blanket designation of open space within the City is not supported by a sound evidence base and as such is premature.	<p>This site was assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Row 245</i>				
5578 - Jesus College 5659 - Jesus College	Object	Insufficient evidence has been submitted to justify the designation. The quality assessment is fundamentally flawed. The open space and recreation strategy is premature and ought to be delayed to allow it to be progressed jointly with the Local Plan Review ensuring a joined up approach to the City's growth. Jesus Lane Car Park and the land to the rear of Park Street ought to be excluded from the designation to encourage growth of this successful institution. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Whilst Cambridge is widely known for its academic achievements, the University and the architecture of its colleges, it is equally relevant to acknowledge the special relationship of built form and open spaces which contribute to the special character of the City's landscape. In both mapping terms and in relation to the intrinsic value of the site, it is often impossible to separate the series of open spaces out from adjacent buildings, e.g. college quadrangles. This site has been reassessed this year, but the boundaries have remained the same as previously assessed.</p>	
<hr/>				
<i>Row 247</i>				
5694 - King's College	Object	King's College School (SPO 26), while included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy, no evidence has been provided as to why the area is included as environmentally important nor has any explanation been given as to how the site was scored in relation to quality. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.	<p>This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.	
<i>Row 252</i>				
5682 - Peterhouse	Object	SPO 31 is incorrectly labelled as public open space associated with Netherhall School. The Freehold on this land is held by Peterhouse and as such is privately owned. The site is within the green belt which offers it sufficient protection. The document must recognise that development can bring with it advantages in open space and recreation provision; as such the review ought to take place alongside that of the Local Plan to ensure a holistic approach is achieved. Please refer to the Bidwells general representations for further commentary.	SPO 31 is labelled as public Protected Open Space as Netherhall School makes it available for public access. The overall freehold ownership of the site is not an issue for the strategy. The document does recognise that development can bring with it advantages in open space and recreation provision, and seeks to secure this through open space and recreation standards. Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	
<i>Row 254</i>				
5662 - Newnham College	Object	The Newnham College Playing Fields (SPO 33), while included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy, no evidence has been provided as to why the area is included as environmentally important nor has any explanation been given as to how the site	The site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>was scored in relation to quality. The designation of this area ought to be revised to exclude the environmental and quality designations as no justification has been provided.</p> <p>The continued success of the University and Colleges must be encouraged and flexibility must be maintained to allow for sensitive expansion of institutions. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.</p>	<p>of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Row 256</i>				
5700 - Pembroke College	Object	<p>Pembroke College Playing Fields (SPO 35), while included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy, no evidence has been provided as to why the area is included as environmentally important nor has any explanation been given as to how the site was scored in relation to quality.</p> <p>Please refer to Bidwells' general representations regarding the prematurity of the document and concerns regarding the methodology.</p>	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
5707 - Trinity College	Object	<p>Trinity College New Fields (SPO 35), while included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy, no evidence has been provided as to why the area is included as environmentally important nor has any explanation been given as to how the site was scored in relation to quality. Please refer to Bidwells' general representations regarding the prematurity of the document and concerns regarding the methodology.</p>	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Row 257</i> 5579 - Peterhouse	Object Insufficient evidence has been submitted to justify the designation of SPO 36. The quality assessment is fundamentally flawed. The open space and recreation strategy is premature and ought to be delayed to allow it to be progressed jointly with the Local Plan Review ensuring a joined up approach to the City's growth. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.	<p>of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.	
			Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.	
<i>Row 258</i>				
5664 - Perse School	Object	The statement that the expansion of the local schools is a threat to sports pitch provision and open space should be deleted and seen as an opportunity to enhance the quality of the provision. Please refer to Bidwells general representations for more detail.	Concern noted. However, the cumulative expansion of schools can lead to the loss of Protected Open Spaces, including sports pitches.	
<i>Row 266</i>				
5725 - Trinity College	Object	There is no justification for the designation of SPO 45 as an area of environmental importance; no ecological or landscape and visual appraisals have been undertaken to support such a designation. The consultation is premature in advance of the Local Plan Review and should be delayed so a holistic growth review can take place.	This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
<i>Row 267</i>	<p>Comment SPO 46 - The assessment of this site should recognise the importance of allowing built development to be brought forward, associated with the outdoor sports use of the site. For sites such as this which are identified for their contribution to recreational resources, it is important to recognise that appropriate loss of open space per se, need not necessarily be unacceptable, if leading to a qualitative and quantitative improvement of sports facilities provision. This ought to follow through in to development plan policy relating to recreational open space.</p>	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space within the Cambridge Local Plan states: Development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>character of, or lead to the loss of, open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and the site is not important for environmental reasons. It is further supported by paragraph 4.10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which states that there is currently very little recreational open space surplus to requirements, as set out in the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006). The majority makes a major contribution to the recreational resources of the local area and could not be recreated elsewhere. In the exceptional circumstance that the open space uses could be replaced elsewhere, and the land is not important for environmental reasons, planning permission will only be granted if an equivalent and equally convenient area is secured.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 of the strategy (2011) also states that there is a clear presumption against the loss of open space of environmental or recreational importance. Development may be acceptable if there will be no material harm to the character, use and visual amenity of the area, and: it is for ancillary recreational or open space related uses e.g. changing facilities; or it enhances the recreational or biodiversity value of the site; or in the case of school and College grounds, the proposed development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on site. As such, this does not unreasonably restrict educational institutions, which comprise many of the Protected Open Spaces.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
			<p>and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
<i>Row 271</i>				
5729 - Trinity College	Object	<p>Trinity College Old Fields (SPO 50), while included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy, no evidence has been provided as to why the area is included as environmentally important nor has any explanation been given as to how the site was scored in relation to quality. Please refer to Bidwells' general representations regarding the prematurity of the document and concerns regarding the methodology.</p>	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p>	<p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Row 272</i>				
5671 - Trinity Hall	Object	The designation of Trinity Hall Playing Fields (SPO 51) as protected in relation to environment and quality should be revised as no evidence has been presented to justify this position. The potential benefits that could derive from development should not be pre-judged in this manner. The Open Space and recreation strategy is premature and should be progressed along with the review of the Local Plan. Please refer to Bidwells General Representations.	<p>This site has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed.</p> <p>Following adoption, the strategy will be used as a material consideration in the planning process and as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review. In relation to forming part of the evidence base for the Local Plan Review, as this strategy suggests new standards, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 (and the Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document) standards will stand as the adopted standards for the time-being. The suggested new standards will be used to inform the Local Plan Review and support the Planning Obligations Strategy. Following the adoption of the next Local Plan, the strategy will be formally updated and readopted in order to ensure that the standards of the new Local Plan and strategy are aligned. Whilst the Council recognises the need to consider the growth of the city holistically, the Council also needs to consider the importance of open spaces across the City.</p>	
<hr/>				
<i>Row 285</i>				
5732 - Trinity College	Object	Trinity College Hockey Field (SPO 66) was not included in the 2006 Recreation and Open Space Strategy and no evidence has been provided as to why it is included in the current revision. The site is no longer used for hockey and is not publically accessible; it therefore fails to offer recreational or	This site was overlooked during the 2006 assessment, but was protected by the caveat on Protected Open Space in paragraph 4.7 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. It has been assessed against the criteria for environmental and recreational importance, which were used for	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		environmental provision and ought to be excluded.	assessment in both 2004 and 2006 as part of the development of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. These criteria were also adopted as part of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and have been subject to examination by independent Inspectors. This has ensured consistency of approach. In terms of the quality assessment, this has been carried out for the first time this year in keeping with the requirements of PPG17 and its companion guide. Understanding the quality of different sites across the City helps those involved in the development process understand where and how qualitative deficiencies might need to be addressed. Any current lack of use does not mean that the site is incapable of being used for recreational purposes.	
<i>Appendix 3: Quality Assessment Criteria</i>				
5616	Object	<p>Quality assessment criterion No 8 may be wrong for an LNR.</p> <p>Criterion 8 is highly subjective, feelings should not come in to the equation.</p> <p>Criterion 17 is wrong for an LNR - evidence of wear and tear would imply over use.</p> <p>Criterion 34 is perhaps phrased wrongly. Encouraging is a better word.</p> <p>Criterion 42 seems as odds with the philosophy. The natural environment should not be landscaped, otherwise it is not natural.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. It is stated in paragraph 3.16 of the strategy that questions may not be relevant to every site. In the case that they are not relevant, they are not applied. The calculation process is explained in paragraph 3.16 of the strategy.</p> <p>Criterion 8 relates to allotment plots and was not used to assess Local Nature Reserves. Criterion 17 would have to be balanced with Criterion 28 in relation to Local Nature Reserves, in order to ensure a balance between habitat management and access.</p>	
5817 - Bell Educational Trust	Object	The Quality Assessment Criteria does not make it clear which questions relate to which typology of open space. It is not clear which questions should be discounted in the assessment of each site. The full assessment of P&G 17 against the criteria in Appendix 3 contains a number of scores that do not appear to exist. There is a wide variation in quality scores with apparently no correlation to a site's recreational or environmental importance. The scoring system is either flawed or not fully explained and should therefore be clarified or altered.	The quality assessment criteria questions are used for each site as relevant. It is obvious in the wording of each question what it relates to, e.g . toilets or changing facilities. This allows the assessors to see if the question is directly relevant to the site. The quality scores relate to the quality of the site, not purely to the site's environmental or recreational importance.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Appendix 4: Indicative Map of Protected Open Spaces and Proposed Open Spaces in the Urban Extensions</i>				
5641	Comment	(Submitted on behalf of the Nineteen Acre Field RA) This map demonstrates the comment at 4.11 about the scarcity of public open spaces in NW Cambridge and of the dominance of private spaces in this part of the city	Comment noted.	
5655 - University of Cambridge	Object	The Traveller's Resst Pit SSSI (NAT24) is not described or shown correctly in the Strategy. The northern part of the site has been denotified by Natural England and the SSSI is now 2.25ha in size.	Concerns noted. The site boundaries will be amended to reflect Natural England's designation.	Amend the boundaries of NAT24 to reflect Natural England's amendments to the designation.

Glossary

Glossary

5940 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future	Comment	Definition of green corridor (see para 4.3) is essential juxtaposed with previous wildlife corridors rejected by the Independent Inspector as part of the Local Plan Review in 2006) - how far is this term a material consideration in the planning process? Semi-natural - split from natural in index	Comment noted. There is no specific need to have a glossary definition of green corridors as this issue is dealt with in paragraph 5.59 of the strategy. Please note that the definition of semi-natural greenspace is dealt with under natural and semi-natural greenspace in the document's glossary.	
---	---------	---	---	--