

APPENDIX 8:

Summary of Consultation

Summary of Consultation for the Urban Capacity Study.

Consultation for the Urban Capacity Study Methodology took place in May /June 2002. Copies of the methodology were sent to a list of consultees, which is shown in Table 8.1 on 9th July 2002. The results of the Consultation exercise were reported to Environment Committee in July. A number of changes were made to the Urban Capacity Study as a consequence. The comments together with the City Councils response are shown in Table 8.2.

In addition, we undertook further consultation on the draft final report of the Urban Capacity Study in July/August 2002. Again we sent a letter to the previous list of consultees advising them of the opportunity to comment. The draft Study was placed on the website and we issued a press release. The Urban Capacity Study was also available to purchase. A number of changes were made to the Urban Capacity Study as a consequence and these comments together with our responses are also shown below in Table 8.3.

Table 8.1: List of Consultees

| |
|--|
| Arup Economics and Planning |
| Barrett Homes |
| Barton Housing Association Ltd |
| Bellway Estates |
| Bidwell |
| Cambridge Cyrenians |
| Cambridge Housing Society |
| Camstead Ltd |
| Carter Jonas |
| Catlings Property Consultants |
| CB Hillier Parker |
| CGMS Ltd |
| Donaldsons |
| Drivers Jonas |
| DTZ Pidea Consulting |
| FPD Savills |
| Fuller Peiser |
| Gleeson Homes |
| Go-East |
| Granta Housing Society |
| GVA Grimley |
| Hanover Housing Association, Midlands Regions |
| Harvey Housing Association |
| Hewitson Becke & Shaw |
| Hundred Houses Society |
| Januarys Chartered Surveyors |
| Leach Homes |
| Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners Ltd |
| Nicholas Ray Associates |
| Phillips Planning Services Ltd |
| Robert Turley Associates |
| RPS Planning Transport & Environment |
| Smith-Woolley |
| Ward Howard Rowlett |
| Westbury Homes |
| Barton Wilmore Planning Partnership - Anglia |
| The House Builders Federation |
| The Fairfield Partnership |
| Wilson Connelly Anglia |
| Wimpy Homes |
| McLean Homes (East Anglia) Ltd |
| Dudley Developments |
| Laing Homes Ltd |
| Bryant Homes |
| Countryside Residential |
| Camstead Homes |
| David Wilson Homes |
| Fairview Homes |
| Turnstone Estates Ltd |
| Crest Strategic Projects |
| South Cambridgeshire District Council (2nd Stage of Consultation only) |
| |

Table 8.2: Urban Capacity Study Consultation Comments & Responses - May 2002

| Comment Number | Consultee | Comment | Response |
|----------------|---------------------------|---|--|
| 1 | House Builders Federation | Exclusion/inclusion of particular category sources - lack of clarity | Text added to clarify |
| 2 | House Builders Federation | Objects to the exclusion of schools/colleges as a capacity source. | These have not been excluded. Further text has been added to clarify this point in the UCS. |
| 3 | House Builders Federation | Treatment of student accommodation. | Text added to clarify. |
| 4 | House Builders Federation | Any departures from existing past rates of subdivision of existing housing need to be justified. | We have not sought departure from past rates. |
| 5 | House Builders Federation | Flats over shops - UCS should identify the policy framework to demonstrate and justify the assumptions made. | We have projected past trends forward. This is explained in the UCS. |
| 6 | House Builders Federation | Not clear whether empty homes have been included. | Empty homes have not been included in the overall capacity figure but we have identified the number of empty homes for the sake of completeness. This is as advised by the EELGA in order to avoid double counting as empty homes are included in the figure for RPG and Structure Plan. |
| 7 | House Builders Federation | Previously developed vacant land and derelict buildings - need to assess direction of local plan policies. Should examine the degree to which policies and priorities have changed since allocation, the need to promote housing as a priority land use, whether employment land is | Very little capacity identified from this particular source as we have categorised much of this as redevelopment of existing other uses. Only included in this category if vacant or derelict at the time of the study. The existing Local Plan already prioritises |

| | | | |
|----|---------------------------|--|---|
| 7 | | viable, the availability and commercial viability of the existing use, whether existing uses are surplus to requirements and the suitability of sites for housing. It should also consider what funding is available to unlock potential. | housing development. No change to this approach is expected. |
| 8 | House Builders Federation | Objects to the exclusion of schools/colleges as a capacity source. | We have not relied only past trends. We have identified specific sites. Past trends have just been used as a check on these figures. |
| 9 | House Builders Federation | Redevelopment of existing housing areas - Heavily dependent upon policies out side of planning. Also need to focus on net changes. | Agreed. Clearly important to focus on net changes. |
| 10 | House Builders Federation | Redevelopment of car parks - needs to be carefully considered against level of policy support, LTP, political acceptability, town centre vitality and viability and compatibility with surrounding uses. Also objects to exclusion of PNR. | Any car parks identified have been carefully considered. We note the comments made. Further text has been added with respect to PNR car parks to clarify the situation. Many such car parks are associated with other existing uses and so would be considered as part of the 'redevelopment of existing other uses' category. It is important to avoid double counting. Some such sites have been included such as the car park between Station Road and Hills Road. |
| 11 | House Builders Federation | Conversion of commercial buildings - requires an assessment of viability and market tests. | Little capacity identified from this source on basis of past trends so it is impractical to assess viability and do market testing. |
| 12 | House Builders Federation | Review of existing housing allocations - HBF anxious that allocations are not subject to continual review and would not have status changed by UCS. | Noted. All existing housing allocations are carried forward in the UCS. |

| | | | |
|----|---------------------------|--|--|
| 13 | House Builders Federation | Review of other existing allocations in Local Plan - need to examine degree to which policies and priorities have changed since allocation, need to promote housing as a priority land use, viability of existing use, whether existing uses are surplus to requirements and suitability of sites for housing. | Noted. Have considered suitability of sites for housing. |
| 14 | House Builders Federation | Vacant land not previously developed - is agricultural, playing field and allotment land excluded from this category and UCS. | Agricultural land is excluded from the UCS. Further text has been added to the report to clarify the situation with respect to the other two sources. |
| 15 | House Builders Federation | Redevelopment of existing other uses - there is a piece of research relating to petrol filling stations published by the Mayor of London. | Noted. |
| 16 | House Builders Federation | Does the consideration of all of the elements of capacity remove from the UCS an estimate for windfalls? | Yes, we consider that the UCS is comprehensive and thorough and to introduce an additional category for windfalls would risk double counting. However, we do acknowledge that there may be sites that we have not identified that will come forward and there may be sites that have been identified that do not come forward. This is only to be expected. We have added some text to the report to clarify this point. |
| 17 | House Builders Federation | Discounting - The HBF suggested that HBF members may be able to check the discounting rates used by undertaking a detailed analysis of the deliverability of sites. | As indicated in the Committee report, this offer is currently being considered. |
| 18 | Bidwells | 2 site specific representations | Not to be considered at this stage in the process, see recommendations 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4. |

| | | | |
|----|-------------|--|---|
| 19 | Go East | Welcomes the Council's intention to update UCS and congratulates Council on comprehensive nature of methodology. No specific comments to make. | No changes necessary |
| 20 | FPD Savills | Site specific representation and query about NLUD. | Not to be considered at this stage in the process, see recommendations 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4. Factual reply given re NLUD. |
| 21 | Bellway | Sites should not be included which ultimately may not be developed for housing. | This caveat is important since, for the purposes of the Urban Capacity Study it was not possible to look in detail at all the issues raised by each individual site. It would also prejudice the views of future committees if there was an implied assumption that every site identified in the UCS would automatically receive planning permission for housing in the future. The purpose of the UCS is to broadly estimate the potential capacity of the City for residential development, not to function as a schedule of housing development proposals. |
| 22 | Bellway | Disappointed that Council has no current intention to use CPO powers, particularly to bring brownfield sites forward. | Noted. In the past even difficult sites have been brought forward by the market for development and the expectation is that this will continue. |
| 23 | Bellway | Identifies a number of other category sources and land uses and questions whether these have been included in the UCS. | Intensification has been included as its own category. Many of the other land uses have been included under the category 'Redevelopment of existing other uses', some of the identified land uses are not found in Cambridge such as port related land and power stations. |
| 24 | Bellway | Commented that a design led approach to individual sites is likely to yield the best assessment on identified sites looking at density, car parking provision, servicing and facilities, character of area, layout of development, access and accessibility, garden and open space | This approach was not a practical one to pursue given current resources. Conducting such a study would have also created unnecessary controversy and given a misleading impression of exactitude and that planning applications applying the chosen design |

| | | | |
|----|---------|---|---|
| 24 | Bellway | requirements etc. | would be likely to gain planning permission. Our chosen multiplier approach has taken into account density, site size (which would take into account things like open space, provision of roads and other infrastructure etc) and accessibility. |
| 25 | Bellway | Commented upon discounting should take into account developability, market viability, local character and planning standards. | The chosen discount rates reflect officer judgements. The offer from the HBF regarding discounting is currently being considered. Comments on discount rates can be made in the period allowed for comment under recommendation 2.2. |
| 26 | Bellway | Commented that need to justify why relying on past trends continuing for some categories. | Additional text added to clarify that no policy changes are currently proposed for flats over shops or subdivision of existing housing. |
| 27 | Bellway | Commented that land assembly difficult in respect of intensification of existing areas. | Already refer to difficulty of land assembly in text. Therefore, no further change proposed. |
| 28 | Bellway | Commented that land assembly difficult with respect to redevelopment of existing housing areas. | Agreed. Further text added to clarify issue of land assembly and also to reflect the fact that the net gain will be lessened due to the loss of some existing housing. Therefore, discount rate has been lowered from 70% to 60%. |
| 29 | Bellway | Questioned why if the majority of car parks are identified are in Council ownership, why so little is likely to come forward. | All Council owned car parks have been identified as a potential source but very few are expected to be appropriate for housing development due to ongoing requirement for car parking in City. Needs to be consistent with Council's parking policy. Consider this is sufficiently justified in the text. Therefore no change proposed. |

| | | | |
|----|---------|--|---|
| 29 | Bellway | Questioned why if the majority of car parks are identified are in Council ownership, why so little is likely to come forward. | All Council owned car parks have been identified as a potential source but very few are expected to be appropriate for housing development due to ongoing requirement for car parking in City. Needs to be consistent with Council's parking policy. Consider this is sufficiently justified in the text. Therefore no change proposed. |
| 30 | Bellway | Question why 80% discount figure is appropriate for existing housing allocations given the fact that they haven't come forward for development to date. | We consider that the sites may still come forward at some point in the future. Therefore, we consider 80% discount figure appropriate. No change proposed. |
| 31 | Bellway | UCS findings should be available at an early stage and throughout the Local Plan process | Agreed. |
| 32 | Bellway | If brownfield land not delivering, the Authority must be prepared to change approach early enough to ensure housing targets are met. | Agreed. |
| 33 | Bellway | The development industry must be given time to scrutinise the Urban Capacity Study early on the process. | This is proposed - see Committee report recommendation 2.2, 4 week period for comments. |
| 34 | Bellway | Landowners may resist redeveloping land for residential purposed in the hope of greater value for retail purposes. Edge of town centre sites are a good example of this problem. Therefore caution needed. | Noted. The Local Plan review will seek to ensure that land continues to be brought forward for housing development in the existing built up area. |
| 35 | Bellway | Urban Capacity Studies tend to favour design led approaches. Caution should be adopted because the ideal planning solution may not be attractive to the market. | We have not adopted design led approach therefore this is not relevant in this instance. |
| 36 | Bellway | Reliance on brownfield sites needs to be balanced against other considerations such as implication of affordable housing policies (thresholds) on viability of sites | Noted. The Local Plan review will seek to ensure that land continues to be brought forward for housing development in the existing built up area. |

| | | | |
|----|--------------------|--|---|
| 37 | Bellway | UCS should include all area including land within the Green Belt. | Green Belt will be considered separately and depending upon the outcome of the Structure Plan Examination in Public. Tapping the Potential advises that the Urban Area should be defined and the study should focus on this area. This methodology has been adhered to. |
| 38 | Bellway | Ideally all landowners should be contacted to confirm availability. At least the HBF should be involved in the assessment. | It is not considered realistic to contact all landowners. This would be done prior to the allocation of sites in the Local Plan. The purpose of the UCS is to provide an approximate estimate of the Urban Capacity not to be a portfolio of current development opportunities. We have had discussions with the HBF regarding the possibility of their involvement. Also a 4 week period for comments on sites is proposed - see recommendation 2.2 of the Committee report. |
| 39 | Barton Willmore | Welcome use of potential sources of capacity from Tapping the Potential as well as recognition that some sites may come forwards from allotments, playing fields and schools and colleges in some instances. | No change necessary although text has been amended to add greater clarification. |
| 40 | Barton Willmore | Car Parks - the UCS should include any known sites and questions the discount rate being rather low. | All known sites are included. Also further text has been added to clarify the issue of car parking - for example many private non-residential car parks are associated with other uses and in order to avoid double counting have essentially been included in the allowance for redevelopment of existing other uses. Regarding the issue of discounting, see the comments in response to Bellways representations. We consider that there is sufficient explanation in the rest of the UCS concerning this point. |

| | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|--|---|
| 41 | Barton Willmore | Study should allow for windfalls over and above identified sites. | Having undertaken a detailed City survey and identified a significant undiscounted capacity, it would be very difficult to also make a windfall allowance without the danger of double counting inflating the overall capacity of the City. However the UCS does contain the trend data to allow a windfall assessment to be made as this is set out in column 2 of Table 20. |
| 42 | Barton Willmore | The Urban Capacity Study should include some market commentary bearing in mind that markets can change. | Market commentary would soon become dated due to the change mentioned in the comment. |
| 43 | Barton Willmore | Discounting should be more than a simple projection of current market conditions. | Agreed, it also needs to take into account changing national and regional policy such as PPG3 and the scope of the UCS itself concerning whether it is based on detailed survey or broad estimates. |
| 44 | Barton Willmore | The UCS should include a section on how the sites identified fair in terms of long term/short term deliverability. | This assessment has not been undertaken and would have been very difficult to do given that market conditions will vary over the 14 year forward look of the UCS. To a large degree issues of deliverability and timing are factored into the discount rates. |
| 45 | Barton Willmore | The UCS should include a list of individual opportunities for residential development. | It does. No change required. |
| 46 | FPD Savills (additional comment) | It would have been more appropriate to consult on site specific matters prior to committee. | It was considered appropriate to consult on the methodology prior to Committee and on the sites after Committee. A 4 week period for comments on sites is proposed - see recommendation 2.2 of the Committee report. |
| 47 | FPD Savills (additional comment) | Support councils approach to providing evidence on capacity particularly to shed light on deposit Structure Plans housing requirement. | Noted. |

| | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| 48 | FPD Savills (additional comment) | Methodology and Site Specific data should be provided for public consultation purposes including NLUD site information. | It was considered appropriate to consult on the methodology prior to Committee and on the sites after Committee. A 4 week period for comments on sites is proposed - see recommendation 2.2 of the Committee report. |
| 49 | FPD Savills (additional comment) | Some Capacity Sources will only provide limited capacity due to the character of Cambridge e.g. Empty Homes and Flats over Shops. | Agreed. |
| 50 | FPD Savills (additional comment) | Site Specific representation. | Not to be considered at this stage in the process, see recommendations 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4. |
| 51 | FPD Savills (additional comment) | Potential yield difficult to assess. Application of density multipliers based on geographical location and accessibility and the size and shape of individual sites cannot be an exact science and therefore this objective nature of final figures has to be recognised. | We recognise that this is not an exact science. However, it provides a useful approximation with sufficient detail for the purposes of this study. Paragraph 1.5 of the Study explains this approach. |
| 52 | FPD Savills (additional comment) | Discounting rates are influenced by various factors including owner's willingness to release land for development. There is no reference to land ownership matters and therefore assume no surveys undertaken to analyse deliverability of sites. Also no information regarding infrastructure capacity. Could be clarified if council were to undertake design led investigations for each individual site. However, acknowledge time and resources constraints. | It is not considered realistic to contact all landowners. This would be done prior to the allocation of sites in the Local Plan. The purpose of the UCS is to provide an approximate estimate of the Urban Capacity not to be a portfolio of current development opportunities. A design led approach was not a practical one to pursue given current resources. Conducting such a study would have also created unnecessary controversy and given a misleading impression of exactitude and that planning applications applying the chosen design would be likely to gain planning permission. |

| | | | |
|----|--|---|--|
| 53 | FPD Savills (additional comment) | Concern at discount rate of 20% for all allotment land. | Allotments have only been included in the Study where they have a high vacancy rate and are not considered important for environmental reasons. The 20% figure has only been applied to these allotments, not all. |
| 54 | FPD Savills (additional comment) | It is difficult to analyse the methodology in the absence of site-specific data but it does generally follow the guidance in "Tapping the Potential". | Noted. |

Table 8.3: Urban Capacity Study Consultation Comments & Responses - August 2002

| No. | Daterec. | Consultee | Comment | City Council Response |
|------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| 1 | 05/06/2002 | Cllr Ben Bradnack | Lock up garages next to & to the rear of 32 Abbey Road - consider inclusion of this site. | We consider that it is appropriate to include this site in the UCS. |
| 2 | 07/06/2002 | Garth Hanlon FPDSAVILLS | Coldham's Lane former land fill site owned by Land Securities - consider inclusion of this site. | See further comments below at 14. |
| 3 | 07/06/2002 | Bidwells | The Evelyn Hospital, Trumpington Road - consider inclusion of this site. The Addenbrooke's 20/20 Vision shows the possibility of moving the Evelyn Hospital to that campus. If that occurred, the approximately 3 acre Evelyn site would be available for housing. | We consider that it is appropriate to include this site in the UCS. The Addenbrooke's 2020 Vision has been broadly accepted in the deposit draft Structure Plan although the details will still need to be agreed through the Local Plan and future planning applications. |
| 4 | 07/06/2002 | Bidwells | Beadle Road Industrial Estate - consider inclusion of this site. | See further comments below at 49. |
| 5 | 27/06/2002 | Cllr Colin Rosenstiel | Paradise Street rear of Burleigh Street, more than one potential site, one of which might have planning permission (r/o 49 or 50) for a residential unit fronting Paradise Street - consider inclusion of this site. | Agree there may be some potential for a mixed-use scheme in this area with redevelopment of some of these properties. We have therefore identified an area with potential for a mixed-use scheme. |
| 6 | 27/06/2002 | Cllr Colin Rosenstiel | P196 -197 East Road - Old Drill Hall site - consider inclusion of this site. | In view of the location of this site and its current vacant state, we consider that it is appropriate to include this site in the UCS. |

| | | | | |
|---|------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| 7 | 27/06/2002 | Cllr Colin Rosenstiel | Constable's Glass Work, Eden Street - consider inclusion of this site. | Planning permission was granted for 1 dwelling by delegated powers on 23/11/01 subject to completion of a S106 agreement. As at end March 2002, the S106 agreement had not been signed. This had not been included in Table A3.2 due to the small scale of the development. However, for the sake of completeness, we have decided to include all outstanding resolutions to grant planning permission that were subject to the signing of a legal agreement at end March 2002. Therefore, we will include this (and other) sites in Table A3.2. |
| 8 | 27/06/2002 | Cllr Colin Rosenstiel | Garages along Willow Walk, rear of New Square - consider inclusion of this site. | The only potential site is occupied by relatively new garages and we do not consider that this would be a suitable site. |
| 9 | 27/06/2002 | Cllr Colin Rosenstiel | Lensfield Road, rear of 20 -58 - consider inclusion of this site. | We do not consider that it is appropriate to identify this land for housing. The land has not been drawn to our attention by the landowner and in many respects is no different to any other back gardens of similar residential properties in the city that have not been identified. |

| | | | | |
|----|------------|---|---|--|
| 10 | 27/06/2002 | Cllr Colin Rosenstiel | 1-2 Trumpington Street and Bene't Place, Lensfield Road - consider inclusion of this site. | Even if these sites were to come forward for residential development it would be for conversion of commercial buildings. We have relied on past trends to project potential capacity from this source. Therefore we do not consider it appropriate to add this site at this stage. |
| 11 | 05/07/2002 | Cllr Colin Rosenstiel | 53-56 Burleigh Street - consider inclusion of this site. | See response to 5 above. |
| 12 | 29/07/2002 | Bidwells, R Hopwood | The Paddocks, Cherry Hinton Rd - consider inclusion of this site. | See further comments below at 54. |
| 13 | 02/08/2002 | The Halpern Partnership Limited Anna Parsons | Betjeman House, Hills Road - welcome inclusion of the site within the UCS. Submitted further information regarding site accessibility. | Comments noted. |
| 14 | 02/08/2002 | FPD Savills Garth Hanlon | Coldham's Lane former landfill site owned by Land Securities - consider inclusion of this site. Refers to information previously submitted to CCC. Site within urban area, highly accessible, close to shops and community facilities, City Centre and railway station short cycle distance. Suitable mitigation measures can be designed to mitigate risks of former landfill site. Conservation and ecological issues have also been assessed. Reference to DEGW study. No direct assessment of the site in the study but Table 15 states that the 38 acre site allocated as site 8.7 has been assessed | This site is not considered suitable as a site for residential development by our Environmental Health Department or the Environment Agency, having examined the risk and mitigation information that has been submitted to them to date. Therefore it would be inappropriate to include the site in the study. The site is also allocated in the current Local Plan as land for recreational development and structurally important open space. The Local Plan Schedule of Proposals states that the proposed use for site 8.7 is 'open space, active and passive |

| | | | | |
|----|------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| 14 | 02/08/2002 | FPD Savills Garth Hanlon | <p>for housing potential. Page 47 states that it is 'not suitable for residential development'. Surprising such a short statement given the amount and nature of material that has been submitted. Indeed MJ Carter Associates continue to be in discussion with the Environment Agency and Environmental Health. The justification for the Councils short statement appears to relate to the capacity column on p47 which states that this is related to the 'retention of open space for the setting of Cherry Hinton'. Suggest that site's contribution to the setting of Cherry Hinton is limited and is an issue that can be more than adequately addressed in the need to retain open space in new housing development. Should include site in UCS and allocate site in Local Plan.</p> | <p>outdoor sport and recreation, not including motorised vehicles or firearms, wildlife areas'. The comments column adds, 'open space to retain and enhance setting of Cherry Hinton and the rest of Cambridge, parts of site important as City Wildlife Sites, but groups as a whole considered to be more important than individual parts; possible use of open area and flooded pit for quiet outdoor recreation, wildlife and conservation interests to be given high priority; special management arrangements may be required.'</p> <p>The land in question is also a City Wildlife site and the majority of the site lies within a Wildlife Corridor.</p> <p>The 'Capacity' column in Table 15 should more appropriately read 'Comments'. Table to be amended accordingly.</p> |
| 15 | 02/08/2002 | Andrew Martin Associates | <p>UCAS well presented - very clear and well presented - very clear and understandable methodology. Impressed with thoroughness and efforts to avoid double counting and to the discounting procedures to ensure that potential supply is not overestimated.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| 16 | 02/08/2002 | Andrew Martin Associates | <p>Schools/Educational Land - paras 3.7, 3.51, 4.116-4.126 - concerned at the principle of including this source. Educational land finite and precious resource. Provision of 6500 homes in urban area will result in increase in number of school children - up to approx 2000 primary school age plus secondary school age children. Urban extensions will include new facilities but this will not cater for new development in Cambridge. Schools education plan looks primarily to 2005. Local Plan needs to look further ahead. Should safeguard educational land and discount from the study.</p> | <p>We have liaised with the County Council regarding their plans for school closures/mergers/relocations. We have only included those sites where there is a high degree of certainty regarding the closure of the sites. The issue of school sites is considered in considerable detail in paras 3.7, 3.51 and 4.116 - 4.126. You will note that the school sites identified are actually being relocated rather than completely closed. Therefore, we do not consider that any change is necessary.</p> |
| 17 | 02/08/2002 | Andrew Martin Associates | <p>Student accommodation - para 3.10 Pleased to see excluded from study as potential source of capacity. Whilst true that additional purpose built accommodation may free up capacity in the city, it will not result in new accommodation per se. Units would simply form part of the general vacant stock expected in any housing market and which Tapping the Potential states should be excluded from studies. Also, the converse may occur - more students = increased strain on housing stock. Students at Polytechnic are increasing. Do not suggest that the capacity study should be discounted as a result of potentially increasing demands from students but clearly should be monitored.</p> | <p>Agree this should be monitored. We refer to paras 3.10 - 3.12 of the UCS in which we set out further details and state that such housing could potentially be an indirect source of capacity for the future. This would not be counted as vacant property for any length of time as it would soon be returned to the general market for housing. Much will ultimately depend upon the policies and proposals in the new Local Plan.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| 18 | 02/08/2002 | Andrew Martin Associates | <p>'Intensification' - para. 3.32 - 3.35 Agree this is a potential source- however, aware that redevelopment of large gardens in areas that have identifiable character not straightforward, many development control decisions do prevent capacity being realised as a result of refusals along the line of "out of keeping with existing character". Agree that often land assembly difficulties. Suggest study would be more robust if it sought to identify what level of development has been achieved in the past from this source, based upon an identification of character areas.</p> | <p>Much of the scope is from garage courts rather than large gardens. The number of sites identified from survey and analysis were very similar to that which might be anticipated through the projection of past trends. Clearly the past trends related to all character areas. In addition, the survey figures are then being discounted by 85%. Therefore we are confident that the findings are realistic for this capacity source. We recognise that the density multipliers are likely to vary (see paragraph 3.63). This will enable sensitive design in keeping with the character of the area.</p> |
| 19 | 02/08/2002 | Andrew Martin Associates | <p>"Redevelopment from existing other uses' and 'reviewing existing other allocations'- para 3.45-46 and 3.49-50 PPG3 states LPAs should review use of non-residential sites and to consider whether these could better be used for housing. One needs to take into account that our towns and cities are generally sustainable places to live because they contain a range of different land uses. Agree this should be a source, and note that the existing allocations source has been heavily discounted. With regard to the 'redevelopment of other uses', suggest some allowance should be made for retention/re-provision of existing non-residential uses as part of any redevelopment, reflecting a general policy</p> | <p>We recognise the issue and emphasis in PPG3 on mixed-use development. Nevertheless, most sites coming forward within the existing urban area are likely to be for purely residential development given the nature of the locality. However, we recognise that mixed use may be more appropriate in some instances (paragraphs 1.5 and 3.57). 'Redevelopment of existing other uses' has already been discounted by 50% so no further change is needed whilst reviewing 'existing other allocations' has been heavily discounted by 10%. This acknowledges that not all of the sites will necessarily come forward for residential development</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| 19 | 02/08/2002 | Andrew Martin Associates | approach of maintaining diversity of land-uses. | |
| 20 | 02/08/2002 | Andrew Martin Associates | Assessing Yield/Site Size - para 3.56-3.58/3.65 Query whether discount applied to large sites (over 2 ha) of 50-75% takes into account the potential requirement for inclusion of mixed-uses, or only ancillary uses (public open space, roads, directly related facilities). If not, discount may need to be lowered to take into account that some major residential schemes may also involve the provision of non-residential uses. | Paragraph 3.65 explains the basis for the site size multiplier together with the references to the research upon which this was based which is set out in Tapping the Potential. The site size multiplier was only one of three factors taken into account. Paragraph 3.57 also makes it clear that the inclusion of a site does not necessarily mean that 100% residential would be acceptable. Mixed use may be more appropriate in some instances. Most of the sites identified are relatively small. The one major exception to this is the Cambridge Northern Fringe East. We acknowledge that this will be a mixed-use area but this has already been taken into account in the CNF strategy and it has been demonstrated that this site is likely to be able to accommodate the potential capacity quoted in the UCS, having taken into account other land uses on the site. By way of note, Brooklands Avenue, one of the largest sites that has recently been granted permission is primarily residential with just some offices, and no shops etc. We would also add that the Hillier Parker Retail Study 2001 has made it clear that there will no further requirement for major convenience retail development to 2016. |

| | | | | |
|----|------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| 21 | 02/08/2002 | Andrew Martin Associates | <p>Site Size - paragraph 3.65 Agree net to gross area on smaller sites likely to be closer to 100% for the reasons given. However, small sites often include infill in existing residential areas and can be difficult to develop at densities substantially different to the character of the area - therefore limits new density. Therefore suggest that density multiplier for small sites should be set towards the lower or middle end of the spectrum or a discount applied to smaller sites generally.</p> | <p>This is really taken into account in the site shape multiplier where we recognise for example that long thin sites may be more difficult to develop to such high densities. We would also add that some parts of inner Cambridge such as the close knit terraces actually have existing densities that are higher than the density assumptions made in the UCS at paragraph 3.63. Otherwise the density assumptions broadly reflect recent trends in the density of recent planning applications.</p> |
| 22 | 02/08/2002 | Andrew Martin Associates | <p>Discounting the Potential/Past Trends - pleased to see UCS includes discounting. Anticipate that Green Belt releases will reduce attractiveness of developing marginal sites within the City, as a result of the increased availability of homes elsewhere. One of purposes of Green Belt to promote urban renewal. This should be reflected in discount figures. Concerned that analysis of past trends based on short time period. - assumptions therefore less reliable. During past 4 years, supply from external sources (not just Green Belt but elsewhere in sub-region) have been v limited and when demand for housing (and hence profits) have been particularly high. Likely to have had an effect on the rate of supply. Therefore, suggest</p> | <p>Agree that past trends taken over limited time scale. However, for most capacity sources, wherever possible dwelling capacity figures from survey and analysis were used, with the figures based on past trends serving only as a check on the survey/analysis figures (see para. 5.3). Recognise that changes in planning policy including the release of land from the Green Belt will affect the market. However, PPG3 advises on the need for phasing of the release of greenfield sites in an attempt to maintain a balance in the market and to ensure that brownfield sites still come forward for development. This will be incorporated into policies in the new Local Plan. There is very strong support from government to</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| 22 | 02/08/2002 | Andrew Martin Associates | <p>changes to discount rates as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Subdivision of existing housing 100% = over-estimate. Although policies have not changed, pressure to produce housing from this source, coupled with diminishing supply of readily available properties, would suggest a discount of between 50-75%. (b) Flats over shops - 100% allowance over-estimate for the same reasons as (a) - proposed discount of 50-75%. (c) Empty Homes - Agreed. (d) Previously developed vacant and derelict land - Agreed. (e) Intensification of existing housing areas - Reduced demand due to other potential sources, problems of assembly, and limitations on altering existing character in some areas suggest discount of around 60% more robust. (f) Redevelopment of existing housing - similar issues to (e) above, but added disadvantage of loss of existing residential units - suggest discount of 40-50%. | <p>ensure maximum use of previously developed land. Local Authorities meeting its agreed target for previously developed land is a best value performance Indicator and such performance indicators are likely to be of growing importance in the coming years. Central sites will also continue to benefit from their central location close to city centre services and o the rail station and can therefore be expected to remain in demand from developers and house hunters. We consider each of the discount issues where there is disagreement in turn:</p> <p>a) The assertion is not based on any evidence. The number of conversions is only a very small percentage of the total stock. We have no reason to believe that there will be a reduction in the number of dwellings coming forward from this particular capacity source. See paragraph 3.74ab) As above. See paragraph 3.74be) Already the survey figures are lower figures than past trends and these figures have then been discounted by 85%. Therefore, we do not consider that there is any change necessary. f) We note that there was in fact an error in C6R5. It should be 225, not 262. The discount is already below the lower threshold recommended in Tapping the</p> |
|----|------------|--------------------------|---|--|

| | | | | |
|----|------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| 22 | 02/08/2002 | Andrew Martin Associates | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (g) Redevelopment of car parks - Agreed. (h) Conversion of commercial buildings - less pressure on Cambridge market likely to reduce rate from past trends - suggest 60%. (i) Review of existing housing allocations - Agreed. (j) Review of other existing allocations - Agreed. (k) Vacant land not previously developed - The study suggests that little land is left in this category, and that most already has consent - indeed, no sites could be identified from the survey of from NLUD - this suggests that, irrespective of the small number of units that have come from this source in the past, the actual capacity is 0. (l) Review of existing other uses - decreased pressure, existing productive uses, finite supply of available sites, and requirement for retained uses, suggests more appropriate rate would be 30%. (m) Allotments - Agreed. (n) Schools and Colleges - 0% due to need to avoid loss of finite resource, likely to be | <p>Potential. However, we agree that this is likely to be one of the more difficult capacity sources to realise. Therefore we recommend a reduction to a discount rate of 55%.h) This projected dwelling capacity is based on past trends. We have taken the upper rate quoted in Tapping the Potential 85% based upon the high demand for land for housing in Cambridge. Urban extensions are likely to include some new commercial development and therefore there is likely to be less pressure on the existing commercial stock. Poorly performing stock may therefore become available or conversion to residential development. In the actual event that balance of commercial advantage is likely to vary over the period to 2016.k) These sites in Cambridge are likely to be very small sites due to built up nature of the existing urban area, together with the protection afforded to many open spaces.</p> <p>However, due to the size of such sites, we may well have missed some such opportunities in the survey of the city.</p> |
|----|------------|--------------------------|--|--|

| | | | | |
|----|------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| 22 | 02/08/2002 | Andrew Martin Associates | <p>be required as a result of urban intensification over the longer term.</p> <p>(o) Playing Fields/Recreation grounds - Agreed.</p> <p>Applying the above, revised discounts rates would suggest that a more robust estimate of future capacity (excluding existing commitments) would be 2565-2654, compared to the 3542 identified in the draft Report.</p> | <p>l) Many recent planning permissions on such sites have yet to come forward as completions and therefore have yet to be included in the analysis of past trends. See above regarding the issue of phasing. In some respects the CNF (East) site is one of the principal areas of risk in the UCS. However, there is quite a long lead in time to allow this site to come forward (to 2016). It is in the commercial interests of landowners to bring such land forward for development. Finally there is strong government support for the redevelopment of previously developed land in PPG3 and recent government statements. n) see our earlier comments relating to schools and colleges.</p> |
| 23 | 02/08/2002 | Andrew Martin Associates | <p>Outstanding planning permissions normal practice in land availability studies to discount when assessing the likely contribution from outstanding planning permissions, and following a study by Roger Tym & Partners, the use of a 10% discount has been quite common. As part</p> | <p>Agree that it is appropriate to apply a discount to unimplemented planning permissions. Therefore, we propose to amend the UCS to apply a discount of 10% to extant unimplemented planning permissions and those permissions subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| 23 | 02/08/2002 | Andrew Martin Associates | <p>of the recent UDP Inquiry in the London Borough of Redbridge, this Practice was involved in an in-depth appraisal of urban capacity, and the issue of whether or not outstanding permissions should be discounted was a matter of great debate. Eventually, an exercise was undertaken whereby some 15 years of previous applications were reviewed to see what percentage had come forward; the result was that at least some 8% of all consents were not pursued. It would be interesting to undertake a similar exercise in Cambridge, but in the absence of that information at the moment, we would suggest some allowance of between 5-10% should be made for non-implementation of outstanding permissions.</p> <p>This would suggest that the overall supply from existing commitments would be 2852-2921, compared to 2990, as suggested in the report.</p> | permissions and those permissions subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement. |
| 24 | 02/08/2002 | Andrew Martin Associates | <p>Overall Conclusions - well researched and presented with generally realistic assumptions. Concern that over next 15 years with Green Belt releases development context will be v different. Analysis of past trends over a short time period during which time high demand and high values. Therefore, consider study findings are slightly inflated. Revised est. 5417-5575. The revised .</p> | <p>Comments noted. See responses above.</p> <p>Past trends were only relied upon in 3 of the 15 capacity sources. For the remaining capacity sources, the figures were based upon survey and analysis. We agree that there are practical reasons for taking a cautious approach and are well aware of the implications in terms of Green Belt sites and the</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|------------|--|--|--|
| 24 | 02/08/2002 | Andrew Martin Associates | <p>estimate still based on high-density yield from small sites which AMA dispute. Sofigures still likely to be relatively high. Good practical reasons for taking cautious approach. Most agree that lack of housing in past led to imbalance between supply and demand, high prices, social exclusion and mismatch between employment growth and infrastructure (incl. housing). Urgent need to ensure houses are delivered on the ground. Over ambitious estimate of supply will mean other options are held back. Over est. will exacerbate recent problem of housing under-provision in the region; and Structure Plan allocation for the City will be based substantially upon the results of this capacity study. A failure to deliver the full number of units estimated will directly impact onto the level of development required from the Green Belt areas of the City and could result in sporadic loss of additional Green Belt sites later in the plan period.</p> | <p>need to bring forward land for housing. However, we have sought to undertake a thorough and realistic study that will provide robust information. Clearly it is impossible to predict the future but we have attempted to complete a detailed assessment to provide a robust baseline for planning for the future. The current emphasis on increasing the number of houses as a priority is likely to be reflected in the new Local Plan. Ultimately though the delivery of the full number of units is not simply a question of making land available but is also dependent upon the local and national economy amongst other factors.</p> |
| 25 | 02/08/2002 | Cambridge Preservation Society- Barry Pearce | <p>Expressed concern regarding consultation - too short and should have been directly consulted. Will be difficult to refuse planning permission for residential development if a site has been included in the UCS, despite the caveats given in the report.</p> | <p>Comments noted. The UCS is only a study, not a Local Plan Proposals schedule. The new Local Plan will be the appropriate forum to include a new proposals schedule and it is only these proposals sites where there will be a presumption in favour of residential development. Having said that, the thrust of the current Local Plan is to look favourably on increased housing</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|------------|--|--|--|
| 25 | 02/08/2002 | Cambridge Preservation Society - Barry Pearce | | housing in the City (paragraph 6.33) and this is likely to be carried forward into the new Local Plan in view of the great need for housing in the City. We would refer you to the caveats in paragraphs 1.4-1.6 of the UCS and confirm that these are important caveats. |
| 26 | 02/08/2002 | Cambridge Preservation Society - Barry Pearce | With few exceptions, most of the sites identified are acceptable for housing. | Comment noted |
| 27 | 02/08/2002 | Cambridge Preservation Society - Barry Pearce | Council clutching at straws for a few of the sites. Difficult to see how some sites can effectively be used for housing (or anything else) e.g. site 160. Also development costs of some sites will be very high, perhaps too high even for housing. | Comments noted. Site 160 is in fact a site on the National Land Use Database and therefore we needed to take account of this. We consider that this site may have potential for residential development and hence considered that it was appropriate to include it in the Study. We would also draw your attention to the fact that the process of 'discounting' takes account of the fact that not all identified sites will come forward for development (perhaps due to cost, ownership issues, site specific constraints etc.) |
| 28 | 02/08/2002 | Cambridge Preservation Society - Barry Pearce | Availability of sites likely to be very constrained, e.g. ownership. Therefore surprised that there | We would draw your attention to the fact that the process of 'discounting' |

| | | | | |
|----|------------|--|--|--|
| 28 | 02/08/2002 | Cambridge Preservation Society - Barry Pearce | is no current intention to use CPO powers to bring sites forward. Council rather optimistic with comment on p 12 saying that even in the past difficult sites have been brought forward by the market. Especially difficult over some sites which are difficult to access e.g. sites 60 and 61 in Chalmers Rd and Ward Rd. | <p>takes account of the fact that not all identified sites will come forward for development (perhaps due to cost, ownership issues, site specific constraints etc.) We would also add that the market has performed in the past and at the present time we have no reason to consider that it will not continue to do so. Finally, with regard to the issue of CPO powers, members agreed a slight amendment to the wording of the last sentence of paragraph 1.6 of the UCS so that it reads:</p> <p><i>'Such decisions will rest with the landowner as your officers do not see a need for the Local Planning Authority to change its policy on compulsory purchase powers to facilitate the assembly of housing development sites. For the most part, in Cambridge, this can successfully be left to market forces.'</i></p> <p>As you will see, this revised wording does not rule out the possibility of the use of CPO powers in the future but states that for the most part we do not</p> |
|----|------------|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|----|------------|--|--|--|
| 28 | 02/08/2002 | Cambridge Preservation Society - Barry Pearce | is no current intention to use CPO powers to bring sites forward. Council rather optimistic with comment on p 12 saying that even in the past difficult sites have been brought forward by the market. Especially difficult over some sites which are difficult to access e.g. sites 60 and 61 in Chalmers Rd and Ward Rd. | takes account of the fact that not all identified sites will come forward for development (perhaps due to cost, ownership issues, site specific constraints etc.) We would also add that the market has performed in the past and at the present time we have no reason to consider that it will not continue to do so. Finally, with regard to the issue of CPO powers, members agreed a slight amendment to the wording of the last sentence of paragraph 1.6 of the UCS so that it reads: 'Such decisions will rest with the landowner as your officers do not see a need for the Local Planning Authority to change its policy on compulsory purchase powers to facilitate the assembly of housing development sites. For the most part, in Cambridge, this can successfully be left to market forces.' As you will see, this revised wording does not rule out the possibility of the use of CPO powers in the future but states that for the most part we do not consider they will be needed. |
|----|------------|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|----|------------|--|--|---|
| 29 | 02/08/2002 | Cambridge Preservation Society- Barry Pearce | <p>Not convinced housing would always be the best use of the land (as distinct from acceptable use). This is certainly the case for sites that are mature gardens with trees etc. Ask Council to look carefully again at such sites. Also not clear why some gardens included and not others. Opposed to including sports grounds and allotments on list.</p> <p>Questionable whether such sites have no environmental or public value. The fact that they have a high vacancy or low usage rate is a temporary phenomenon. The reports own figures suggest that allotment vacancy actually decreasing. Once developed will be lost forever.</p> <p>Significant number of sites listed if developed for housing would impinge on the ability of the local authority to meet its other planning policies, as well as regional and national policies. Some sites have value or potential value as sites for open space, with respect to wildlife protection, amenity, active and passive forms of recreation and urban structure. Chesterton Sidings (site 172) is noteworthy in this regard. Given the deficit of certain types of open space e.g. Playing fields and childrens playspace many sites have as much value for open space as for housing eg. site 133 Seymour Street - a</p> | <p>Each site would need to be considered on its merits. We recognise that not all potential gardens will have been included but value judgements have been made on site by officers. With respect to sports grounds and allotments, very high discount rates have been applied and indeed very few sites identified. Paragraphs 4.104 - 4.115 clearly explain the rationale behind the selection of sites. We would also emphasise that the identified capacity is in fact much lower than that that might be anticipated on the basis of past trends. Discounting also means that we have taken into account that fact that not all identified sites will necessarily come forward for development. Each site will need to be considered on its merits. It is important to make the best use of previously developed land in the urban area. We recognise the need to maintain residential amenity and this will be reflected in the new Local Plan.</p> |
|----|------------|--|--|---|

| | | | | |
|----|------------|--|--|--|
| 29 | 02/08/2002 | Cambridge Preservation Society- Barry Pearce | small but locally significant site. Concern that sites identified on UCS list will only be considered for housing, or at least there will be a presumption in favour of housing. One protection against this is the general discount rate and assumptions about density which is insufficient and unsatisfactory. | Chesterton Sidings has not in fact been identified in this study as it lies within South Cambridgeshire's administrative boundary. The thrust of the current Local Plan is already to increase the number of dwellings in the City. |
| 30 | 02/08/2002 | Sue Dellar, Housing | Three Crowns House, Hills Road - consider inclusion of this site | This site may have some potential as part of a mixed-use scheme. Therefore we have identified this site in the study. |
| 31 | 02/08/2002 | Sue Dellar, Housing | Victorian/Georgian House, Hills Road - consider inclusion of this site | This site is now being re-developed and therefore it is inappropriate to include the site in the study. |
| 32 | 02/08/2002 | CPRE - S Traverse-Healy | CPRE recognises that the survey is comprehensive and professionally executed, taking into account Government Guidelines in Tapping the Potential. However, concerned that the potential for development of non-residential car parking outside the development of the whole site might be understated, particularly in the light of proposals for work place parking charges. Recognise that the UCS is a snap shot in time and changes to planning policy and market forces can alter the position. | Comments noted. Some car parks have been included in the car parks category, others that are associated with buildings are effectively included in the redevelopment of existing other uses. We consider that to introduce any further provision for development of non-residential car parks could risk double counting. In addition, at this stage there is no assurance that workplace parking charges will be introduced in Cambridge and even if it is, when this might occur. Therefore, we consider it unrealistic to include any further provision in the UCS at this stage. |

| | | | | |
|----|------------|----------------------------|--|---|
| 33 | 02/08/2002 | Fuller Peiser - F Sandwith | Support inclusion of Site 88 (Foster Mills Site). | Comment noted |
| 34 | 02/08/2002 | Fuller Peiser - F Sandwith | Object to 'unconstrained housing capacity' of site as 102 dwellings. Suggest could accommodate 314+ dwellings. | Whilst we agree that this site is quite likely to accommodate additional capacity if it gets planning permission, we maintain that it is important to apply the formula consistently throughout the City. However, as expressed in paragraph 3.57 we accept that there is likely to be some deviation from the calculated capacities. |
| 35 | 02/08/2002 | Fuller Peiser - F Sandwith | Assessing Yield - Accept that by necessity formula has been used to assess yield. However, this approach is broad and inflexible. Request amendment to paragraph 3.57 to read ' <u>...may be significantly higher or lower</u> than those stated in this study.' | Important to apply formula consistently to all sites throughout the City. However, as expressed in paragraph 3.57 we accept that there is likely to be some deviation from the calculated capacities. We are prepared to accept some of the proposed change of wording to read 'significantly higher' but we would prefer to leave the words, 'or lower' in the text too to cater for those instances where the capacity achievable on a particular site may be lower than that calculated by means of the formula. |

| | | | | |
|----|------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| 36 | 02/08/2002 | Fuller Peiser - F Sandwith | <p>Geographical Location and Accessibility - Site 88 included in Band 1. Object to figure of 75 dph used to calculate capacity of sites. Densities in excess of 150 dph could be achieved. Request amended wording to paragraph 3.63 to read, ' The indicated dwellings per hectare figure has been identified for the purposes of calculating the site capacities in this study. <u>The figures are for indicative purposes only and do not necessarily reflect what can be achieved on individual sites.</u> Development would actually vary from this figure within the indicated range although we would expect most to be around the indicated figures on the basis of recent trends.'</p> | <p>As explained above, it is important to apply formula consistently to all sites throughout the City. However, as expressed in paragraph 3.57 we accept that there is likely to be some deviation from the calculated capacities. We are prepared to accept some of the proposed change of wording to read, <u>'The figures are for indicative purposes only and do not necessarily reflect what can be achieved on individual sites.'</u> This will not affect the meaning of the original text. However we propose to retain the last sentence relating to range because <u>most</u> sites would be within this, even if some sites are not. We do not expect the new Local Plan to have an upper density limit policy in line with the existing Local plan. Instead, the density will be down to design, parking and other site specific issues.</p> |
| 37 | 02/08/2002 | Fuller Peiser - F Sandwith | <p>Size - gross to net ratio for development sites over 2ha (50-75%) is based on the assumption that as the demand for other land uses becomes greater, so the proportion of the site available for residential development decreases. Seek clarification that this range is only indicative and will not prejudice the ability of sites to accommodate a proportion of residential development in excess of 75%.</p> | <p>We agree that this is only indicative and is not intended to influence future Local Plan proposals, planning briefs or our assessment of individual planning applications. See paragraph 3.57 of the UCS for confirmation of this position.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|------------|----------------------------------|---|---|
| 38 | 02/08/2002 | Fuller Peiser - F Sandwith | Discount Rates - Rank Hovis committed to closure of milling activities at Station Road. Development of site being pursued by Laing/Bryant Homes. Therefore, whilst this site falls in the REOU category, do not consider 50% discount rate should apply to this site | Discount rates apply to capacity source categories rather than individual sites, as we are not able to be so specific and indeed 'Tapping the Potential' for this reason advises applying the discount rate only to each broad capacity source. We have to discount the potential capacity of each source because not all of the capacity will actually be forthcoming in the period to 2016. This can be for a number of reasons some of which are listed below such as land ownership, site specific constraints etc. |
| 39 | 02/08/2002 | South Cambridgeshire DC - C Hunt | Received study with interest as are developing own methodology. Important to seek general compatibility of approach in assessments of capacity. | Comments noted. Meeting arranged to discuss methodology. |
| 40 | 02/08/2002 | South Cambridgeshire DC - C Hunt | Important to make best possible use of land in urban area of Cambridge. Not clear whether study has been sufficiently ambitious in projecting the potential contribution from all potential sources of intensification particularly in residential areas. Not clear that looking at past trends over the long term will be very helpful or give a realistic indication of likely future trends. | Agree important to make best possible use of land in the urban area of Cambridge. The study has not aimed to be ambitious but realistic. Only looked at trends for the past 4 years and generally only as a check on survey findings. Not generally sought to rely on trends. |

| | | | | |
|----|------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| 41 | 02/08/2002 | South Cambridgeshire DC - C Hunt | Not clear whether assessment of intensification includes small sites. Over the period 1991 -2001 completions of infill, group and other development totalled 744 dwellings. Housebuilders however would prefer greenfield to brownfield sites. | Small sites are included in the study. However, inevitably some will have been overlooked in the survey. We have not included an allowance for windfalls in order to avoid double counting. We consider that the survey and analysis has been thorough enough to avoid the need for an additional windfall allowance. The figure of 744 dwellings was taken from data given by the City to the County. These figures include dwellings from a variety of capacity sources, not just intensification. |
| 42 | 02/08/2002 | Bidwells - R Hopwood | The Old University Rifle Range Site, off Herschel Road - Jesus College. Area - 5.081ha - consider inclusion of this site | This site is located in the Green Belt and is therefore beyond the scope of this study that looks at the area of the City that lies within the inner Green Belt boundary as it existed in 2002 (see paragraph 3.4 and map 2 in Appendix 8). |
| 43 | 02/08/2002 | Bidwells - R Hopwood | Land at St Barnabas Road, Christs College 0.107ha - consider inclusion of this site | We consider that it is appropriate to include part of this site in the UCS. We have excluded the house and its garden but included the garages and parking area to the rear. |

| | | | | |
|----|------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| 44 | 02/08/2002 | Bidwells - Emma Veale | Gonville and Caius College: 25 - 29 Glisson Rd - site 6. It is in fact 0.09 hectares (not 0.0692 hectares as identified in the study). Capable of 14 rather than 5 units identified in the study. | We have checked the site area of the existing housing allocation on our GIS system and it is 0.0692 ha. Therefore no change is required. With respect to the issue of capacity, we draw your attention to paragraphs 3.56 - 3.72 that describes to formula approach to the calculation. It is important to apply the formula consistently across the City although we recognise that the actual eventual capacity achievable on a particular site may be higher or lower than the theoretical unconstrained capacity quoted in the report. |
| 45 | 02/08/2002 | Bidwells - Emma Veale | Gonville and Caius College: 1 Ditton Walk - site currently used as a warehouse and comprises 0.28ha - consider inclusion of this site. | We accept that this site may have some potential capacity for residential development, subject to the 50% discount rate for this capacity source. We refer to the caveat in paragraph 1.4 of the Urban Capacity Study which makes it clear that not all sites identified in the UCS will necessarily be granted planning permission for residential development. |

| | | | | |
|----|------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| 45 | 02/08/2002 | Bidwells - Emma Veale | | <p>The current Local Plan employment policy is subject to change through the Local Plan review process. This may release more employment land for residential development and/or amend the criteria set out in policy ET5 concerning changes of use from employment. There is a continuing emphasis in the Structure Plan, RPG and national planning policy on maximising residential development in urban areas, but also there is a need to provide a range of employment opportunities in Cambridge that are accessible to local people. The employment policy review will be influenced by many factors including the Industrial Land Review Study dated January 2001.</p> |
| 46 | 02/08/2002 | Bidwells - Emma Veale | <p>Gonville and Caius College: Various garage blocks at Glisson Rd, Gresham Rd and Drosier Rd - may be sites 65 and 66. Potential to extend the Gresham Rd site between Harvey Rd and Glisson Rd to include part of the rear of the Harvey Rd houses. 0.232ha - consider inclusion of this site.</p> | <p>Extend site 66 to include larger area. New area 0.2328ha</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|------------|-----------------------|---|---|
| 47 | 02/08/2002 | Bidwells - Emma Veale | Gonville and Caius College: Cambridge Lawn Tennis Club and Hockey Field, Wilberforce Rd - consider inclusion of this site. | This site has already been included in the UCS as it is an existing Higher Education allocation 9.4 in the current Local Plan. The site is number 182 in the Urban Capacity Study. |
| 48 | 02/08/2002 | Bidwells - Emma Veale | Botanic House, Hills Road, Aberdeen Asset Managers - site area 0.611ha - consider inclusion of this site. | This site has already been included in the Urban Capacity Study - site 58. |
| 49 | 02/08/2002 | Bidwells - R Hopwood | Beadle Road Industrial Estate, Ditton Walk - Willowbrite. Currently in storage and distribution use. Site area - 1.4 ha. - consider inclusion of this site. | We accept that this site may have some potential capacity for residential development, subject to the 50% discount rate for this capacity source. We refer to the caveat in paragraph 1.4 of the Urban Capacity Study which makes it clear that not all sites identified in the UCS will necessarily be granted planning permission for residential development. The current Local Plan employment policy is subject to change through the Local Plan review process. This may release more employment land for residential development and/or amend the criteria set out in policy ET5 concerning changes of use from employment. There is a continuing emphasis in the Structure Plan, RPG and national planning policy on maximising residential development in urban areas, but also there is a need to provide a range of employment opportunities in Cambridge that are accessible to local |

| | | | | |
|----|------------|----------------------|---|---|
| 49 | 02/08/2002 | Bidwells - R Hopwood | | people. The employment policy review will be influenced by many factors including the Industrial Land Review Study dated January 2001. |
| 50 | 02/08/2002 | Bidwells - R Hopwood | Land off Herschel Road, A R Farming Ltd - potential residential redevelopment site. Site area 0.243ha. | Half of this site has already been included in the Urban Capacity Study as the western half is an existing Higher Education allocation 9.8 in the current Local Plan. The site is number 186 in the Urban Capacity Study. Part of the site is located in the Indicative floodplain and therefore it is not appropriate to include this site. However, the remaining portion of the site has been included in the Study. |
| 51 | 02/08/2002 | Bidwells - E Veale | Trinity College: Cocks and Hens Tennis Club, Clerk Maxwell Rd - identified as site 189 in the Urban Capacity Study. Confirm that the site should stay in the study. Site measures 0.224ha (our study states 0.888ha). | This site has already been included in the UCS as it is an existing Higher Education allocation 9.11 in the current Local Plan. The site is number 189 in the Urban Capacity Study. |

| | | | | |
|----|------------|----------------------|---|---|
| 52 | 02/08/2002 | Bidwells - E Veale | 31 Queen Edith's Way - Clare College. Site currently used for 4 residential flats. Site could support more intensive development. Site area 0.232ha. | We consider that it is appropriate to include this site in the UCS. |
| 53 | 02/08/2002 | Bidwells - E Veale | 38 Queen Ediths Way - Clare College. Site under utilised. Would like to investigate possibility of intensifying the use with a mixed residential use for medical students and private housing. Site area 0.178ha. | We consider that it is appropriate to include this site in the UCS. |
| 54 | 02/08/2002 | Bidwells - R Hopwood | The Paddocks Trading Estate, Cherry Hinton Road. Potential redevelopment site currently in employment use. Site area 2.804ha. Currently B1, B8 and sui generis uses. Site would be available for redevelopment towards the end of the local plan review period. Buildings likely to reach the end of their economic life in about 10 years. | We accept that this site may have some potential capacity for residential development, subject to the 50% discount rate for this capacity source. We refer to the caveat in paragraph 1.4 of the Urban Capacity Study which makes it clear that not all sites identified in the UCS will necessarily be granted planning permission for residential development. The current Local Plan employment policy is subject to change through the Local Plan review process. This may release more employment land for residential development and/or amend the criteria set out in policy ET5 concerning changes of use from employment. There is a continuing emphasis in the Structure Plan, RPG and national planning policy on maximising residential development in urban areas, |

| | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 54 | 02/08/2002 | Bidwells - R Hopwood | | but also there is a need to provide a range of employment opportunities in Cambridge that are accessible to local people. The employment policy review will be influenced by many factors including the Industrial Land Review Study dated January 2001. |
| 55 | Late submission1 2/08/2002 | Bidwells - R Hopwood Carter Jonas - S Smith | Suggests inclusion of playing field off Porson Road, Peterhouse College - suitable and available. Privately owned. Not designated as public open space. Not used by Peterhouse college as have sufficient playing field provision elsewhere. Good access to Porson Rd and could have pedestrian links onto Long Road. The area characterised by a number of playing fields and not felt that land needs to be protected from development. | The new PPG17 reinforces existing government policy to protect playing fields. The Protection of Open Space in Cambridge Study in November 2000 stated that whilst this site was not important for environmental reasons it was for recreation reasons. There are other sites in the City in a similar position. We do not consider that it is appropriate to include this site in the Urban Capacity Study due to the high protection afforded to playing fields. The most appropriate forum to test this will be through the Local Plan review process. |

| | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 56 | Late submission1 2/08/2002 | Bidwells - R HopwoodCarter Jonas - S Smith | Suggests inclusion of land off Daws Lane, Peterhouse College - partly in use as private allotments, partly as disused chalk pit and partly disused land. Available and suitable for development. Allotments being privately owned not subject to same legislation as others in Council ownership so can be looked at as having potential. Chalk pit could be used for recreation use if vacant land comes forward for development. Vacant land has no known constraints to development and use for residential would not harm wider Local Plan objectives. | The Protection of Open Space in Cambridge Study in November 2000 states that the allotment site is sacrosanct to the setting of Cambridge. The chalk pit has no residential capacity and therefore is not included in the Urban Capacity Study. The remaining land is also important environment of the City. For these reasons we are not prepared to include these in the study. It would be unrealistic to include the land within the study as there is little likelihood of these sites ever coming available. To include them would reduce the realism of the UCS. Instead the appropriate forum to test this will be through the Local Plan review process. |
| 57 | Late submission1 2/08/2002 | Bidwells - R HopwoodCarter Jonas - S Smith | Concern that figures for existing commitments and permissions appear not to be discounted. Rarely do all permissions come forward. Usual to make 10 - 20% reduction. | Agree that it is appropriate to apply a discount to unimplemented planning permissions. Therefore, we propose to amend the UCS to apply a discount of 10% to extant unimplemented planning permissions and those permissions subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement. |

| | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|
| 58 | Late submission1 2/08/2002 | Carter Jonas - S Smith | Concern that figures for existing commitments and permissions appear not to be discounted. Rarely do all permissions come forward. Usual to make 10 - 20% reduction. | We note your concern regarding reliance on some major areas being redeveloped e.g. Cambridge Northern Fringe East. We would comment that a substantial discount has been applied to this category source (50%). In addition, the assumptions made on the number of dwellings are more conservative than those suggested in the Cambridge Northern Fringe Strategy 2000 which suggested up to 1950 dwellings on Cambridge Northern Fringe East. The Structure Plan assumptions are based upon this particular site coming forward during the plan period whilst it should also be noted that the Structure Plan period and indeed the period of this UCS extends to 2016. Finally, we understand that a masterplanning exercise is likely to commence in the next few months for the Cambridge Northern Fringe East. |
| 59 | Late submission1 4/08/2002 | Carter Jonas - S Smith | Anglian Water Services actively exploring the possibility of bringing forward the Cambridge Sewage Treatment Works for a housing led development. The inclusion of the site in the Urban Capacity Study is therefore supported. | Comments noted. |

