

Cambridge Local Plan – Towards 2031

Pre Issues and Options Consultation

Residents' Associations Workshop

1st February 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 that form 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 Members of local resident associations were invited to the workshop on 1st February 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 participants were asked what they wanted to get out of the session. Expectations and aims included:
- Not just a planning process – community inputs
 - Link ups with other Councils
 - Consider carrying capacity of City – number & location of facilities & quality
 - Consider future developments in Cambridge
 - Enable Council to tell developers what to do, e.g. on-site facilities
 - Getting around Cambridge
- 1.4 The attendance list is in Appendix 2

2.0 Vision for Cambridge

Cambridge Now

- 2.1 Perceptions, words and phrases that residents associated with the City included:
- Small market town with a big reputation
 - Punches above its weight
 - A rapidly expanding City
 - Distinctive character at risk from bland development

- Grossly overcrowded City Centre
- One City Centre for a large hinterland
- Surprisingly complex
- A City of contrasts
- Stunning architecture
- Beautiful centre but scruffy outskirts
- Buildings, footpaths, open spaces in City over used and deteriorating
- Cosmopolitan & versatile
- Too many tourists
- An oasis of learning and living
- Unaffordable housing
- National economic hub
- Bicycles
- Traffic gridlock
- Doesn't believe the car has been invented

Cambridge 2031

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

- No bigger than planned at the moment
- Full and balanced; not overflowing
- Development of other foci than City Centre, with own shopping
- Effective incorporation of new communities
- Beautiful and distinctive new development
- Ownership for City Centre
- A City more at ease with itself – so it can welcome visitors and transient workers
- Preservation and enhancement of green spaces
- Good green spaces all round City
- Better community facilities
- Affordable family housing
- A University town
- Vibrant & diverse shops & employment options
- Independent shops
- More coherent approach to getting around
- Much better transport
- Fewer cars and less need for cars
- Green spaces & corridors integrated with cycle paths
- Safer intersections for cyclists
- A genuinely carbon neutral City
- City determining own policies
- Managing challenges of increased population & climate change

The Future Vision – Getting There

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

Table 1 Future vision SWOT analysis

Strengths	Weaknesses
Community willing to embrace change A proportion of articulate, bolshie individuals A lot of people prepared to contribute Strong vibrant economy World class university	Fear of change Too constricted City boundary and Green Belt Too crowded in City Centre for about three-quarters of the year Lack of support for community groups Shortage of school places Money & finance Local Plan open to interpretation People who don't understand rules Not in charge of destiny Lack of unitary authority
Opportunities	Threats
Only allow quality building Schools north of river – Secondary & Sixth Form Can reduce infrastructure deficit Growth needed to boost national economy More river crossings Take traffic and parking underground Still time to plan properly, even to reverse poor decisions	Threat of localism – local interest groups dominate Throwing away opportunities Cambridge will become a victim of its own economic success and quality of old buildings (too many residents and too many tourists) Loss of Green Belt Increase in population – maintain character of historic core Strength of University Too many tourists, pushing out residents Too much private parking in centre Limit on number of river crossings Dependent on others for infrastructure Development rules in favour of developers Rings run around us by developers Controlled by developers

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

- With 'localism' do we have to accept central housing targets?
- Cambridge should grow by only the amount necessary to support the Science Park, not have to accommodate Government targets
- Bias to housing development (because lucrative for developers) drives out other uses, e.g. pubs, light industrial, open space, schools
- Don't be tied to a specific target for new homes or we'll get cheap and nasty
- Strategy to manage the demand for housing, while controlling density
- Developers building flats for commuters, not residents
- Should basically be for people who live, or want to live & work in the City
- Housing for those who service the City & Universities

- Control those working a long way off (e.g. London) or overseas investors taking up new housing intended for key workers and those on housing list
- Forward looking: car free zones; no garage; community orchards; allotments; cycle/walk to City
- S106 provisions – lack of off-site provision – green space and parking
- In Park Street area the Varsity Hotel should be turned back into apartments
- House prices too high
- More social housing
- Affordable housing
- Need more Council housing and the amount needs to increase annually
- Affordable family housing – not enough
- Lack of social housing – huge housing list
- What is affordable housing?
- Key worker affordable
- Continued emphasis on affordable housing within new developments
- Invest more in social housing
- More affordable housing – higher ratio
- Make developers provide a proper level of affordable housing
- More affordable housing (and social housing)
- More family and affordable housing – fewer (developer led) flats (including environment)
- More family housing
- Maintain a housing mix in all areas of the City
- More mixed housing not private all together & social all together
- Require all new housing to meet whole of life standards
- Lifetime homes
- Use of space- need mosaic, mixture! – household sizes
- Healthy mix of housing types – not all 1-2 bed flats, not over concentration of student housing in certain areas
- Need decent family housing – with gardens
- Housing for over 65s
- More family houses, fewer 1-bed flats
- Better mix of housing (3+ bedrooms now neglected)
- More houses in the City Centre, not just students
- Less student housing
- Private landlords should pay rates on student accommodation
- Colleges should be discouraged from turning family homes into accommodation for students
- Pressure on existing residential areas - rented accommodation, conversions, garden studios etc
- Control homes being split up
- Better control of private rents & more secure tenancies
- Retaining community feel against threats – short term student lets
- Addressing the impact of poorly managed HMOs
- HMO's very poor standard – very small
- License HMOs? (also with fewer than 6 occupants)
- More control of HMOs – introduce licensing
- Needs much tougher policies re houses in multiple occupation. Need to stop any more HMOs in Romsey
- Danger to tenants – regulation now is reactive and slow

- Impact on neighbours – sustainability of communities is threatened
- Multiple occupation of small terraces – not enough regulation
- Recognise good quality high density housing can be provided on smaller areas if you do not use point blocks of flats
- Design of new housing – distinctive
- Good architecture
- Developments are too crowded e .g. Prospect Row 9 dwellings on the space of 2

Social and Leisure

- Clear commitment to community development principles
- Increased community and cultural facilities – new communities not housing estates
- Recreate communities
- Continues emphasis on local community centres and support services
- Neighbourhood support – community development
- Support & fund community groups
- New standards of open spaces & community facilities - can these be applied to existing new developments?
- Developers should be obliged/forced to provide community facilities & open spaces
- Community and space facilities to be on-site as the rule rather than the exception
- On site provision of facilities, particularly on large developments
- Protection against erosion of community facilities
- More importance placed on community facilities, including pubs – protect against change of use
- Pubs as community facilities
- Distribute facilities/resources across City
- More local leisure/community facilities
- Developing & protecting leisure facilities in areas outside City Centre
- More facilities towards edge of City & in new development
- Good mix of facilities
- Health provision: where are GPs, dental services, centres for certain health provisions outside Addenbrooke's?
- Faith provisions in new developments & faith groups involved in delivery of community facilities
- Community facilities for all ages from birth to death. Meeting places for interest groups of all ages. This applies to existing residents as well as to those in new developments.
- Provision of facilities for teenagers under 18 all over the local communities of the City
- Limit expansion of Addenbrooke's to the ability of the roads & infrastructure to cope
- Schools, Secondary and Sixth Form colleges north of river reduce traffic across the City
- Lack of community facilities in area between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road – meeting rooms, pubs, open spaces, play areas
- Facilities in City Centre will be on overload, e.g. theatres, concert halls, cinemas, sports, etc. How to provide for needs of increased population?

- Affordable community facilities – halls, theatres, exhibition spaces
- Social amenities, e.g. swimming pools
- Camb United football ground
- Need permanent ice rink in the City
- Move forward with ice skating rink – Madingley Road – linked with University

Economy and Retail

- Cambridge's engineering heritage needs to be recognised and supported, e.g. Marshall, Lister
- Tougher scrutiny of jobs claims by developers, e.g. do 32 jobs really justify building huge ugly blocks (Travelodge Hotel). i.e. balance impacts, be demanding
- Encourage provision of jobs on average wages or above – How?
- Encourage development that supports small/medium enterprises
- Retain/and and encourage small local industrial/retail/commercial facilities to help start-up & provide local employment
- Range of premises – small to large – located accordingly (large out of the City on periphery)
- Small and medium industrial element required on all larger developments
- Employment and shopping hubs at development alongside new residential centres
- More small industrial units – protect existing, promote new ones
- Contribute to support and enhance economic/high-tech success
- The Plan needs to recognise Cambridge's national importance for high-tech industry
- High-tech industries need to be encouraged
- Affordable retail/business units
- Retail parks – be more creative with space
- The disastrous retail park on Newmarket Road needs to be razed to the ground & replaced with housing
- Disappearance of local shops & businesses
- Limit expansion of supermarket chains
- Support (financial) for independent traders
- We need to encourage more independent shops
- Lower rents for independent shops, lower rates, rebating of rates
- Shops that cater for the many less well off
- Affordable rental schemes for local retailers
- Encouraging independent retailers
- New housing estate (Bell School) – no thought given to shopping needs of residents
- Champion independent shops
- More independent small retail traders
- Independent shops & Pubs – need for training for those running them
- Passing trade – smaller shops – lack of parking would have an impact, i.e. double yellow lines
- Protect local shops – for everyday use (affected by high rents – City Council owns some of these) – value local shops
- Encouraging diversity of shops in centre and neighbourhoods
- Fewer big supermarkets opening express shops leave room for small shopkeepers

- Is expansion of ARU on present site a bad idea?
- Lack of large conference centre/concert hall (modern)
- Creative arts use of empty shops
- Too much development of City Centre for hotels etc
- Need some way to control overcrowding in the City Centre, It's impossible to get around at times
- Is there any real evidence that most tourists really bring overall revenue? Include day visitors and longer term separately – consider cost of negative impact in this
- Number of tourists to City Centre needs to be controlled or the City will be ruined
- Cambridge theme park in Bedford to take some tourists, especially young teenagers
- Licensing Act: implications for City Centre residents – the City cannot be both a centre for all night entertainment & a place where people get a good night's sleep
- Mixed housing & retail in City Centre
- How do we regenerate businesses in the City Centre?
- Shopping: ensuring the City works for all 'stakeholders' not just flat dwellers & retailers
- More mixed use
- Protecting and enhancing retail diversity
- Retail balance of strategic/anchor stores & independent retailers
- More practical shops (DIY, Woolworth type) instead of Grand Arcade types
- Presumption against conversion of pubs, retail premises to residential use.
- Leisure park duplication of retail outlets
- Encouraging vitality and viability of local centres
- Retail outside City Centre should be encouraged – to stop 'suburbanisation' of areas just outside the centre
- Retention of market in City Centre
- Market Square opened up in evenings (like an Italian piazza)
- Preserve current market, just improve facilities (no Italian piazza)
- Enhancement of Market Square & positive joined up promotion of the market
- Indoor market hall
- Local open markets
- Encourage local centres with short term parking. e.g. 30 mins on street waiting sections near shops
- Addressing issue of development classes – not all A1s are good if you end up with 100 hairdressers

Environment

- Preservation of historic setting & views
- Protecting the character of Cambridge's different areas
- Planning for local areas – thinking about whole area/community
- Encouraging/educating the public to take responsibility for their local area
- Environment must be friendly to residents, neighbourhoods
- Ensuring that all of Cambridge has green space
- Open spaces – more needed
- Green space not a commodity but a context

- Grass, shrubs, planting, trees – in all parts of the City – boskiness¹ for all.
- Pressure on existing open space – too many new developments with minimal open space
- Protection of green spaces
- Loss of green space & corners in existing residential areas
- Gradual erosion of open green space by increase of activities, e.g. ice rink on Parker's Piece
- Green Spaces – risk of overload on existing green spaces, if (when) population expands it can only get worse
- Maintenance of green spaces
- Green spaces - are they managed as well as they should be? For example, should student groups be charged for playing games like hockey? Lacrosse etc?
- More spaces to grow food (allotments)
- Invest in allotments
- Protection of green space and avoidance of development alongside
- Preserving green & open spaces outside the City Centre – enhancing where possible
- Open spaces and green corridors – importance
- Preserve the green corridor
- Green corridors
- Protection of the Green Belt and green corridor space within the City
- More accessible green space – woodland, water
- Retention of Green Belt buffer zone
- Hands off Green Belt – enough has gone already, e.g. NIAB fields
- Larger developments must provide green open space – commuted sums in lieu should only be accepted in exceptional circumstances. (Local Plan should define 'large' so that policy is clear!)
- Green space in all developments to expand on central green corridors
- Green spaces absolutely essential
- Loss of playing fields providing green lungs
- New parks & playgrounds in new developments
- Make disused pits at end of Mill Road into a country park
- The river should be celebrated as an aesthetic and leisure resource – how to maximise access and enjoyment for residents and visitors? (NB Moorings policy currently a non policy; college ownership a barrier?)
- Imaginative creation and use of spaces, e.g. in front of Emmanuel
- Connections between new developments – bad example Cromwell Road
- More Accordias – socially mixed, trees, open green spaces
- Poor design now, e.g. Cromwell Road, Orchard Park. Accordia flagged up – nothing like it – but it works because of trees, open space as much as design – need to replicate
- Need to set new buildings back from pavement or for wider pavements
- More investment in hard landscaping & street furniture, especially in Conservation Areas
- Get rid of surplus unsightly street furniture
- Liveable streets
- Less new public art, and better
- Public art to help inform new places – integrated and innovative

¹ Bosky – covered by trees or bushes: wooded. Source:OED

- Need for design guidance & environmental care
- Suitability of modern design – must be appropriate
- New buildings must be of high standard of design & materials
- Much better and more attractive designs by developers
- More imaginative, even adventurous, modern architecture, please! (Not so many bland ‘box-type’ developments or pastiche Victoriana)
- Somehow marry good design with space, affordable housing and cost (see Alternative centres) & marry with small as well as large shops.
- Failure to match architecture of University with anything in the town
- Dismaying blandness & low quality of what has already gone up – specific example, NIAB development so far
- More attention given to visionary architecture instead of glass blocks. Don’t ruin the architectural heritage of the City
- Be prescriptive to dramatically improve quality of design for new development – complement the historic and distinctive nature of Cambridge
- Clear guidelines on building heights
- Tall buildings overpowering the City
- Stop tall commercial buildings – they ruin the sky line
- Stop high rise development around the centre – ‘the architecture of greed’
- Put tall buildings in the right place – build a La Defense
- St Mary’s Church – overall skyline of City Centre
- Height of buildings in City Centre
- Bad planning: Botanic House Hills Road – height, position, eyesore
- Why is it so difficult to plant trees on streets – utilities given priority. Can trees be given same priority as utilities?
- Trees
- Trees need to be protected from developers who cut down mature trees & plant saplings
- Enforce aspirations for mature trees, tree-lined boulevards, e.g. Eastern Gate development recently permitted to ‘step forward’ eliminating opportunity
- Trees – we need more in many areas; and are Tree Preservation Orders too weak?
- Provide areas on narrow streets for residents to put wheelie bins for collection
- Design to maximise light: sunny and warm
- ‘Ancient lights’, does it still apply?
- The ‘environment’ – pollution controls
- Great problem with pollution due to increase in vehicles
- Good lighting that doesn’t pollute

Transport

- Better voice for City residents over transport issues
- Limit traffic coming into City
- Sky routes
- Transport network not corridors
- Creative traffic solutions (shared space?)
- Cross country communications
- Sort out A14
- Smooth traffic flow: effect of traffic lights, e.g. 12 in Trumpington Road to M11

- Restrict traffic in the centre and improve flow at bottlenecks further out
- Need to reduce congestion into Cambridge
- 20 mph car speed limit inside City boundary
- Stronger policy on car-free development near/in City Centre (or local centres)
- Concentration on the centre (Emmanuel Street) is too great
- One way streets extended significantly, e.g. Bridge Street
- No increase in private vehicle traffic
- Banish cars as far as possible, increase all alternatives
- Tax on workplace car spaces to reduce commuting by car. Money raised to fund better public transport
- Too many car parking spaces in City Centre. Need to do more to deter people from driving into the City. Hold up buses when cars queue to get into e.g. Park Street car park
- Parking in local streets (including between Huntingdon Road & Histon Road) – commuters and residents compete
- Resident parking versus visitor parking
- Southern Ring Road (underground)
- Underground, suggested a while ago
- Underground transport system. Research already in place, see Jesus College
- Parking under green spaces like Lammas Land, Gonville & Caius playing field and shuttle to centre
- Use rail to transport all heavy goods
- CB1 Station area transport hub
- Move/better bus station
- Need for all the long distance buses to have terminus at the railway station
- Railway station at Chesterton and Cherry Hinton
- Put another Park and Ride on the periphery, e.g. Barton Road
- Babraham Road: expanding P & R at one end and expanding employment (Addenbrooke's Hospital) at the other – mass daily migration between two
- Too many cars – better plans for getting people away from cars – how to motivate them to use cycles, public transport
- Think about banning cars from larger areas of City – narrow streets mean cycles & public transport cannot function effectively if also competing with cars/parking restrictions
- Transport needs to be better coordinated to all areas of City – more frequent
- Public transport into City from Huntingdon/Histon Road area into City Centre and railway station 24/7 needs to be frequent and reliable
- More green buses
- Have coupons for local bus fares to avoid delays in loading buses. Standard fares?
- Need City to be in charge of its bus services. Some Citi services are very unreliable, e.g. Citi 2
- Bus overload, e.g. Bridge Street – Magdalene Street
- Improved bus provision around the City, not just from outskirts into centre
- Guided Bus link from Chesterton Rail to Cambridge Station with Jim Chisholm trails completed
- Extension of the Busway beyond the City to the south
- High quality public transport
- Better bus services
- Affordable public transport

- Reliable efficient public transport
- Subsidise park and ride – it is too expensive
- Major cycleways and public transport investment – carrot not stick for less use of cars
- Contributions from developers to overcome parking in streets and improve cycling safety
- Strategies for helping cyclists/pedestrians/drivers coexist
- Getting about without cars – making life easier for pedestrians
- Need to encourage pedestrian journeys, but pedestrians need to feel safe and at ease on streets – rubbish/litter threatening; poor pavements (Romsey).
- Students should not be allowed cars in the City unless they are disabled
- Cycle network up to Europe's best
- More bike lanes, better managed cycle parking, better intersections
- Need properly connected cycle network that is safe for cyclists to use, e.g. wide enough lanes, lighting, information to other road users
- Segregation of public transport, cars, pedestrians, cyclists – especially busy junctions
- Safer cycling
- More off-road cycle paths so cycling is safer
- Much safer cycle routes from suburbs to City Centre
- Strategic cycle routes
- Secure bicycle parking throughout City
- Proper provision for cyclists & cycle parking. Wider, more separated cycleways & footpaths
- Continued development of footpath and cycle network
- Provision for more cycle parking in the centre and elsewhere
- Ban cyclists from more streets & paths
- More car controls – bollards; more pedestrianisation
- Pedestrianise centre
- Better pavements to encourage people to walk
- Heavy vehicles are destroying pavements, some are in a terrible state
- Community car parks
- Put parking underground (x2)
- Undercroft car parks
- Provide small scale off street parking to free streets for movement
- Issue of lack of parking for residents
- Residential parking – no capacity
- Need to change parking standards so that they are: (a) adequate; and (b) say what the minimum standard is
- Allowing development with inadequate off-street parking causes major problems
- On pavement parking should be scrapped
- More coordination of repair works – why tear up the same road several times? Do all work at once

Sustainability and Climate Change

- City slogan/motto 'Proudly Green'
- Use local knowledge & expertise, innovate
- Low carbon houses

- Are communities 'sustainable' if unbalanced – just old, just, young, just families? How do you get balance?
- Is commuting to London 'sustainable'?
- Discourage London commuters from living in the City Centre
- Will water, sewerage and electricity supplies match demand?
- Retrofitting investment
- Need a more comprehensive approach to energy issues – too many 'individual' solutions
- Renewable energy in Conservation Areas
- High quality and sustainable developments – code 4/code5
- All new development to be fitted with thermal & photo voltaic panels and be triple glazed & insulated
- Low energy houses
- All new buildings should have some form of energy saving
- Green roofs/green trees – minimise heat island
- On the 20 year timescale water shortage will occur in South East and East England – plan for this
- Insist on permeability in all new development so that all rainfall is either captured or can soak into the ground to sustain aquifers
- Use of cisterns for non-potable water requirements filled by rainfall
- Strategies for limiting use of water, e.g. water butts
- Support rainwater usage
- Alternative water supplies should the aquifers dry up
- Rain drainage – SuDS
- Seriously look at Cam2 project to reduce flood risk (Midsummer Common, Riverside, Stourbridge Common)
- How do we reduce block paving on driveways etc that exist already?
- Encourage urban food production, composting etc
- More emphasis on recycling as more rubbish is generated
- Waste

Spatial Development

- Population density (behavioural sink) versus green space (urban sprawl). Space to breathe
- One great strength of Cambridge is its small size. How to stop expansion beyond that already committed
- Don't expand Cambridge any more
- Consolidation of already approved developments, which will have a massive impact over the next 20 years
- Build out not up
- Danger of temptation to build higher
- Buildings go up rather than sprawl outwards eating up countryside yet more. Up need not be more than, say, 4 floors
- Risk of housing sprawl in outskirts of Cambridge – Clay Farm, NIAB etc
- The Guided Busway is great. It could go to a new town. We need to start a new town. How else can pressure for growth come to an end?
- Use rail as the spinal link
- Alternative centres/foci beyond the current City boundaries
- Urban extensions with decent community facilities

- South Cambs must bear its share of expansion
- Key issue of land use – including outside City boundary – links to South Cambs District Council
- Resolve City/South Cambs boundary issues
- New residential developments in new communities which are viable in themselves linked to Cambridge by public train/tram/bus through Green Belt buffer
- Further growth should be outwards & satellite centres
- May need to use part of Green Belt
- Push back the Green Belt with green lungs into the countryside
- The City boundary & Green Belt need to be pushed back to allow more house building so homes will become more affordable
- Further development of external science parks
- Defocus old City Centre – make satellite ‘centres’ with shop (retail) /school/open space provision
- ‘One City Centre’ is unsustainable – need to think about multiple alternative locations with community facilities, employment, transport etc – like London on a smaller scale
- Plan to separate the tourist centre from the commercial business centre(s)
- Leave space for growth in new housing community developments
- Smarter use of land, e.g. retail parks should be built over their car parks (multi level going down) with residential development above
- More use of brownfield sites, West Chesterton for example
- Babraham Road: expanding employer (Addenbrooke’s Hosp Campus); very little thought been given to housing employees locally
- Make better use of space, e.g. Newmarket Road, underground junction at Barnwell to create a new Barnwell centre above the through traffic
- High density near to transport hubs & community facilities
- No more ‘infill’ housing developments
- More balance in new developments – housing plus community facilities plus small business units, pubs etc
- Replace commuting in with housing near jobs
- Mixed use neighbourhoods good
- Housing – new developments to be mixed use & have facilities (shops, schools, pubs) & good transport links
- Need policies that encourage healthy mix/distribution of land uses, e.g. many small hotels, many local sports facilities

Other

- Revision and improvement of the planning process
- Less adversarial planning applications helped by a robust Local Plan
- More guidelines against which planning applications can be considered, e.g. extensions to people’s houses in light of more relaxed control. Too much is being allowed.
- Unified planning policy between the City and South Cambs
- More support to residents & community (who are closer to issues around proposed developments) up against well-funded developers. Fiction of planning officer ‘balance’
- Finding out about development proposals & having an input

- More control of developers – should not be allowed to change plans after they have been signed off
- Ensuring developers/speculators do what they agree (at planning permission) & don't do what they want
- More openness on traffic issues re planning apps
- More transparency re use of S106 monies
- S106 levies on student accommodation in respect of leisure & recreation and highways at least
- Ensure the Community Infrastructure levy (CIL) allows investment in local area to incentivise development
- Enforcement of planning restrictions on big developments
- Need better cooperation between City and County – less 'us and them'
- Divorce the County Council – it has no strategic view for Cambridge!
- Need County Highways to be far more rigorous in assessing traffic impact and far more creative in thinking about alternatives to cars
- Localism: danger of special interest groups dominating & promoting interests of members to the disadvantage of everyone else
- Localism: how to stop resident fighting each other? Who will arbitrate?

4.0 Existing Planning Policies

4.1 Following the discussion residents 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).

Residents 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.

4.2 Some residents voted and put comments on deleted policies.

- Policy 4/16 development and flooding – 1 yellow; comments included:
 - Needs more consideration of how flood risk will be assessed.
- Policy 5/6 meeting housing needs from employment – 1 yellow, 3 red; comments included:
 - New employment/increase in student numbers should only be approved if pro rate housing provided
 - Encourager large employers to contribute to housing provision
 - Often naive assumptions about where employees will live, especially where there is more than one person working per household & children travelling to school
- Policy 9/7 Land between Madingley Road & Huntingdon Road – 1 yellow; comments included:
 - Interaction with NIAB site

- 6/5 Shopping development in the City Centre – 1 red; comments included:
 - Local policy needed to encourage local businesses. Need to discourage: (a) obtrusive signage; (b) development which closes streets (as at Grand Arcade)

4.3 Stakeholders made the following comments on the box for missing policies.

- Need to reconsider detailed policies in light of revisions to Planning Policy Statements, Planning Policy Guidance and Regional Spatial Strategy. No longer duplicated?
- Requirement to consult local residents
- More consultation for residents or residents associations at Planning Committee
- Need funding for engagement with all residents.
- Strengthen enforcement of conditions (x2)
- Proper planning enforcement (x2)
- More enforcement of Conservation Areas
- Specify in detail how enforcement will be guaranteed, & penalties for non-compliance. Devil is in the detail.
- Need funding for enforcement of planning (especially promised landscaping)
- Infrastructure required for a new development should be put in place before development can commence
- Policy on mix so don't have over-concentration of any one use in an area where City needs multiple locations of that use, e.g. hotels, sports, arts, culture
- Designation of open space – change 'does it' to 'could it' (x2)
- Open space – needs to take into account provision, or lack of in surrounding area and protect rare spaces/gaps/garden areas, where low provision
- Secondary schools and 6th form colleges
- Protection of pubs as community facilities
- Need a policy relating to protection of existing shops – A1 use category too wide, needs reinforcement
- Appendix on parking provision not realistic when it comes to car ownership
- Car parking standards: developers must love these! They are a nightmare for residents. We need minimum standards, they need to be adequate to meet the likely requirement

Table 2 Residents views on how well policies work

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
3 - Designing Cambridge						
3/1	<u>Sustainable Development</u> Sustainable Development	520	1	1	3	Poor policy implementation. Add: development must connect housing with retail, jobs, recreation etc
3/2	<u>Promoting Design Quality</u> Setting of the City	13		4	1	Strengthen this to ensure views of historic skyline preserved. View of City from the Gogs is ruined by hideous Addenbrooke's buildings.
3/3	Safeguarding Environmental Character	21	1			Built environment must be planned within green infrastructure.
3/4	Responding to Context	1051	2	1	4	Not responding to local vernacular architecture – bland uniformity of inferior design. Built environment must be planned within green infrastructure. Flats on Riverside – I rest my case.
3/6	Ensuring Coordinated Development	33			3	Keep pressure on agreed provision. Council's own officer ignoring the Mill Road development Brief.
3/7	Creating Successful Places	391		2	1	3/7(c) should be applied positively, but mediocre designs regularly approved – too subjective, not sufficiently clear/prescriptive. Excellent policy, but must be implemented with more rigour.
3/8	Open Space and Recreation Provision Through New Development	83		1	4	On-site should be rule rather than exception. Rus in Urbe ² – Keep Cambridge as Garden City. Must be tightened up – to discourage commuted sums in lieu, which have become the norm.
3/9	Watercourses and Other Bodies of Water	14	2	1	1	Good policy working quite well. Let these shape the development of new housing. Is it advisable to build at river level? Need policy on residential moorings – what % of river frontage should they seize?

² Country in the City (Latin) – Bringing part of the countryside into the town.

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
3/10	Sub-Division of Existing Plots	48	2	2		Inadequate enforcement / weak decisions on good policy. (x2) Essential in existing residential areas.
3/11	The Design of External Spaces	163				Good plan; poor execution.
3/12	The Design of New Buildings	160	1	3	2	3/12(a) is regularly ignored – too subjective – need to define Cambridge design criteria & qualities (see above 3/7(c)). Could be improved, particularly higher buildings. Accordia praised, but Cromwell Road terrible.
3/13	Tall Buildings and the Skyline	14	3	3	6	3/13 (a), (d) too often not observed. Skyline based on height of King's Chapel & Gt St Mary's church – stronger policy. Varsity Hotel, Thompson's Lane! Too subjective – impact must be proved to be positive, not just 'evaluated'. Much more caution needed re 'landmark' buildings – all hideous! Words OK but they did not protect us.
3/14	Extending Buildings	563			2	Needs more specific criteria. Policy too broad – needs guidance on acceptable standards etc.
3/15	Shopfronts and Signage	117		1	2	3.42 poor.
4. Conserving Cambridge						
4/1	<u>Protecting the Natural Environment</u> Green Belt	22		1	6	Cambridge boundaries and the Green Belt are too tightly drawn. Cambridge needs to grow and provide more affordable housing. Green Belt policy to be strengthened to ensure key areas are preserved as Green Fingers to countryside. Green Belt and green corridors need protection. Too much already taken out.
4/2	Protection of Open Space	51		2	3	Policy should be strengthened to ensure existing protected open spaces retained.

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
						<p>Policy is well written, but officers interpret as they wish – decide if area is or is not environmentally valuable. (x2)</p> <p>Informal spaces such as pub gardens, spaces providing vistas just as important.</p>
4/3	Safeguarding Features of Amenity or Nature Conservation Value	14			3	
4/4	Trees	120		3	9	<p>Many more trees need to be planted and existing trees protected.</p> <p>Keep developers to agreed level of boskiness³.</p> <p>Developers have an uncanny ability to override TPO⁴s.</p> <p>TPOs swept away in new plans.</p> <p>Essential on large new developments – lots of them!</p> <p>Protection for areas where important trees cut down in advance of applications.</p> <p>Joint Urban Design Team needs to enforce not roll over.</p> <p>Joint Urban Design Team inconsistency and naivety, e.g. Eastern Gate residential ‘step forward’ has forever prevented tree lined Newmarket Road up to Abbey Street (where ‘historic’ buildings begin).</p> <p>Need to amend policy to promote care and maintenance of existing trees in private ownership.</p>
4/6	Protection of Sites of Local Nature Conservation Importance	12	2			
4/8	Local Biodiversity Action Plan	2				

³ Bosky – covered by trees or bushes: wooded. Source:OED

⁴ Tree Preservation Orders

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
4/9	<u>Protecting the Built Environment</u> Scheduled Ancient Monuments/Archaeological Areas	12	2			
4/10	Listed Buildings	196	2	2		But to exclusion of most/all others.
4/11	Conservation Areas	475	1	3	3	<p>Good policy but not implemented with any rigor.</p> <p>3/13(d) Varsity Hotel, Thompson's Lane should never have been approved in such a sensitive location.</p> <p>Needs to be given greater weight (x2).</p> <p>Good policy but 4/11(b) loop hole – 'successful contrast' used to permit inappropriate development because subjective and open to interpretation – need to define or cannot prove 'unsuccessful'.</p>
4/12	Buildings of Local Interest	28		2		BLIs are particularly important outside City Centre, where they may be the only buildings of character.
4/13	<u>Pollution and Flood Protection</u> Pollution and Amenity	215	1	1		
4/14	Air Quality Management Areas	22			1	Air quality is lousy.
4/15	Lighting	33	2	1		<p>The words are good, but there are concerns over the implementation.</p> <p>Policy requiring minimum level good.</p>
5. Living in Cambridge						
5/1	<u>Housing</u> Housing Provision	108	2		5	<p>Poor mix.</p> <p>Too much housing planned for the size of the City – it can barely cope at present.</p> <p>Bungalows important for elderly – in existing neighbourhoods, not elsewhere away from friends.</p> <p>Housing in Cambridge is unaffordable - £320k average house price.</p>

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Your view			
			Green	Yellow	Red	
						<p>Planning should respond to market signals & release more land for housing if prices are unaffordable.</p> <p>Determine house numbers locally.</p> <p>Expand? Yes, but only for local needs not national.</p>
5/2	Conversion of Large Properties	18	1		2	<p>Criteria of extend up to over 110 sq m allows developers to divide up even the smallest houses into bedsits.</p> <p>Criteria of extend then convert to HMO is permissible – causes problems even when initial property was very small.</p>
5/3	Housing Lost to Other Uses	3			1	<p>Change of use to HMO⁵ should require consent to avoid loss of family homes to student housing.</p>
5/4	Loss of Housing	14	1			<p>Presumption against loss of existing bungalows.</p>
5/5	Meeting Housing Needs	16		3	1	<p>Threshold of affordable housing needs revision – need more.</p> <p>Not creating significantly affordable housing.</p> <p>Housing is unaffordable – more land to reduce house prices.</p>
5/7	Supported Housing/Housing in Multiple Occupation	10		3	3	<p>Not working – too many HMOs in some areas.</p> <p>HMOs should be licensed & account taken of parking and management problems.</p> <p>Should be much stricter controls on HMOs and limits to the density of HMOs in areas.</p> <p>Assess car parking impacts.</p> <p>Need to link with regulation of all rented housing – more licenses for non HMOs.</p> <p>Detrimental impact of too many HMOs ignored.</p> <p>Regulation of HMO reactive.</p>
5/8	Travellers	0		1	1	<p>Nothing about boats – needs to work with Conservators.</p>

⁵ HMO - Houses in Multiple Occupation

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
						County not enforcing use occupied vans.
5/9	Housing for People with Disabilities	7		2	1	Policy looks fine, but does it happen? Agree with above. Many old people end up with disability – not enough provision given projected demographics for over 65s.
5/10	Dwelling Mix	11	1	4	3	Need stronger policies to enforce. Great policy but hasn't worked, see Cromwell Road, especially site next to Greens – no family housing. More family housing & fewer cheaply built flats. This has not worked. BT site in Cromwell Road is a poor mix.
5/11	<u>Community Facilities</u> Protection of Existing Facilities	9		3		Sounds like a good policy, but does not seem to be implemented. Protection needed for pubs and shops. Need to protect pubs, or convert to other community facility. Changes of use - need to consult wider community than just neighbours.
5/12	New Community Facilities	21			1	On-site should be rule rather than exception (including corner shops).
5/13	Community Facilities in the Areas of Major Change	4	1	1	1	As 5/12. Enforce phasing plan.
5/14	Provision of Community Facilities through New Development	79	1		1	Local communities should be actively engaged on use of these funds. Continue to include child care.
5/15	Addenbrooke's	4			2	All roads to it for everyone. Less laissez faire please – overwhelming the local infrastructure.
6. Enjoying Cambridge						
6/1	<u>Leisure</u> Protection of Leisure Facilities	4	2	3		Leisure facilities are good, should be better maintained. Closure of Mill Road Library was bad.
6/2	New Leisure Facilities	13			1	

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
6/3	Tourism Tourist Accommodation	5			2	'maintains, strengthens and diversifies' means that no hotel application will ever be refused! Nothing about locating / distribution, or about scale relative to local needs. Needs assessments appear endlessly elastic in developers favour. Parking for tourist buses – shambolic at present.
6/4	Visitor Attractions	3	1	1	1	Find ways to limit negative impact of tourists.
6/6	Shopping Change of Use in the City Centre	14		2	1	More should be done to promote independent shops & stop chains (x2).
6/7	Shopping Development and Change of Use in District and Local Centres	7	1		1	6.24 good. 6.25 does not protect small independent shops from invasion by supermarket chains.
6/8	Convenience Shopping	6	1	1	1	The idea that up to 400 sq m is a small shop is ludicrous and a gift to large chains. Seems to be plenty.
6/9	Retail Warehouses	2			1	Need more industrial units (not necessarily warehouses).
6/10	Food and Drink Outlets	35		4		Lack of affordable retail units for independent retailers.
7. Working and Studying in Cambridge						
7/1	Employment Employment Provision	7		3	1	Need to provide more housing so that employers are not losing best people (who cannot afford to live here)
7/2	Selective Management of the Economy	20		2	1	Larger employers should be encouraged to move to periphery – smaller employers nearer City Centre.
7/3	Protection of Industrial and Storage Space	10		2	1	7/3(e) is massive loophole – developers would love to get hands on Mercer's Row site for residential development – how to protect mixed use/local industry?
7/4	Promotion of Cluster Development	1				
7/5	Higher and Further Education Faculty Development in the Central Area,	1			1	New development that increases employment or student numbers should only be allowed if pro-rata housing / student housing is provided

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
	University of Cambridge					
7/6	West Cambridge, South of Madingley Road	11	1			
7/7	College and University of Cambridge Staff and Student Housing	7			1	More specific control that supported student housing will have genuine university students occupying in perpetuity.
7/8	Anglia Ruskin University East Road Campus	1		2	2	Anglia Ruskin University building over taking residents light.
7/9	Student Hostels for Anglia Ruskin University	4	1		2	Excessive.
7/10	Speculative Student Hostel Accommodation	9		1	4	Designs of speculative student housing easily suited for change to general residential use.
7/11	Language Schools	8		1	2	Outside the City. Not in Cambridge. Stricter controls needed.
8. Connecting and Servicing Cambridge						
8/1	Transport Spatial Location of Development	12			1	More land needs to be released for housing to restore balance to the City housing market
8/2	Transport Impact	159		4	6	No restricted roads to Addenbrooke's. This policy is not implemented properly due to poor advice from County Council. County Highways refuses to enforce 'zero impact' in congested roads. Local impacts not assessed, often decided on a narrow basis. Damage to pavements by vehicles. Enforcement.
8/3	Mitigating Measures	36				
8/4	Walking and Cycling Accessibility	46		2	5	The words are great but not always implemented. Not enough joined up cycle path segregated from vehicles.

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
						8/4(a) is not enforced, e.g. County Highways instructed Berkley Homes to run CRC site traffic under bridge into oncoming cyclists – only resident protest & developer response prevented.
8/5	Pedestrian and Cycle Network	11		2	2	The words are great but not always implemented.
8/6	Cycle Parking	174		2	7	Cycle parking needs to be better managed. Very poor in centre of City.
8/7	Public Transport Accessibility	10		2	1	Public transport has improved, but not enough. Define high quality provision as 24/7. Lack of buses.
8/8	Land for Public Transport	5			1	Congestion.
8/9	Commercial Vehicles and Servicing	13	1	2		
8/10	Off-Street Car Parking	163			4	Not reduced as planned. There is too much in City Centre. Needs to be much more restricted to deter people from driving into the City. Promoting the lower level of car parking does not give solution as to where to put all the cars.
8/11	New Roads	6				
8/12	<u>Cambridge Airport</u> Cambridge Airport	0			1	Noise nuisance move it! Retain this world class enterprise in the City.
8/13	Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone	1				
8/14	<u>Telecommunications</u> Telecommunications Development	10				
8/15	Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lords Bridge	1				
	<u>Energy Resources</u>			2		Difficult to comment, don't know how effective.

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
8/16	Renewable Energy in Major New Developments	31				
8/17	Renewable Energy	11	1			Cost effective.
8/18	<u>Water, Sewerage and Drainage Infrastructure</u>				2	Require water capture for non potable uses.
	Water Sewerage and Drainage Infrastructure	22				Permeable surfaces to maintain ground water levels under City.
9. Areas of Major Change						
9/1	Further Policy/Guidance for the Development of Areas of Major Change	9			2	CB1 variation on outline planning. Reduction of density of housing on NIAB
9/2	Phasing of Areas of Major Change	6		3		Interaction between sites at all stages in development needs to be specified.
9/3	Development in the Urban extensions	8	1			
9/5	Southern Fringe	9	1	1		Process has worked well so far, but the end result of the approved development will saturate the area. Now talk of new stadium – not considered before.
9/6	Northern Fringe	3	1			
9/8	Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road	3		1	4	More details needs to be specified about community facilities, e.g. meeting hall. Interaction with University NW site. Too lax – policy hasn't responded to changing housing market. Prime agricultural land – should be used for growing local produce.
9/9	Station Area	12			12	Station area a totally lost opportunity – poor control of developers. A botched plan and missed opportunity. Horrible design of blocks at present going up – not an attractive introduction to Cambridge. Bicycle parking. 9.46 says 'mature vegetation helps to

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
						<p>green the area...' but all the mature trees are destined to be cut down. Why?</p> <p>Section 106 money, for whose benefit?</p>
10. Implementation						
10/1	Infrastructure Improvements	86		1	1	<p>Needs better control of implementation & penalties for non compliance by developers.</p> <p>Location & timely provision of infrastructure associated with new development – enforcement of Section 106 (Station area)</p>

Appendix 1

Cambridge Local Plan

Pre Issues and Options Consultation

Residents' Associations Workshop

Date: 1st February 2012

Time: 5.30pm – 9.00pm

Venue: Small Hall, Guildhall

AGENDA

Time	Item
5.30	Registration and coffee
6.00	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome and introduction• Introduction to planning process, Local Plan and timetable• Purpose of workshops• Attendees' 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
6.50	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 & design○ Transport○ Sustainability/climate change○ Spatial strategy and options
7.30	Break
7.45	Feedback on Planning Issues
8.05	Existing Planning Policies⁶ <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Overview of existing policies and perceptions of policies and use• Existing policies – what works well, what not so well<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Housing○ Social and leisure○ Economy and retail○ Environment○ Transport○ Sustainability/climate change○ Areas of major change• Where are the major gaps?
8.45	Summing up and next steps
9.00	Close

⁶ It will be helpful for those attending who do not use the Cambridge Local Plan frequently to familiarise themselves with the polices.

Appendix 2

Attendance

Name		Organisation	Present
Alice	Fleet	Highsett Residents' Association	X
Allan	Brigham	EMRAG	X
Andrew	Roberts	Trumpington Residents Association	X
Angus	Mackinnon	Oxford Road Residents Association	
Ann	Prince	EMRAG	
Ann	Mullinger	Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE)	X
Barbara	Bell	Glisson Road/Tenison Road Area Residents' Association	
Beverley	Carpenter	Mill Road Society	X
Chris	Wagner	Gough Way Residents Association	X
Colin	Wiles	EMRAG	X
Diane	Winkleby	Highsett Flats Resident's Association	X
Edward	Cearns	Christ's Pieces Residents Association	X
Elizabeth	Davies	North Newnham Residents Association	X
Gillian	Rogers	Tavistock Road & Stratfield Close Residents' Association	X
Gordon Or Michael	Ward Bryant	Residents' Association of Old Newnham	X
Harmke	Kamminga	Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	X
Hilary	Lowson	Accordia Community and Resident's Association (ACRA)	
I.N.	McCave	Christ's Pieces Residents Association	X
Ian	Gaseltine	SOLACHRA	X
Jane	Singleton	Residents' Association of Old Newnham	X
Jane	Brookes	Mill Road Society	X
Jenifer	Cooper	Park Resident's Association (PRSA)	
Jeremy	Wager	Greenlands' Residents Company	
Jill	Crossley	RTLG Residents Technical Liaison Group	X
Juliet	Van Rijsbergen	Park Street Residents' Association	X
Liz	Buchholz	Old Chesterton Residents' Association & Friends of Stourbridge Common	X
Luisa	Sartini Baldwin	The Linchpin Project	
Lynette	Gilbert	Riverside Area Residents Association	X
Mairin	Lennon	Bradmore & Petersfield Residents Association	X
Mal	Schofield	FECRA (Cambridge Federation of Residents' Associations)	X
Margaret	Collins	Romsey Action	X

Name		Organisation	Present
Margaret	Tait	Christ's Pieces Residents Association	
Mark	Sopworth	Pinehurst South Resident's Association	X
Martin	Thompson	Jesus Green Association	
Michael	Bond	Old Chesterton Residents' Association	X
Morcom	Lunt	FECRA (Cambridge Federation of Residents' Associations)	
Mr	Cooper	Park Resident's Association (PRSA)	
Neville	Silverston	Babraham Road Action Group	
Nicola	Terry	Sandy Lane Residents' Association	X
Penny	Heath	North Newnham Residents Association	
Peter	Jeffery	Bateman Street & Bateman Mews Residents' Association	X
Peter	Dummett	SOLACHRA	X
Prudence	Jones	Shelly Gardens Leaseholders' Association	X
Richard	Footitt	Richmond Road Residents' Association	X
Richard	Price	Park Street Residents' Association	X
Richard	Robertson	Friends of Milton Road Library	X
Roger	Chatterton	Brunswick & North Kite Residents Association	X
Roger	France	King Street Neighbourhood Association	
Roger	Crabtree	Rustat Neighbourhood Association	X
Ronald	Clifton	Brooklands Avenue Area Residents' Association	X
Ruth	Deyermond	Mill Road Society	X
Sharon	Murray	Cherry Hinton Residents' Association	
Simon	Gosnell	University of the Third Age & Mill Road Society	
Simon	Watkins	Victoria Park Residents Association Working Group	
Sue	Green	BENERA (Bentley and Newton Road Residents' Association)	
Susan	Dixon	Brunswick & North Kite Residents Association	
Susanna	Brown	Christ's Pieces Residents Association	
Tamsin	Walker	EMRAG	X
Val	Cutting	Bradmore & Petersfield Residents Association	
Clive	King	St Bartholomew's Court RA	X
Nick	McCave	Christ's Pieces RA	X
Chris	Linton	Cherry Hinton & Rathmore	X