

***Cambridge Local Plan – Towards 2031***

# **Pre Issues and Options Consultation**

## **Developer & Agent Workshop**

**24th January 2012**

## **1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 Cambridge City Council is in the process of reviewing its Local Plan. The Cambridge Local Plan will set out the planning framework to guide the future development of Cambridge. It will comprise the core strategy, development management policies and site specific allocations which forms part of the City Council's Local Development Framework. The first stage in the production of the new Local Plan is the preparation of an evidence base to inform an issues and options document which will be subject to public consultation.
- 1.2 As part of evidence base preparation and in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and Consultation and Community Engagement Strategy for the Local Plan Review (November 2011), a series of workshops were held between December 2011 and February 2012, with councillors, stakeholders, developers, agents and residents' associations. The purpose of the workshops was to explain how the Plan will be prepared, to encourage people to get involved and to hear their ideas and concerns.
- 1.3 Local developers and agents were invited to the workshop on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2012. A list of attendees can be found in Appendix 2.
- 1.4 The workshop was structured as follows (see Agenda at Appendix 1):
- a brief introduction to the Plan;
  - exploring the vision for Cambridge;
  - discussion of planning issues; and
  - a review of existing policies.
- 1.5 The attendance list is in Appendix 2.

## **2.0 Vision for Cambridge**

### **Cambridge Now**

- 2.1 Perceptions, words and phrases that attendees associated with the City included:
- Historic
  - Heritage
  - Quality
  - Distinctive
  - Flat
  - Low rise
  - Design strain
  - Education
  - Town & gown
  - Enterprise
  - Technology
  - Tourism
  - Education
  - Town & gown

- Choice – retail, transport
- Expensive
- Sought after
- Congested
- Cycle friendly/unfriendly
- International profile
- Political tension

## Cambridge 2031

### 2.2 What sort of place should Cambridge be to live in in 2031?

- How big? 200,000
- Sub centres in an expanded city (on the outskirts) – issues around transport links and disparity
- Intensification of land use versus expansion
- Review of Green belt to expand City & sustainable villages
- Protect the historic core – where to develop businesses? The Station?
- Sustainable environment (transport, housing etc)
- Low carbon
- Successful, integrated, established new communities with identity
- Greater diversity (communities, housing etc)
- Democratically run social housing
- The place that discovered the cure for cancer
- A top University (world class)
- Continued success – everyone has a job & a home
- Dynamic
- Continued national & international business presence
- More expensive
- Better transport infrastructure
- Better links (non car modes?)
- Unitary

## The Future Vision – Getting There

### 2.3 Attendees were asked to identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT analysis), see Table 1.

Table 1 Future vision SWOT analysis

Strengths	Weaknesses
Historic appeal Diversity of design Brain power Economy Concentrated land ownership	Historic appeal Meeting true housing need Accommodating design issues Existing transport infrastructure Desire to drive Existing local government structures Local leadership Concentrated land ownership
Opportunities	Threats
Outside the City Science based economy	What is happening outside City (with developments)

Education based economy Community Infrastructure Levy Site opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airport</li> <li>• Cambridge Northern Fringe</li> <li>• CB1 – larger area</li> <li>• Science Park</li> <li>• West of the City</li> <li>• Addenbrooke's rail station</li> </ul>	Competition from other cities Swamp existing communities Attitudes to development The new planning system Community Infrastructure Levy Design and Conservation Panel Lack of ambition
--	--

### 3.0 Issues

3.1 Attendees were asked to write down planning issues, which they thought should be considered in the review of the Cambridge Local Plan. These have been grouped under seven broad headings and are transcribed below; a few issues are recorded here under 'Other' where they did not fit easily under one of the headings. Some issues might fit under more than one heading, but have been allocated to the one which looks the most appropriate.

#### Housing

- Assessing housing needs
- Need to see all housing as essential infrastructure to support the economy
- Establishing level of housing need robustly
- Locally derived housing need and calculation of this
- Mismatch between jobs and homes
- Ensuring the right type of homes are provided in the right place to ensure economic growth
- Meet housing need
- Address need and demand
- Housing land supply (deliverable within plan period)
- Change of use to housing
- Lack of market housing
- Ensuring delivery by not being too punishing e.g. affordable housing (different scales)
- Housing delivery
- Financial contributions
- Strong local areas of communities – 'City villages'
- Development viability – not too much social & S106 cost
- Do not allow high affordable housing obligation to kill off housing development
- Waiting list of 7000 in and surrounding Cambridge. How will 'affordable', key worker housing be met by Local Planning Authority. No finance. Must be through private developers on strategic scale
- Addressing the housing shortage – affordable – to support the economy/economic progress
- Lack of affordable housing
- Affordability issues
- Affordable housing provision
- Affordability/tenure
- Affordable Housing - Impact on small windfall sites, different affordable housing thresholds for different site scales
- Provision of social housing: democratically owned and run
- Social housing strategy:

- Pepper potting
- Density & character
- Modern/traditional
- Open space & density
- Public spaces
- Green belt
- Areas & districts
- Securing appropriate housing mix
- Variety in stock – middle market gets squeezed
- Full range of housing – social to top end
- Housing mix
- Types, tenures, mix
- Poor stock – need for executive houses/homes, not just expensive flats
- Student accommodation blocks impact on traditional landlords
- Student accommodation balanced with the private sector
- Priority to student accommodation in favour of Cambridge Uni and ARU
- Allow flexibility for sites near University or ARU to provide student accommodation in lieu of affordable
- Maintaining quality, creating quality, distinctive environments
- Allocations and development densities
- Pressure to accommodate housing growth – need higher densities in development sites
- Design constraints
- Design
- Good size plots (what people want)
- Sustainability of housing
  - A challenge
  - A high cost
  - Lack of knowledge
  - Change in technologies so policies need to be flexible
- Sustainability
- Integration of energy efficiency technologies

## **Social and Leisure**

- Assess need for locality
- Sense of belonging
- Better facilities
- Broad mix of leisure facilities/social, well located & accessible to all
- Important; protect and enhance; provide; diverse; integrated
- Ensuring that adequate facilities provided with new development
- Provision to match housing growth
- Strong clustering
- More sustainable/greater success
- Community facilities/'villages'
- Real integration of amenities, work spaces, social spaces with housing
- Community provision in pubs & local scale
- Diverse provision rather than large 'leisure complexes'
- Policy re loss of local facilities, e.g. pubs – outside local centres in particular
- Maintaining and building quality: theatre, sport (high quality)
- Promotion of sports, health & wellbeing

- Resolve sports clubs (CUFC, CCFC, CRUFC) needs
- Dual use of university sports facilities – public use
- Better access to countryside
- Access to new country parks and open spaces for all residents

## **Economy and Retail**

- Need to cater for homes for the workers of all the new jobs which will be created from successful incubator companies, growing larger need servicing. Perpetuate the success/expand
- Promote attractive framework that promotes investment in City
- Engaging with the Local Enterprise Partnership
- Economic policies need to be flexible to allow for changing circumstances, e.g. Cambridge Biomedical Campus, hospital/Uni biotech, more integrated
- Marketing of the City is essential. Currently not good at singing its praises
- Need to allow for a whole raft of businesses which serve the bio-tech industry and they need to be centrally located
- Embracing e- culture
- Foster science and technology economy
- Provision of R&D/science parks to ensure businesses are retained & City keeps its world class status
- Support cooperative businesses
- Building on what we are good at
- Build upon economy; build on our strengths; diversify; protect
- Development of business clusters
- Support universities
- New city centre shopping centre
- Grand Arcade extension?
- Accommodating retail commercial growth outside historic core
- Out of town versus in town
- Night time economy?
- Development viability – S106, CIL
- Flexible uses for vacant property
- Be realistic about certain sectors where there are societal changes, e.g. pubs
- Pub closure inevitable – policy on loss of amenity, change in needs?
- Promotion of river tourism
- Provision of small affordable retail spaces
- Avoid homogeneous retail provision
- Respect community wishes for retail
- Maintain balance of A1 to A3 uses – not overly reliant on cafe economy
- Small retailers pipe dream for city centres – need to be realistic about what is possible
- Allow neighbourhood provision to enhance sustainability

## **Environment**

- Protection of the historic integrity and image of the City
- Protect the central historic core

- Protect important historic buildings and open spaces by defining key view corridors
- Viable scheme conflict with higher sales values
- Recognition of the subjectivity of design – how do you address this?
- Contemporary or traditional design in historic areas in particular – extreme subjectivity
- Environment and Design: high quality but not too prescriptive
- Design and Conservation panel (mini CABE). City fixated on design slows development process. Can't see wood for trees. What is needed on ground for local businesses? Must be reasonable.
- Interfere less in the design process
- Building density
- Create a historic period, i.e. good quality innovative design
- Historic buildings can work with innovative architecture
- Sufficient iconic buildings
- We need more iconic buildings
- High quality green network – protect and add to

## Transport

- County transport strategy
- Transport strategy dictates spatial strategy, must be coordinated – congestion charge
- Transport infrastructure improvements, but not to be used as a reason for no/limited growth. Find solutions.
- More joint working with nearby settlements to provide enhanced 'rapid' public transport links
- Innovative new transport options – tram?
- Improve linkages efficiency choice, see as an opportunity
- Orbital transport link
- Pressure to open up the Addenbrooke's Road
- Park and Ride, Guided Bus anything else to relieve commute congestion in particular and tourism traffic
- Railway line & Guided Bus – new E-W route?
- Close City Centre to traffic
- Congestion charge
- No congestion charging
- Coherence
- Access routes
- Don't target the car
- Need to accommodate the car
- Promote non car use
- Promote use of green travel plans
- Big investment in public transport (real time info)
- Increase public transport
- Increased frequency public transport
- Connections to Rail station
- Promote cycle travel
- Cycle parking a design challenge in housing developments
- Safer segregation of cars/cycles
- Improve cycle & pedestrian

- Make City much more pedestrian/bike friendly – limit car access in certain areas
- Enhancement of cycle & pedestrian links
- More car parking in the City
- Car parking charges

## **Sustainability and Climate Change**

- Define it
- Link up/use creative intelligence within City
- Sustainability – important at strategic level and local level
- Sustainability – embrace and improve
- City led initiatives
- Promote high standards & educate communities of residents
- Leave performance of buildings to Building Regulations
- Awareness of viability
- Viability – not the tail to wag the dog
- Accommodating within existing stock
- Require low carbon options at design and build stage
- Wind power – flat land
- Support wind farms in South Cambridgeshire District Council
- Wind farms/sustainable technologies

## **Spatial Development**

- Spatial relationship with nearby satellite settlements (large villages, new settlements, market towns) which look to the City
- Joint working essential to explore direction for growth, i.e. to take pressure off the City. Danger City will sprawl over the years as logical sites are used up
- Spatial strategy: outward looking and inclusive
- Spatial Strategy
  - Brownfield sites decreasing resource
  - Need to locate development sustainably
  - City centre?
  - Integrate/linkages
- Build up and out
- Higher density
- Allow tall buildings in the business zones, e.g. station area/Hills Road/Cherry Hinton Road triangle
- Intensification in the City centre – issue resident/councillor resistance
- Green belt review needed to progress and provide for future growth of the City
- Green belt review – otherwise a continuation of high density development
- Green Belt review (again!) so that the need for housing can be addressed in a well coordinated manner, rather than lots of tiny sites, which can ruin character of City
- Green Belt review (x2)
- Green fingers need protecting – parts of Green Belt not as valuable
- Green Belt sensitive to west
- Substantial areas of growth – linked to transport infrastructure – not just concentric growth
- Locate development in/edge Cambridge to reduce car travel

- Siting dependent on strong transport links
- Integration of new communities by sustainable transport links & proximity to local services and failures
- Allocate development zones near transport hubs
- Expand City with sustainable transport; existing centre limited capacity, consider other hubs – Addenbrooke's, Marshalls, Northern Fringe
- Build to the east, but in SCDC
- Cross boundary, e.g. village expansion (on best transport routes)
- Identify & promote areas for development, e.g. Chesterton Sidings
- Sustainable village growth
- City village concept
- Coordinating housing growth with other factors, e.g. business strategy
- Joint vision between local authorities
- Political expectations
- Manage expectations of local communities
- Coherence and planning particular areas of excellence
- Need for Science Park growth
- Need for hospital growth

## Other

- Development is good for the city/economy
- Promotion of growth opportunities in the future
- Try to adopt a positive approach to planning rather than a negative 'protectionist' approach
- Proactive not reactive policy framework
- Flexibility of Development Plan policy
- Reduce/remove non-statutory designations – offer too much scope for objections
- Development constraints
- Developers are experienced in delivery – LPAs do not have the commercial awareness often

## 4.0 Existing Planning Policies

4.1 Attendees discussed existing planning policies in groups and shared concerns.

4.2 Following the discussion attendees indicated their views of policies on a wall chart with coloured dots:

- those they thought were working well (green);
- those that worked fairly well, but with reservations (yellow);
- Those they thought were not working (red)

Attendees were given a maximum of 10 dots of each colour to allocate; and were encourage to annotate the chart with comments. This information will be used in considering if any existing policies should be taken forward into the new Local Plan and if so whether they need amending.

4.3 One red dot was put on deleted policy 6/5. The following points were noted in the box on the wall charts for ‘Any missing policies?’

- Geographically area based policies could be more effective in addressing specific issues, i.e. historic policies versus change in the historic core.
- Policies need to recognise that the University is not the same as the Colleges and vice versa.
- Need policy for services apartments
- General point on application of policies: officers often apply subjective views to proposal, not always with a policy basis (including views of resident objections) leading to changes to proposals which lead to no material improvement and often significantly delay delivery.
- Policy on code/BREAM not needed – leave it to building regulations.
- Chapter 8: Clear and concise support for integrated public transport network to assist development opportunities required.

Table 2 Attendees’ views on how well policies work

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
<b>3 - Designing Cambridge</b>						
3/1	<u>Sustainable Development</u> Sustainable Development	520		6 <sup>1</sup>		Needs more specific targets. Clear definition required.  Needs to be supported by up to date guidance which can be reviewed regularly
3/2	<u>Promoting Design Quality</u> Setting of the City	13	1	3		Needs reviewing in the light of urban extensions.
3/3	Safeguarding Environmental Character	21		1		
3/4	Responding to Context	1051	1	2	1	Can use this policy to capture other policies in this chapter – no need for repetition.  Key issue is interpretation and how the SPD evolves the issues.  Too often used to refuse development.
3/6	Ensuring Coordinated Development	33		1	1	Several policies could be combined, e.g.3/4, 3/6. 3/7

<sup>1</sup> Number of dots

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
3/7	Creating Successful Places	391		1		
3/8	Open Space and Recreation Provision Through New Development	83	1	2	1	Currently OK – need flexible approach, full on site provision not always possible.  Often not clear how off site contributions will be spent.
3/9	Watercourses and Other Bodies of Water	14	1			
3/10	Sub-Division of Existing Plots	48		1	1	
3/11	The Design of External Spaces	163				
3/12	The Design of New Buildings	160			12	Overly complicated and over restrictive; the wording does not accurately describe 'good design'.  Often applied very subjectively by officers.  Needs to allow for innovation and creativity.  Zero carbon design.  Must not be prescriptive and allow innovation in design.
3/13	Tall Buildings and the Skyline	14			10	This is too restrictive: tall buildings should be welcomed in business zones, outside the historic core.
3/14	Extending Buildings	563			1	More protection for neighbouring properties
3/15	Shopfronts and Signage	117	1			
<b>4. Conserving Cambridge</b>						
4/1	<u>Protecting the Natural Environment</u> Green Belt	22			7	Reassess extent and quality of Green Belt.  Needs to be reviewed to support science-based economy.  Agree with review; housing need acute over next 20 years.  Requires flexibility. Should not constrain development opportunities in future.

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
4/2	Protection of Open Space	51		2		Too much open space protected via SPD
4/3	Safeguarding Features of Amenity or Nature Conservation Value	14				
4/4	Trees	120		1		
4/6	Protection of Sites of Local Nature Conservation Importance	12				
4/8	Local Biodiversity Action Plan	2	1			
4/9	<b><u>Protecting the Built Environment</u></b> Scheduled Ancient Monuments/Archaeological Areas	12				
4/10	Listed Buildings	196		2	1	Listed Building & Conservation Areas more responsive approach to proposals affecting these in City Centre?
4/11	Conservation Areas	475			2	
4/12	Buildings of Local Interest	28			2	Unreasonable use of BLI <sup>2</sup> s to prevent development. BLIs – Local Planning Authority often has no control system of designating BLIs, not transparent / too arbitrary.
4/13	<b><u>Pollution and Flood Protection</u></b> Pollution and Amenity	215				
4/14	Air Quality Management Areas	22	2			
4/15	Lighting	33			1	
<b>5. Living in Cambridge</b>						
5/1	<b><u>Housing</u></b> Housing Provision	108			6	Provision too low; needs to accord with provision in East of England Plan (EEP); reducing rate below EEP would have significant implications for economy & affordability.

<sup>2</sup> Buildings of Local Interest

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
						<p>Need to consider where to focus development.</p> <p>Needs to meet the need. Aspiration for growth should result in increased housing provision.</p>
5/2	Conversion of Large Properties	18				
5/3	Housing Lost to Other Uses	3				
5/4	Loss of Housing	14			1	Resists conversion of a single dwelling house to HMO (7 occupiers or more); is this always desirable?
5/5	Meeting Housing Needs	16		2	7	<p>Loan development funds to cooperatives to meet requirements.</p> <p>Policy should not require 40% and full 15 unit provision; should be graded, first 14 units 'free' &amp; then apply to excess.</p> <p>Accept policy requirements, but must reflect viability issues.</p> <p>Do not increase % above 40% and be flexible about actual %.</p> <p>Current applicable housing policy does not work well; need different thresholds; existing targets need to be thought through.</p> <p>40% affordable housing target is killing viability; there should be no thresholds; it should be solely on viability.</p> <p>Provision in Plan / promotion of self-run / democratic housing coops.</p>
5/7	Supported Housing/Housing in Multiple Occupation	10				
5/8	Travellers	0			4	<p>Permanent site.</p> <p>City needs to do more for the traveller community.</p>
5/9	Housing for People with Disabilities	7			1	Building Regulations an issue.
5/10	Dwelling Mix	11		3	1	<p>Impact on viability of mix.</p> <p>Needs to allow for market demand.</p>

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
						A range of house types and mix should be fully supported.
5/11	<b><u>Community Facilities</u></b> Protection of Existing Facilities	9		1		
5/12	New Community Facilities	21				
5/13	Community Facilities in the Areas of Major Change	4			2	Provision for locally run (by the community for the community) amenities.
5/14	Provision of Community Facilities through New Development	79			1	
5/15	Addenbrooke's	4		2		Should recognise need for support services.
<b>6. Enjoying Cambridge</b>						
6/1	<b><u>Leisure</u></b> Protection of Leisure Facilities	4				
6/2	New Leisure Facilities	13		2		
6/3	<b><u>Tourism</u></b> Tourist Accommodation	5	1	1		
6/4	Visitor Attractions	3	2	1		
6/6	<b><u>Shopping</u></b> Change of Use in the City Centre	14				
6/7	Shopping Development and Change of Use in District and Local Centres	7			2	Too much emphasis on 'A' uses; non 'A' uses can also contribute to community function of local centres. Some centres no longer fulfilling criteria
6/8	Convenience Shopping	6				
6/9	Retail Warehouses	2			2	
6/10	Food and Drink Outlets	35			3	Provision in policy for limiting 'multi national;' supermarkets on sensitive local community shopping centres.

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
						Too restrictive
<b>7. Working and Studying in Cambridge</b>						
	<b>Employment</b>					
7/1	Employment Provision	7			4	More employment land / R&D / science parks needed
7/2	Selective Management of the Economy	20		3	1	Needs more flexibility to allow for legitimate support services.  Brake on economic development.  Promote all levels of economy, i.e. minimum wage employment linking into housing provision.  Redevelopment of inappropriate industrial/commercial should be supported.
7/3	Protection of Industrial and Storage Space	10		1	2	Each application should be determined on merit, taking into account vacancy rates on a site specific basis; also some latitude for temporary change of use.  Some protected employment sites have a high B1 content.
7/4	Promotion of Cluster Development	1	3			
	<b>Higher and Further Education</b>					
7/5	Faculty Development in the Central Area, University of Cambridge	1				
7/6	West Cambridge, South of Madingley Road	11				
7/7	College and University of Cambridge Staff and Student Housing	7		1	1	Student housing in high demand.  Policies need to be more effective in assessing housing issues for low paid Uni / college workers
7/8	Anglia Ruskin University East Road Campus	1		1		Needs review to take account of Anglia Ruskin's needs and changes on campus.
7/9	Student Hostels for Anglia Ruskin University	4		10		Too restrictive; should allow student accommodation in lieu of affordable on other sites located close to ARU <sup>3</sup> & University

<sup>3</sup> Anglia Ruskin University

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
7/10	Speculative Student Hostel Accommodation	9		7		<p>Too restrictive; speculative student housing should be welcomed; it will free the market.</p> <p>There needs to be a policy for non University / ARU student accommodation – some operators are now local businesses with needs</p>
7/11	Language Schools	8		2	3	<p>10% restriction inhibiting growth of important employment sector.</p> <p>If Council is going to retain opposition to language schools need to better justify; current plan does not.</p> <p>10% restriction on floorspace expansion too rigid &amp; inflexible; it is an unreasonable restriction on businesses in recession; policy must not constrain business to unreasonable degree.</p>
<b>8. Connecting and Servicing Cambridge</b>						
	<u>Transport</u>					
8/1	Spatial Location of Development	12				
8/2	Transport Impact	159		1		What is 'unacceptable transport impact'?
8/3	Mitigating Measures	36		1		Role of Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 agreements? ; How to resolve?
8/4	Walking and Cycling Accessibility	46	1			
8/5	Pedestrian and Cycle Network	11	1	1		
8/6	Cycle Parking	174		1		
8/7	Public Transport Accessibility	10		1		
8/8	Land for Public Transport	5				
8/9	Commercial Vehicles and Servicing	13				
8/10	Off-Street Car Parking	163			1	

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
8/11	New Roads	6				
8/12	<b><u>Cambridge Airport</u></b> Cambridge Airport	0			2	New future vision required; world-class cities need to be accessible by air.
8/13	Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone	1				
8/14	<b><u>Telecommunications</u></b> Telecommunications Development	10	2			
8/15	Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lords Bridge	1				
8/16	<b><u>Energy Resources</u></b> Renewable Energy in Major New Developments	31	1	4	4	Move towards zero carbon rather than renewables in design stage.  Needs to be flexible and move with technology.  Leave to developer how best to reduce carbon.  Concentrate on zero carbon.  Support in principle, but need to take account of density/aesthetic impact (NB PV panels).
8/17	Renewable Energy	11		1	3	Focus should be on carbon reduction.  Need to deliver significant capacity – should be more positive.
8/18	<b><u>Water, Sewerage and Drainage Infrastructure</u></b> Water Sewerage and Drainage Infrastructure	22				
<b>9. Areas of Major Change</b>						
9/1	Further Policy/Guidance for the Development of Areas of Major Change	9			1	
9/2	Phasing of Areas of Major Change	6				
9/3	Development in the Urban extensions	8				

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
9/5	Southern Fringe	9	2	1		Useful policy when supported by more detailed guidance, e.g. Area Development Framework, as long as detailed discussion with developers etc takes place as it did with the SDF.  Support the caveat that these are urban extensions and very different to historic core/city in planning/design.
9/6	Northern Fringe	3				
9/8	Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road	3				
9/9	Station Area	12			2	
<b>10. Implementation</b>						
10/1	Infrastructure Improvements	86			2	Public art: is this a priority when competing against other Section 106 requirements?  Public Art SPD now a serious constraint on development (too bureaucratic)

## Appendix 1

### Cambridge Local Plan

### Pre Issues and Options Consultation

### *Developers & Agents Workshop*

**Date:** 24<sup>th</sup> January 2012

**Time:** 9.30am – 1.00pm

**Venue:** Small Hall, Guildhall

**Please note:**

In preparation for the last session on 'Existing Planning Policies' it would be useful if you could consider the current Local Plan policies and which of these work well, not so well and whether there are any gaps.

## AGENDA

Time	Item
9.30	<b>Registration and coffee</b>
10.00	<b>Introduction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Welcome and introduction</li><li>• Introduction to planning process, Local Plan and timetable</li><li>• Purpose of workshops</li></ul>
10.20	<b>Vision</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cambridge now – perceptions of the City</li><li>• Cambridge 2031 – What sort of place should it be to live in?</li><li>• Getting there: SWOT analysis</li></ul>
10.50	<b>Planning Issues</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Introduction to session</li><li>• Topics<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Housing</li><li>○ Social and leisure</li><li>○ Economy and retail</li><li>○ Environment &amp; design</li><li>○ Transport</li><li>○ Sustainability/climate change</li></ul></li><li>• Spatial strategy and options</li></ul>
11.25	<b>Break</b>
11.40	<b>Feedback on Planning Issues</b>
12.00	<b>Existing Planning Policies</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Overview of existing policy documents and existing perceptions of policies and use</li><li>• Existing policies – what works well, what not so well, what's missing<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Housing</li><li>○ Social and leisure</li><li>○ Economy and retail</li><li>○ Environment</li><li>○ Transport</li><li>○ Sustainability/climate change</li><li>○ Areas of major change</li></ul></li></ul>
12.45	<b>Summing up and next steps</b>
1.00	<b>Close &amp; Lunch</b>

## Appendix 2

### Attendance

Name		Organisation	Present
Andrew	Thompson	Beacon Planning Limited	X
		Savills	
Andrew	Sharpe	Grosvenor USS	X
Andrew	Blevins	Liberty Property Trust UK Ltd	
Chris	Blencowe	Bursars Environment & Planning Sub-Committee	X
Colin	Campbell	Savills	X
Colin	Brown	Januaries Consultant Surveyors	X
Don	Proctor	RPS	X
Emma	Wilson	Bellway Homes	
Hamish	Buttle	Bovis Homes Ltd	X
James	Stevens	Home Builders Federation	
Jamie	Wilding	Skanska UK Plc	
Jo	Clark	Countryside Properties (Homes and New Communities) Ltd	X
Karen	Beech	Bidwells	X
Leigh	Johnson	Barratt Eastern Counties	
Mark	Buxton	DPP	
Neil	Waterson	Bidwells	
Owen	Simpson	Argyle Street Housing Co-op Ltd	X
Owen	Pike	Cheffins	
Peter	Biggs	Barratt Eastern Counties	X
Richard	Taplin	Bursars Environment & Planning Sub-Committee	X
Rob	Hopwood	Bidwells	X
Sam	Dyer	Argyle Street Housing Co-op Ltd	X
Simon	Ward	Chartered Institute of Architectural Technologist (East)	
Stephen	Walsh	Unex	X
Stephen	Brown	Artek Design House Ltd	X
Steven	Kosky	Barton Willmore	X
Sven	Töpel	Brookgate	X
Wendy	Wong Chang	Berkeley Homes	X
Will	Lusty	Savills	X
William	Jewson	The Howard Group of Companies	X