

Cambridge Local Plan – Towards 2031

Pre Issues and Options Consultation

Member Workshop

17th 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 City Councillors and County Councillors whose wards fall within the City boundary were invited to the workshop on 17th 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 During the introduction Members were asked what they wanted to get out of the session. Expectations and aims included, to:
 - understand the bureaucracy & process;
 - hear views of others;
 - consider what the vision to 2031 is;
 - understand how we can predict the future;
 - see how we can meet needs;
 - hear how much freedom we have (localism);
 - consider how Cambridge relates to the Region;
 - think how infrastructure works;
 - consider breaking down disparities; and
 - address transport issues.
- 1.6 The attendance list is in Appendix 2

2.0 Vision for Cambridge

Cambridge Now

- 2.1 Perceptions, words and phrases that Members associated with the City included:

- Punches above its size
- Connected to South Cambs, but not enough joint working/discussion No nearby urban centres
- A liberal City in a conservative County
- Different views (perceptions) of Cambridge
- Conservative solutions to problems
- A diverse City
- Compact City – small core
- Accessible without a car
- Lack of integration between new and old
- Operates in separate spheres (University)
- Fragmented
- Clumpy – no coherent whole
- Historic City
- Lots of open space and cows
- Great place to bring up kids
- Hugely improving quality of life (development bringing in new facilities)
- Not as safe in the centre
- Very crowded in centre
- Transport is a nightmare
- Different experiences of traffic
- Traffic is better than London
- A crowded and badly managed Houses in Multiple Occupation
- Victorian terraces
- Council estates

Cambridge 2031

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

- Radical solutions
- Larger City with new settlements
- A Smart City¹
- Better integrated – fewer gated communities
- Greater social integration, e.g. students, less town/gown split
- High quality housing – bigger and right type
- Affordable
- Diversity of opportunity
- Maintain open spaces on peoples' doorsteps
- Creating new open spaces
- People able to live and work in Cambridge
- Sustainable jobs 'that produce things'
- People commute to London
- Tunnels (for transport)

¹ "A city can be defined as 'smart' when investments in human and social capital and traditional (transport) and modern (ICT) communication infrastructure fuel sustainable economic development and a high quality of life, with a wise management of natural resources, through participatory governance." (Source: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/conferences/od2010/file-upload/2010/docs/39-05A34-Presentation_OD_Smart_Cities_CEMR.pdf)
Other References: <http://smart-cities.eu/why-smart-cities.html> and <http://www.smartcities.info/>

- Better connected – links to Norwich, Oxford, internationally
- Low carbon
- Has enough water
- Fewer bins – better waste management systems

The Future Vision – Getting There

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

Table 1 Future vision SWOT analysis

Strengths	Weaknesses
A world brand Physical size – compact The University Knowledge base	Expensive Physical size Weak local centres Lack of employment in light industry
Opportunities	Threats
More effective ways of dealing with affordable housing allocations Collaboration with the University	Transient communities Can we afford what we want? Widening income gap How are people going to shop in 2031? This is an unknown

3.0 Issues

3.1 Members 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

- Need for lots more houses
- Build lots of new houses or convert non-residential buildings to residential use.
- Identifying new housing sites to meet the demands for social and market housing
- Significant new housing sites will largely be in South Cambs
- More housing on Addenbrooke’s hospital site
- Building long term communities
- More cohesive & permanent communities especially on new developments (not transient rental flats)
- Need mixed, but affordable adequate housing stock
- Sufficient affordable housing
- Bring forward publicly owned sites for 100% affordable housing (including some self-build and community build).
- Affordable housing at present not keeping up with our agreed numbers

- The Policy relating to student hostels is too loose. Buildings student hostels seems to relax the requirement to build affordable housing. People could be using this as a loophole to bypass having to provide affordable housing.
- Affordable rents
- Need houses for social rent
- Ensuring young professionals/young workers/post grads are accommodated in terms of housing
- Housing needs of older people – safe, but integrated
- Housing priorities for local connections in area, not the city as a whole e.g. give housing priority to people who have a local connection to the area.
- Regulating and integrating HMOs
- Good quality housing that enhances environment and is energy efficient
- Varied housing with reasonable size gardens or very good open space with plenty of trees
- Quality and type of housing – suitable for different types of family need, e.g. extended families, older people
- Need for generously proportioned new homes
- Building more large dwellings
- Balance housing types in areas (HMOs)
- Possible need for policy about annexes/studios built for letting out to ‘lodgers’ as opposed to separate dwelling)
- Holiday lets
- Privatisation, e.g. gated communities, student hostels, blank walls to the public
- End gated communities
- Ways of restricting gated communities/requiring permeability
- In all new housing areas broadband etc should come as standard
- Cosy but open layout pattern

Social and Leisure

- Need to define this as community assets
- What is a community asset?
- Leisure facilities throughout the City
- Community facilities – no planning to meet the needs of individual wards
- Safe, vibrant City Centre catering for all sections of society, including young and elderly
- Vibrant local communities supported by excellent local facilities, including shops and leisure facilities
- ‘Sustainable’ local communities – shops, houses, clubs & employment all local
- Support community identity
- Social cohesion – mixed communities
- Encouraging ‘local’ community
- Mill Road – support special areas with distinct identities
- Providing local health care facilities, like Chesterton Hospital
- Protect sports facilities and widening access – rugby, cricket, football etc – e.g. Abbey Stadium
- Reverse University gating of playing fields
- Alternative centres
- Providing for allotments on new communities

- Pubs!
- Work to adapt pubs & pub trade to developing social patterns
- Pubs, including pub gardens
- Pubs Council Tax discount
- Integration between students/academics and residents not connected with the University

Economy and Retail

- Employment profile
- Encouraging a variety of local employment types
- Diverse industries requiring different levels of skills, not just high-tech for exceptionally clever people.
- Deciding which economic elements should be actively encouraged and those that may not be
- Creating more middle income jobs so we do not become a two income level city
- Manufacturing: protect suitable sites and existing, e.g. Cowley Road/Abbey
- Is manufacturing compatible with the vision of Cambridge as high-tech knowledge centre?
- Identifying employment sites for new companies to locate to and sites for existing companies which may wish to expand
- Jobs for people who live in the City
- Want state of the art business facilities
- Good accessibility – integrated transport system
- Proximity of jobs and housing and transport links
- Addressing gap between jobs and housing availability - proximity
- Expanding learning to far wider range of training in Cambridge – apprenticeships – (and more jobs)
- Balance between retail diversity and affordable shopping
- Adapt to changing retail patterns, adapting shopping areas in time
- Need sizable new district centres with 'town centre' type range of facilities
- Good, vibrant local shopping centres
- Local shops near to housing with affordable rents
- City Council owned local shops – low rents to keep open
- Would like to see a diverse mix of coffee bars & restaurants beyond the railway line crossing Newmarket Road
- New independent shops in new communities/developments – covenant issues
- Inability to consider competition when dealing with planning for districts
- Inability to protect shopping areas from chains, e.g. Tesco in Mill Road
- Need policies so that authority and communities can decide on the right shopping mix on high streets, e.g. local use classes
- Night time economy and anti social behaviour
- Local shopping centres not attractive to locals and become run down
- Support small businesses on high street
- Public space: street markets, street parties – Mill Road
- Covered market
- Suitable petrol stations
- Need policies for new business start-ups

Environment

- Protection of unique things – open spaces, historic core, Mill Road etc
- The River Cam as a resource/amenity
- Spreading the feeling of the centre through the suburbs
- Still approving mediocre quality developments
- Balancing land requirements for housing and green space (apartments?)
- Not bourgeois London Suburb
- Crowds of people in the City Centre
- Lots of 'shared space', especially in residential areas
- Shared space
- Living streets, streets for people
- Adequate public green space
- Retain parks and greens
- Protect public open space provision (inc new spaces for new development)
- Retain all open space & maintain as needed for enjoyment, keep some 'wild'
- Open space for areas of the City with near nil
- Poor provision of new open space in existing settlements
- Expand open spaces
- Plenty of open space to offset general move to dwelling in flats
- Different types of open spaces. i.e. formal, commons, wild areas, woods
- Open space within gated communities does not count as being 'public'
- Good roads and pavements
- Planting on new development
- More trees – mature ones – as part of all development
- Need trees in Fisher Place
- Well maintained trees
- Woods and forests
- Community growing
- Have we already reached the maximum sustainable density?

Transport

- Integrated transport system connecting the whole City & villages in S. Cambs to ensure sustainability
- Tame the car – a slow city!
- Better integration with transport planning – Local Plan Policies could be reworded to sound more positive stating what you can do, instead of what you can't.
- Short journeys to work by sustainable means
- Join employment centres & dedicated transport space
- Improved transport, especially through the City
- Sustained investment in transport infrastructure
- New transport, i.e. tunnels (x2)
- More waterways
- We need high quality public transport around town and not just through centre
- Trams (x2)
- Prevention of buses on convoy
- Reliable buses
- Direct bus from Abbey to Addenbrooke's

- Fast train to Ipswich
- Link station to City and Science Park
- Parking standards – assumptions about transport habits – cars spill on to residential roads nearby
- Genuinely car free developments, where the need for car is designed out, not just banned in a plan that does not work
- Reducing presence and movement of cars
- Maximise non car transport modes – in other words reduce need for car travel to the minimum while recognising there are irreducible minima and reducing transport need overall is overarching
- Support for car clubs
- Post codes on parking at work (bus services)
- Ability to shop without car use bikes
- Create more legal cycle routes
- Improve cycle routes – Newmarket Road
- Get rid of potholes – safe for bikes
- Go Dutch – radically enhanced cycle network
- Cycle parking and access to cycle parking in new developments – higher standards
- Schools can open and close at different times
- Local Plan Policy 8/2 Transport Impact is not working and is unrealistic. To put it right we need radical funding solutions that can deliver a sustainable transport system.

Sustainability and Climate Change

- Need flexibility to set climate change policy dynamically, not plan to plan
- Water supply
- Water and drainage
- We will only have enough water if current residents use less
- Ensure robust infrastructure – sewerage, water, drains
- In all new housing areas SuDS should come as standard
- Grey water
- Need to develop community energy plan – neighbourhood schemes, Citywide scheme
- Solar water heating vital
- Need district heating structure
- Solar panels etc on all new builds
- Addressing fuel poverty
- More emphasis on sustainable construction methods
- Smart houses

Spatial Development

- Keep City compact – no more Cambournes
- Creating a shared growth vision with South Cambs and the surrounding villages
- Housing – face up to the need to review the Green Belt boundary again
- Green corridors
- Move Airport and Sewage Works
- Working out how Addenbrooke's fits when surrounded by housing

- Mixed use City – fewer housing only sites
- More master planning for all major development
- Need for generally higher rise for better land use

Other

- Think as a city region
- Beads on a string for regional development
- Regional connectivity
- Rearrangement of local authorities, i.e. unitary!
- City to have more power, less County highways
- How should our universities, and hospital for that matter, be allowed to grow?
- IT infrastructure – broadband, communications, citywide wi-fi free
- Growth is needed. Right to refuse/direct

4.0 Existing Planning Policies

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

4.2 Following the discussion members 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).

Members were given a maximum of 10 dots of each colour to allocate; and were encourage to annotate the chart with comments. Not all members present used all dots available to them. 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.

Table 2 Member views on how well policies work

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Amber	Red	Your view
3 - Designing Cambridge						
3/1	<u>Sustainable Development</u> Sustainable Development	520				
3/2	<u>Promoting Design Quality</u> Setting of the City	13				
3/3	Safeguarding Environmental Character	21				

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Amber	Red	Your view
3/4	Responding to Context	1051	7 ²	2	3	Strengthen! Somewhat subjective Responding to context is to some extent (or possibly) subjective Recently stopped Hampden Gardens / Winstanley Court happening again
3/6	Ensuring Coordinated Development	33			1	
3/7	Creating Successful Places	391	1	3		Include detail of water and planting
3/8	Open Space and Recreation Provision Through New Development	83		3	1	Needs beefing up
3/9	Watercourses and Other Bodies of Water	14		1		Encourage waterworks
3/10	Sub-Division of Existing Plots	48		4		Need more work to ensure we can protect gardens from development as brownfield sites
3/11	The Design of External Spaces	163		1		Add 'imperative to plant and give space to planting'
3/12	The Design of New Buildings	160		3		Need to say 'are very good examples of their kind.'
3/13	Tall Buildings and the Skyline	14	3	1		Retention/protection of 'landmark buildings'
3/14	Extending Buildings	563		3	2	More protection for neighbouring properties
3/15	Shopfronts and Signage	117		1		
4. Conserving Cambridge						
4/1	<u>Protecting the Natural Environment</u> Green Belt	22		1		

² Number of dots

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Amber	Red	Your view
4/2	Protection of Open Space	51	2	1		
4/3	Safeguarding Features of Amenity or Nature Conservation Value	14			2	Pub gardens
4/4	Trees	120			3	Need coherent strategy Punish any pre application felling
4/6	Protection of Sites of Local Nature Conservation Importance	12		1		Stronger requirement for tree planting, Semi mature trees, not saplings
4/8	Local Biodiversity Action Plan	2		1		
4/9	<u>Protecting the Built Environment</u> Scheduled Ancient Monuments/Archaeological Areas	12				
4/10	Listed Buildings	196			1	Too many caveats mean it is somewhat open to interpretation
4/11	Conservation Areas	475	3			
4/12	Buildings of Local Interest	28			2	Strengthen Protect pubs
4/13	<u>Pollution and Flood Protection</u> Pollution and Amenity	215				
4/14	Air Quality Management Areas	22	2			
4/15	Lighting	33			1	
5. Living in Cambridge						
5/1	<u>Housing</u> Housing Provision	108			2	
5/2	Conversion of Large Properties	18		1		Min size house to which policy applies too large. All family houses in Listed terrace in Eden Street have been lost as a result

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Amber	Red	Your view
5/3	Housing Lost to Other Uses	3				
5/4	Loss of Housing	14				
5/5	Meeting Housing Needs	16		3	3	Too many housing associations are remote from their stock Risk of becoming NIMBY capital of Europe
5/7	Supported Housing/Housing in Multiple Occupation	10		2		
5/8	Travellers	0			1	
5/9	Housing for People with Disabilities	7	1		1	
5/10	Dwelling Mix	11			2	Need more mixed & genuinely affordable stock, including family housing. Limit number of flats in a large development flats & houses
5/11	Community Facilities Protection of Existing Facilities	9		1	3	Should be made much more applicable – need to protect all community assets, e.g. laundrettes, pubs, anywhere people meet & use communal facilities. Para 5.22 supporting the policy is restrictive.
5/12	New Community Facilities	21		2	2	
5/13	Community Facilities in the Areas of Major Change	4	1		1	
5/14	Provision of Community Facilities through New Development	79	1		2	
5/15	Addenbrooke's	4	2			
6. Enjoying Cambridge						
6/1	Leisure Protection of Leisure Facilities	4		1	1	

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Amber	Red	Your view
6/2	New Leisure Facilities	13		1		
6/3	<u>Tourism</u> Tourist Accommodation	5		1	1	No proper assessment
6/4	Visitor Attractions	3			2	New visitor attractions not come forward
6/6	<u>Shopping</u> Change of Use in the City Centre	14			3	Policy not ensured diverse city centre shopping in many streets
6/7	Shopping Development and Change of Use in District and Local Centres	7		3	1	What can be done to protect / support independent businesses Mill Road – fails to prevent change of use of local services Fail on the role of district and local centres
6/8	Convenience Shopping	6			2	Affordable shopping
6/9	Retail Warehouses	2				
6/10	Food and Drink Outlets	35		1		
7. Working and Studying in Cambridge						
7/1	<u>Employment</u> Employment Provision	7		2		
7/2	Selective Management of the Economy	20		3		More encouragement of small / med enterprise Encourage local / sustainable businesses
7/3	Protection of Industrial and Storage Space	10		2	1	
7/4	Promotion of Cluster Development	1		1	1	
7/5	<u>Higher and Further Education</u> Faculty Development in the Central Area, University of Cambridge	1		1		

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Amber	Red	Your view
7/6	West Cambridge, South of Madingley Road	11	1			
7/7	College and University of Cambridge Staff and Student Housing	7	1	1		
7/8	Anglia Ruskin University East Road Campus	1	1			
7/9	Student Hostels for Anglia Ruskin University	4	1			
7/10	Speculative Student Hostel Accommodation	9		1	4	Cease affordable housing exemption
7/11	Language Schools	8		2		
8. Connecting and Servicing Cambridge						
	Transport					
8/1	Spatial Location of Development	12				
8/2	Transport Impact	159			12	Don't believe the promise being made in policy 8/2 is being delivered or is deliverable in the context of current & projected traffic conditions and transport policy.
8/3	Mitigating Measures	36		5	1	Need to ensure money spent before everyone living there
8/4	Walking and Cycling Accessibility	46		2	1	Not being applied firmly to, e.g. CB1 residential where cycling access is poorer than for cars
8/5	Pedestrian and Cycle Network	11		2		
8/6	Cycle Parking	174		1	3	Better access to cycle parking in major developments; better quality / higher standards for what is acceptable – types of racks. Access to include lifts, ramps etc
8/7	Public Transport Accessibility	10			2	Clay Farm/Glebe Farm will not have the 'high quality' bus service described in 8/7 in 2012
8/8	Land for Public Transport	5			2	Policy seems back to front – we should be proactive creating a policy for public transport & recent developments that don't have adequate public transport

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Amber	Red	Your view
8/9	Commercial Vehicles and Servicing	13				
8/10	Off-Street Car Parking	163		5		Revise standards
8/11	New Roads	6		2		
8/12	<u>Cambridge Airport</u> Cambridge Airport	0				
8/13	Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone	1	1	2		
8/14	<u>Telecommunications</u> Telecommunications Development	10	2			
8/15	Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lords Bridge	1				
8/16	<u>Energy Resources</u> Renewable Energy in Major New Developments	31	2			
8/17	Renewable Energy	11				
8/18	<u>Water, Sewerage and Drainage Infrastructure</u> Water Sewerage and Drainage Infrastructure	22				
9. Areas of Major Change						
9/1	Further Policy/Guidance for the Development of Areas of Major Change	9				
9/2	Phasing of Areas of Major Change	6				
9/3	Development in the Urban extensions	8				
9/5	Southern Fringe	9	2			

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Amber	Red	Your view
9/6	Northern Fringe	3			2	Has not delivered – revision needed
9/8	Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road	3				
9/9	Station Area	12		3	1	
10. Implementation						
10/1	Infrastructure Improvements	86				

Appendix 1

Cambridge Local Plan

Pre Issues and Options Consultation

Member Workshop

Date: 17th January 2012

Time: 5.30pm – 9.00pm

Venue: Large 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
5.30	Registration and refreshments
6.00	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome and introduction• Introduction to planning process, Local Plan and timetable• Purpose of workshops• Members' aims for workshop
6.20	Vision <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cambridge now – perceptions of the City• Cambridge 2031 – What sort of place should it be to live in?• Getting there: SWOT analysis
7.00	Planning Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introduction to session• Topics<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Housing○ Social and leisure○ Economy and retail○ Environment○ Transport○ Sustainability/climate change○ Spatial development
7.45	Break
8.00	Existing Planning Policies <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Overview of existing policy documents and perceptions of policies and use• Existing policies – what works well, what not so well, what's missing<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Housing○ Social and leisure○ Economy and retail○ Environment○ Transport○ Sustainability/climate change○ Areas of major change
8.45	Summing up and next steps
9.00	Close

Appendix 2

Attendance

Name		Ward
Mark	Ashton	Cherry Hinton (City)
Kevin	Blencowe	Petersfield (City)
Killian	Bourke	Romsey (County)
Robert	Dryden	Cherry Hinton (City)
Nichola	Harrison	Petersfield (County)
Caroline	Hart	Abbey (City)
Lewis	Herbert	Coleridge (City)
Simon	Kightly	Castle (City)
Ian	Manning	East Chesterton (County)
Gail	Marchant-Daisley	Petersfield (City)
George	Owers	Coleridge (City)
Colin	Rosenstiel	Market (City)
Julie	Smith	Newnham (City)
Tariq	Sadiq	Coleridge (County)
Paul	Saunders	Romsey (City)
Catherine	Smart	Romsey (City)
Jean	Swanson	Queen Edith's (City)
Damien	Tunnacliffe	West Chesterton (City)
Margaret	Wright	Abbey (City)
Roman	Znajek	East Chesterton (City)