

*Cambridge Local Plan – Towards 2031*

# **Pre Issues and Options Consultation**

## **Stakeholders Workshop**

**31st 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 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 Local and statutory stakeholders, including service providers, educational establishments, businesses and lobby groups, were invited to the workshop on 31<sup>st</sup> January 2012. A list of attendees can be found in Appendix 2.
- 1.4 The workshop was structured as follows (see Agenda in 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 stakeholders associated with the City included:
- No longer compact
  - Confused – what does Cambridge want?
  - High quality of life, but declining.
  - Delights the senses
  - Historical
  - Defined by its historic core
  - River and commons
  - Inspiring
  - More polluted than it should be
  - Carbon intensive
  - Two halves
  - Unequal
  - Diverse
  - Unfriendly to children (lack of facilities)

- Conservative
- Economic engine – innovative
- Creative
- Best university in the world
- International
- Tourism
- Declining retail offer
- Expensive
- Conflicting transport policies (or lack of)
- Congested
- Cyclist/motorist conflict
- Good cycling city
- Overwhelmed by commuters

## **Cambridge 2031**

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

- With a clear vision of its size
- Well connected to region
- Innovative about dealing with growth
- Well integrated (everything to hand)
- A living city, not a museum
- Sustainably accommodated growth
- Resource efficient
- Clean air
- Water sensitive
- At the forefront of low carbon living
- Lots of trees and green spaces
- High quality open space network throughout whole city
- Preserved open spaces
- Calm & exciting
- High quality design
- Variations of design
- Diverse, secure and accessible neighbourhoods
- Children and young people friendly
- New development that respects the old
- No homelessness
- Affordable housing for all
- High quality art and sports provision that all can access
- Equal access to services wherever you live
- Ideas engine
- Strong vibrant economy
- Full employment
- Internationally competitive/successful
- Thriving University
- Easy to shop
- Low speed limits and no traffic congestion
- Scandinavian cycling standards and levels

## The Future Vision – Getting There

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

Table 1 Future vision SWOT analysis

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Historic core</li> <li>• Diversity of sports/recreation facilities</li> <li>• International reputation</li> <li>• Local economy</li> <li>• Strong research and science base</li> <li>• University</li> <li>• Skilled population</li> <li>• Mix of uses in town centre</li> <li>• Transport patterns &amp; modes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historic core (constraint)</li> <li>• Provision of community services lags behind development</li> <li>• Lack of job opportunities within new housing</li> <li>• Congestion may get worse (modal split)</li> <li>• Coherence of planning at sub-regional level</li> <li>• Need to consider space allocations at outline planning stage</li> <li>• Lack of enforcement of policy</li> </ul>
Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce water consumption in new development &amp; existing properties</li> <li>• Improve existing historic buildings stock energy efficiency</li> <li>• Development – new open spaces and facilities</li> <li>• Manufacture from ideas from Cambridge (rather than abroad)</li> <li>• Make best of Chesterton railway station</li> <li>• Coherence of planning at sub-regional level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decentralisation</li> <li>• High levels of development threatens what makes Cambridge special</li> <li>• Piecemeal erosion of Green Belt</li> <li>• Climate change</li> <li>• Lack of willingness to reduced carbon consumption</li> <li>• NHS reforms: planning not on radar of new commissioning groups</li> <li>• Affordability of health premises and service provision – need overall plan for the City</li> <li>• Sports &amp; recreation run out of space</li> <li>• Internet shopping</li> <li>• Increased congestion due to expansion</li> </ul>

## 3.0 Issues

3.1 Stakeholders identified issues under seven broad headings; a few issues are recorded here under 'Other' where they did not fit easily under any of the headings. Some issues might fit under more than one heading, but have initially been allocated to what looks the most appropriate.

### Housing

- Quantity and where?
- Non delivery of Cambridge East – need for alternative sites
- Insufficient previously developed land to provide low density family housing
- Supply currently lags behind demand. Jobs outstrip availability of homes – results in in-commuting
- Meeting the demand for homes whilst retaining the historic character of the City
- Positive: small City. Limited land availability for new housing
- Make better use of existing development land

- Regeneration of some declining residential areas
- Future development should allow improvements /benefits for more deprived areas of City – remove have and have nots
- Housing should be designed to form communities to encourage inter generational volunteering
- Genuinely mixed and balanced communities
- Flourishing major growth areas that are fully integrated into the life of the City
- New housing to be provided with high quality social infrastructure, e.g. playing fields & sports facilities
- Affordable
- Avoid clustering social housing in areas
- Affordable intermediate housing for people on medium level incomes
- Affordable housing for those in their 20s
- Affordable housing/key worker housing
- Key worker housing policy needs re-examining
- Could business community fund housing for staff to increase house building?
- Affordable housing for locals and people who moved in for work
- Affordable housing for families indigenous to Cambridge – lower paid staff necessary to service businesses
- Meeting real housing need for local people and providing sufficient housing to accommodate all those new jobs coming to the area over the next 20 years
- Lack of affordable housing in wider area to match Cambridge's strengths
- Economic pressures, changing government funding structure plus introduction of CIL placing pressure on % affordable housing delivery
- How to ensure high % of affordable housing is built (with little/no government grant)
- Revise affordability criteria in 2006 Plan – 30% income no longer appropriate – need more evidence
- Housing for those working in City Centre that is affordable
- Look at more ways to keep the younger generation involved with housing
- Attract young people/families and key workers
- Greater clarity of type of housing mix and focus on meeting needs of community to avoid potential 'ghettos'
- Mixture of size and cost
- Ensure that new communities include high % of family (2+ bedrooms) accommodation
- Need to provide diverse housing – prestige and spacious as well as affordable
- Shortage of large family houses impacting on 'Executive' recruitment.
- Large family homes are also required
- Continue building and providing right type of housing – Life Time Homes – Code for Sustainable Homes
- As University grows more student accommodation will be required near to the colleges students attend.
- Over provision of student housing in specific areas resulting in mono culture, e.g. 1000 student rooms in CB1
- Accommodation for students, given inevitable expansion of University of Cambridge (plus also Anglia Ruskin University?)
- Policies for all student types in housing required
- Houses and communities must be designed so that people can stay in them as long as possible as they get older
- Lifetime homes should become the standard for new houses
- Good quality housing design

- High standards of innovative housing design – not 'identikit Barratt Homes'
- Quality design
- High-rise verses infill
- Densification
- Need to introduce green/open spaces with links to wider network of open spaces

## **Social and Leisure**

- Service hub for surrounding area
- Crowded
- Protection of existing community facilities
- Broader interpretation of community requirements – culture, sport, open space & recreation
- Provision of social and leisure facilities to meet the needs of the whole diverse population
- Promote lifetime neighbourhoods
- Social infrastructure/community cohesion: we plan physical buildings but not always the people, social infrastructure needed to ensure access or to bring new people together
- Good level of community facilities but links to growth
- Enjoyment in leisure time
- Better access to health care outside working hours without the need to go to Accident and Emergency
- Affordability of service provision - unaffordable to have health provision in each new development but this is often desired, e.g. University site & NIAB.
- Need to have an integrated vision for services across the City. Hampered by NHS changes – danger that new commissioning bodies not well enough engaged or up to date with planning issues.
- New community facilities to be secured through implementation of Community Infrastructure Levy
- Provision for a growing, more health conscious population
- Provision of 'broader' public sector services that go beyond single development sites, e.g. adult social care
- Keep service provision local & recognise different needs
- A good mix of leisure facilities available to residents, students and visitors (less exclusive)
- Provision for young people
- Cambridge must be made more interesting for those not connected with the University, particularly the young
- Encouraging diverse multinational spirit in retail, arts and other recreational facilities
- Need to include broader cultural provision, e.g. art work, display space, dance and drama/theatre
- Need commuted sums for maintenance of indoor & outdoor provision not just Public Open Space.
- Insufficient public space in new developments for recreation and sport
- Running out of capacity for leisure/sport/recreation
- The need for a new community purpose-built stadium for Cambridge
- Aspiration for being home to top flight sporting team
- Better facilities for both young people and elderly
- Affordable family tickets

- Capacity; accessible; multi-functional
- Should social and leisure be in central locations or on the outskirts? Transport links important. Small population - will facilities be used?
- Need more sports facilities for non-University use, e.g. ice rink.
- Vibrant but safe City Centre at night
- Safe City Centre
- Better design

## **Economy and Retail**

- Local economy thriving
- Larger employment focus
- Need to remain attractive to inward investment – planning policies can help
- More land allocations for high-tech, R&D on accessible public transport network
- Making it possible for small to medium sized enterprises (SME) businesses & retailers to set up shop in the City, i.e. business rates/rents
- Protection of small businesses
- Encouragement for smaller independent businesses
- Affordable office & retail outlets to prevent empty boarded-up units
- Opportunities for local small businesses to compete with large brands, e.g. B&B/budget hotels
- Supporting economy emerging from recession
- Reinforce knowledge industries (high tech)
- Academic inspiration maintained in the City & Sub-region
- Educational attainment - opportunity for local people – link to economic health of City
- Link businesses better to schools
- Relax restriction on HQ/regional offices of non high-tech businesses
- Policies to encourage economic clusters in the City, e.g. around CB1
- Keep and build on Cambridge's strong research base
- Encourage retail/office development in the City
- Maintain ability for economy to be innovative & competitive
- Capacity to exploit City's innovation
- Restabilising link with high tech manufacture
- Promote 3rd cluster as Clean Tech Sector
- We are a two University City with different needs – we need to remember this
- Support sustainable growth of Colleges
- Lift ban on encouraging educating private sector to increase business
- Meeting the housing & building requirements of colleges. Redevelopment on Campus and on new sites, Need positive and flexible policy
- Keeping up its international reputation by encouraging international tourism and welcoming international students
- Tourism could be better coordinated – promotion happens just because of our history and beauty – can we better manage tourists to maximise spend by making improvements that will also benefit residents'.
- Lack of tourist accommodation and standards for it
- Tourism development – how and what?
- Protecting employment land.
- Maintain vibrancy of historic core – retain retail University/retail/cultural activity which underpins success of City (activities in urban extensions to be subservient)

- Vibrant City Centre, not a museum
- Historic core – mixed use pressure
- Economy & retail: keep centrally in the City
- Give thought to how to make better use of the Market Square and the Guildhall
- Greater retail diversity
- Driving opportunities & unlocking potential to attract ‘world class’ retailers (constantly changing)
- More local shops
- Easy access to local shops
- Avoid Tesco-isation of the City
- Retail for everyone – cheaper shops getting pushed out
- Need to understand that retail needs are changing, e.g. desire for larger shops within constrained city centre, but retaining local retailers.
- Create a number of well-connected ‘City Centres’
- Stop centralising retail sheds on Newmarket Road – second site on other side of town
- Conflict between in town and out of town retail
- Box-retail units on Newmarket Road – more intensively use site
- Protecting the City Centre from out of town retail development
- Manage out of town retail so city is not so damaged and within this retain the strength of our independent offer
- Make sure out of town hyper-stores do not cancel out local shops
- Care needed to ensure range of offer ensures less travel to shop
- Retail needs no encouragement
- Congestion + car park prices + inconvenient transport + internet shopping = threat to retail/perpetual decline = less visitors = less spend = less jobs
- Declining retail unsightly retail, e.g. when Habitat goes
- Extend ‘Changing Spaces’ initiative while retail unit vacant
- Reduction in retail due to internet based shopping
- Relax Change of Use categories
- Anticipate effect of web retailing
- Needs to be accessible by non-car users

## Environment

- Effects of growth on the environment
- Lack of accessible green space
- Protection of existing areas – open space & wildlife areas; opportunities to enhance; opportunities to create new areas to link to existing
- Retain and enhance open spaces/wildlife habitat and create high quality green links to wider network of green spaces – should be multi functional
- Protection and enhancement of natural environment should reflect aims and aspirations of the Cambs Green Infrastructure Strategy
- Maintain and enhance Green Infrastructure – within City and wider area
- Gog Magog Countryside Project: accessible green space; wildlife habitat creation; landscape; strategic open space over looking Cambridge
- Local Plan needs a strong vision & spatial plan for natural environment ( help implement Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy and Cambridge Nature Conservation Strategy)
- Provide high quality network of natural green spaces throughout the whole City (and beyond)

- How to retain the same ratio of open (accessible) space per head of population as now in future developments
- Preservation of green spaces
- Pleasant places to walk to (leafy & green)
- Existing open spaces should be protected and where applicable access widened, e.g. College playing fields
- Understanding of historic significance of open space
- Increase in density must not be to detriment of green space
- Provision of accessible natural green space in parts of the City without much
- Quality accessible green space
- Protection & enhancement of areas of geological interest
- Low quality public realm in new developments
- Quality of public realm
- Improve public realm: more investment, e.g. along Riverside; paint /maintenance
- Spend S106 money on the public realm
- Lack of finance limits creative use of space (Market Square) & dwelling standards of cleanliness & security
- Spending on public realm from Section 106 funds
- Neglected gateways into City Centre re Newmarket Road
- Conflict between protecting historic past & embracing the opportunities of modern design
- A sense of Cambridge as a whole, with the historic core as the focus, and its linkage to the landscape at the urban edge.
- Low rise City
- Design and skyline
- Maintain historical assets/character for benefit of residents. Tourists & economy & enhance
- More development sympathetic to Cambridge's heritage, e.g. Hills Road is more appropriate to Docklands not Cambridge, not just in the centre
- Design that fails to understand what is special about the Cambridge context
- Developer greed resulting in erosion of historic 'low rise' skyline
- Forward thinking while respecting City's heritage/architecture
- Vision in design
- Good design is not good enough for Cambridge – it must be excellent (including appearance!)
- Continue to build iconic buildings
- Quality and interesting design
- High quality design for new building to complement the current historic core, but push the limits of design
- Flexibility in use of public sector buildings & in design over time – adaptability
- Large gardens – stop garden grabbing
- Water body quality
- Congestion on the river – tighter control on houseboats
- Air pollution – improve non-car transport opportunities
- Pollution prevention
- Cleanliness (air, recycling) making Cambridge a cleaner City

## **Transport**

- Networks within the City are quite constrained which makes facilitating travel challenging

- A City such as Cambridge is bound to generate long distance travel (in and out) and a balance needs to be sought on this.
- Improved transport infrastructure for the wider Sub-region
- Plans which draw fewer workers to the centre of the City
- Prevent gridlock
- Address polluting congestion through joined up transport planning
- Impact of development on transport networks and wider links needs to be considered beyond 'red line boundaries'
- To alleviate the A14 congestion
- Is enough being done to resolve issues on A14?
- Transportation: accessible; affordable; integrated; balanced with needs of cars/vehicles & public
- Need to cater for all transport forms
- Enforcement of travel plans – new mechanism needed
- Balance between public transport, cars, car parking, cycle lanes, pedestrians is not there yet
- Reduce congestion yet provide access
- Good transport links/accessibility for patients, visitors, staff (*relating to Addenbrooke's*)
- Ease traffic congestion: retail parks outside main City routes; take into account many people who have cars when building new homes
- Help congestion by: relocating some schools away from city centre & split Long Road and Hills Road sites
- Link up with Stagecoach P&R: local travel school policy; how to get private schools to reduce car trips
- Free flowing or Cambridge's unique economy will suffer – science/innovation, tourism, education
- Ensuring the growth of the local economy and improving infrastructure, e.g. road, rail, bus services, general connectivity
- Transport infrastructure improvements before more development, particularly housing
- Holistic approach to infrastructure planning
- Suitability of Cambridge for underground routes (Queen's Road) – help to improve open spaces; also over ground routes
- Ensure good rail/road links to the City (so people and businesses are not put off coming here)
- Limited option due to historic layout
- Changing technology & information systems on : movement; traffic; work pattern
- Reduction of retail transport from digital advances
- Airport – growing importance
- Grasp the nettle and go for congestion charge
- Fewer cars
- Car use has to be reduced if City is to avoid being choked by traffic as it grows
- Keep cars out of the centre
- Remove all motor vehicles (internal combustion engine) from the City Centre
- City Centre capacity and environmental impact is a challenge
- Accessibility to City Centre
- Ban large vehicles from City (trucks etc)
- Protect and enhance sustainable transport methods
- Designing to reduce conflict between road users

## **Buses/Public Transport**

- More buses
- Buses are key part of the solution
- Park and Ride better facility needed for the evenings
- Frequent and reliable public transport
- Improved access to public transport for City residents (pricing for young people)
- Frequent reliable public transport (long hours)
- Public transport and cycling important as car use becomes more difficult
- More Guided Bus
- Exploit opportunities of rail/Guided Bus/bus for trips into City
- Improve public transport – increase not reduce bus services
- Subsidies for public transport for new developments to reduce car usage
- Infrastructure in place early in new developments, particularly public transport to reduce car usage
- Needs dedicated public transport links if ever to get modal shift
- More public transport priority lanes in urban area with enforcement
- Public transport available in the evenings/late night – including to rural hinterland
- Cashless bus service – drivers just drive! Ticket available throughout the City

## **Rail**

- The need to relieve congestion and increase capacity on the railway – new stations?
- Improvement of train links & station capacity as City size expands
- Good rail links, e.g. Oxford, Chesterton Sidings opening
- Chesterton railway station (x2)
- Railway station in the east

## **Cycling**

- More cycles
- Improve the network of cycle paths and maintain them better so as to encourage all cyclists to use them
- Provide cycle routes off road that are lit at night
- Improved cycle only routes/network
- Sometimes there are difficult balances if we want high quality bus/cycle facilities
- Continued development of cycleways, footpaths, etc to encourage active lifestyles
- Better facilities for cyclists: dedicated areas; clear signage in centre; parking/racks
- Insufficient cycle parking around the City – need for new development to assist in providing new cycle stands
- Continental levels of cycling to reduce road congestion
- The 2006 Local Plan gives priority to walking and cycling (section 8/4). Problem is implementation – examples:
  - Government guidance where streets are too narrow – guidance effecting pedestrians and cyclists should be paramount
  - Space for cycle parking. In sufficient for cycle parking standards allocated at outline stage and in wrong place to meet cycle parking standards
  - In planning recommendations and decisions, walking and cycling treated as an after thought

- Housing designs that make cycling & walking the desired, natural choice, not by coercion
- Ensuring that local centres have a strong & varied selection of facilities – people not forced to go into the City Centre
- Enhance cycling routes/facilities

### **Walking**

- More walking
- Provide network of public rights of way from the City into S Cambs & access areas, e.g. Wandlebury, Roman Road, Coton NR, Gog Magog Downs, Lode
- Local facilities within walkable reach
- Expand pedestrian zone
- Pedestrianise large part of historic core
- Provision for mobility scooters
- Garaging in central Cambridge
- More house=more cars – ensuring that adequate parking is provided
- Adequate parking provision for houses
- Provision of adequate parking facilities – this has been insufficient in CB1 development

## **Sustainability and Climate Change**

- Needs to be a principle underpinning all the topic areas
- Strategic City solutions versus local sites solutions
- Risk of climate change
- Climate change is overarching issue – should influence everything
- Economic cost of not doing anything – adaptation
- Climate change adaptation – increase tree cover & open spaces
- Necessity for broad sustainability in all development planning, but restriction by costs despite intentions
- Education – changing customers thinking
- Encouraging people to think about & care for the wider environment – providing the right infrastructure & facilities
- Less consumption
- Low carbon lifestyles
- Aim for carbon neutral
- Decarbonise Cambridge
- Cambridge should be leading the low carbon, energy efficiency agenda in practice
- Be an exemplar in sustainable building demanding higher than national standards
- More use of modern technologies (sustainable) to make its place for environmentally friendly City
- Build on success to date in locating/designing new development to minimise a variety of environmental impacts – more can be achieved.
- Short term responses to climate change resulting in long term harm to historic core – need to develop appropriate solutions, not one size fits all. Listed buildings are 2% of building stock.
- Multifunctionality e.g. green spaces for biodiversity, recreation, drainage, food production
- New developments to improve accessibility. Green spaces. Mixed-use, distribution of general facilities for City
- Reduce the need to travel – No. 1 priority

- Sustainable construction (waste and energy efficient design)
- Consider building new homes to the Code for Sustainable Homes level 5/6, but also need to think about the cost effectiveness and carbon footprint options
- Sustainable homes – code level 5 realistic? On new schemes, e.g. North West Cambridge
- Building efficient houses – reduce use of water, be aware of carbon footprint
- Growth figures need to be available for Cambridge Water to plan for future demand
- Sustainability of historic buildings still in use – get the right balance
- Retrofit the existing building stock
- Innovate in order to improve the historic building stock in terms of environmental performance. Develop clear policy framework to support this
- Resource efficiency
- Rigorous application of high environmental efficiency standards
- Look at innovative ideas for providing heating etc – similar to city like Sheffield
- Reduce fuel poverty
- Scientific research is often energy intensive
- Encourage groups and initiatives for energy saving development
- District heating scheme – an added element to individual development proposals
- Increase micro renewables – favourable planning regime to promote
- Energy efficiency (x2)
- Energy planning (x2)
- High standards of energy efficiency & renewable energy
- Housing energy efficient
- Social and leisure facilities energy efficient
- Flood risk – surface water, river
- Minimisation of flood risk
- Flood prevention – how safe is Cambridge from a major flood?
- One authority for the Cam (currently two)
- Availability of water
- How to meet extra water demand with more housing?
- Water resources - need great efficiency
- Water resources scarcity
- Water efficiency
- Retrofitting in older properties to reduce water consumption (x2)
- Integrated household recycling provision - innovative
- Alternative recycling- away from Milton on opposite side of town or near centre

## **Spatial Development**

- Should Cambridge grow?
- Cambridge cannot grow in size beyond the current extent of Local Plan development allocations
- Retain a compact City with access to the countryside
- Encourage spatial growth – Cambridge has a unique opportunity
- Not many more opportunities in the City – needs new urban form properly resourced with infrastructure
- Further revision of inner Green Belt? To identify alternative extension sites to Cambridge East; and or another new settlement (South Cambs)

- Expansion of the current City beyond boundary should be done on scale that effectively supports service planning and delivery
- Much more housing in & on edge of Cambridge to help address over time jobs/workforce imbalance.
- Growth potential of Southern Fringe – to be extended further
- New urban fringes – accountable to maintaining high quality urban design, e.g. North West Cambridge site – still level code 5/access/new school provision
- Housing based around accessible corridors
- Agree a spatial vision considering the impact on the economy & maintaining the history & character of the City – will require working with County Council & S Cambs
- Cambridge needs to work with neighbouring areas & surrounding market towns if it is to ‘grow’ further
- Linkages to surrounding areas (village) if they are growing too.
- Satellite towns – housing + fast rail and bus links
- New settlements in the City’s Sub-region that are linked and well served by public transport
- What will be put on Waterbeach?
- New neighbourhoods on guided Busway or good transport use
- Congestion – lack of space for growth; need to protect Green Belt where this is part of the green infrastructure network, Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy
- Cambridge Green Belt: maintain the principle that its function is to protect the character of the historic City – update the Cambridge Green Belt study with South Cambs
- Principles that Green Belt seeks to meet are a strength. However, the policy has led to poor and unsustainable development and travel patterns. Future approach needs to be in spirit of the Green Belt rather than a rigid prohibition
- Risk that University will move the bulk of its teaching away from the centre to NW Cambridge & West Cambridge resulting in loss of diversity in centre
- Integrating different uses across the City – retail, housing economic
- Densification of central area
- Be aware of wider issues of intensification of development of current city – limited opportunities to expand schools/leisure service provision
- Utilise existing brownfield sites through regeneration and renewal – to higher densities; use of CPOs – in full
- Alternative centres for attraction/enterprise (La Defense model) on a Cambridge scale
- Even distribution of: housing (inc affordable mix); open space; employment; retail; community facilities

## Other

- Greater cooperation between City Council, County Council & South Cambs – or unitary authority?
- City state
- Alconbury must be well used and not designed just to make money for the developers
- Need holistic link between planning housing and planning service provision – not just statutory services

- Economic environment adding to existing pressure on new housing requirements for infrastructure impacting on transport, leisure, sustainability. Quality, design etc
- Impact of cyber/digital economy on future development
- Changing public sector service provision: relocation; reuse; release value (for reinvestment)
- Planning policies which encourage diversity of facilities and services
- Ghettoisation of facilities – to avoid this
- Make it attractive for younger generation – more creative, modern, child & teenager friendly place
- Reduce the time to implement planning
- Economic climate is slowing down introduction of mandatory legislation, e.g. Code for Sustainable Homes
- Need to look at option for capturing developer contributions
- Ensure that provision of open space rights of way can be funded through CIL
- Better balance between in-commuters and out-commuters
- Better liaison with the needs of the future elderly population

## 4.0 Existing Planning Policies

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

4.2 Following the discussion Stakeholders 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). Stakeholders were given a maximum of 10 dots of each colour to allocate; and were encouraged 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 Some stakeholders voted and put comments on deleted policies.

- Policy 4/5 protection of sites of nature conservation importance – 2 green and 3 red; comments included:
  - Needs to be included, not properly covered in new NPPF (also applies to 4/7 & 4/16)
  - Needs to be included – should be seen as an asset, not just a constraint; opportunities for enhancement
- Policy 4/7 Species protection – 1 yellow and 2 green; comments included:
  - 4.7 & 4/16 need reinstating with local context in light of loss of PPS25 and the NPPF
- Policy 5/6 Consider reinstating – Oxford has policy.
- Policy 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)

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

- Policies currently in PPS need to be considered for inclusion if not in the NPPF
- CIL
- RSS policy/Cambs Structure Plan policy recognise importance of Green Belt in protecting historic character of Cambridge. Add LP policy on the role of GB to support character and setting
- Policies for health facilities and services – integration with community facilities. Issue of affordability if considered by development rather than as integrated approach for whole City.
- Policies to ensure delivery of sites for necessary community infrastructure, not just money, especially in response to infill/smaller scale developments
- Consider policies to enhance public access to river frontage
- Need policy on off road (walking and cycling) access to leisure routes in S & E Cambs – Roman Road, Beechwoods, old railway line - Lode for Anglesey Abbey
- Landscape? Built and natural
- Cambridge community stadium
- Cambridge Science Park should be covered in a single Local Plan, even though it is within S. Cambs and the City
- Increasing likelihood of new station at Chesterton sidings means 8.20 should be implemented
- Protection of agricultural land/ soil resources
- Policies to deliver Climate Change Act 2008 legally binding targets

Table 2 Stakeholders' 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		1	8	Need to tackle retrofit. Resource efficiency and Climate Change Act 2008. Needs to be strengthened. Does not consider the efficiency of future developments – water efficiency.
3/2	<u>Promoting Design Quality</u> Setting of the City	13		2	2	Most recent commercial and residential development out of character to Cambridge heritage – Hills Road Bridge War Memorial. The setting of Cambridge should be considered in a wider sense – it is much wider than the quality of the urban edge, ref Cambridge Green Belt Study (LDA).
3/3	Safeguarding	21	2			

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
	Environmental Character					
3/4	Responding to Context	1051	4	1	1	Means developers fight to make Cambridge 'exceptions' to national rule.  Very important – need to make sure understand whole City context, as well as local context.
3/6	Ensuring Coordinated Development	33		2		
3/7	Creating Successful Places	391	1	1		Public art policy needs greater subtlety of application.
3/8	Open Space and Recreation Provision Through New Development	83	1	1		Developers getting away with commuted sums constantly.
3/9	Watercourses and Other Bodies of Water	14		1	1	
3/10	Sub-Division of Existing Plots	48			3	Completely failed to protect large gardens.  Need to achieve intensification, so building in large gardens is needed sometimes.
3/11	The Design of External Spaces	163				
3/12	The Design of New Buildings	160	3	1	3	This is written so that it permits intrusion of design, the realm of architecture to an excessive subjective degree.  This is an important policy – its implementation is key. Some likelihood that 'one-off' landmarks are creating confusion of policy and compromising quality.
3/13	Tall Buildings and the Skyline	14		4	5	Tall building policy unclear – need for city debate about whether Cambridge should stay human scale or not.  Not proactive.  Tall buildings skyline policy – too conservative.  Very important policy. Needs strategic sense of City as predominantly low rise. Need to adhere to LP – presently inconsistent.

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
3/14	Extending Buildings	563	2	1		
3/15	Shopfronts and Signage	117	2		1	
<b>4. Conserving Cambridge</b>						
4/1	<u>Protecting the Natural Environment</u> Green Belt	22	3	1	10	Needs greater integration of different considerations not just areas of beauty.  Policy needs to be more holistic and take more account of transportation and overall development strategy.
4/2	Protection of Open Space	51	1	4	6	Covers protection but not enhancement. Fails to properly contribute towards creating a network of natural and accessible green spaces across Cambridge.  Having all school playing fields as protected open space limits the ability to flexibly develop schools to meet the demands upon them for school places.  This should recognise the historic interest & associations of open spaces / interplay with built heritage.  Ability of developers to get away with commuted only sums.  Some areas I do not feel should be under this policy.  Failure to protect commons from residential development where they go under the river.  Better integration of open space in new developments with existing open space. Need specific policy guidance for playing fields.  Need to improve quality & access to open space (esp. College facilities), as well as protection.
4/3	Safeguarding Features of Amenity or Nature Conservation Value	14	2	1	2	Good but needs improved ref to protection of statutory sites biodiversity, geo diversity.  Covers protection but not enhancement. Fails to properly contribute towards creating a network of nature accessible green spaces across Cambridge.
4/4	Trees	120	3	2	2	Ref to veteran trees protection
4/6	Protection of Sites of Local	12	2			

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
	Nature Conservation Importance					
4/8	Local Biodiversity Action Plan	2		2		Rewrite to cover creation and enhancement of an 'ecological network' / green infrastructure / network of natural accessible green spaces across the whole of Cambridge.
4/9	<b><u>Protecting the Built Environment</u></b> Scheduled Ancient Monuments/Archaeological Areas	12	1			Policies 4/9, 4/10, 4/11, 4/12 – strongly support, but should be reviewed to consider the wider character conferred by City's heritage
4/10	Listed Buildings	196	1	3		Many listed buildings have evolved over centuries. Balance needed between use and preservation = not frozen for ever.  4/10 & 4/11 enhancement should be included in these important policies & latest understanding of 'setting'.
4/11	Conservation Areas	475		1	3	Too many restricting future opportunities.
4/12	Buildings of Local Interest	28			1	
4/13	<b><u>Pollution and Flood Protection</u></b> Pollution and Amenity	215		2	5	Need to stress importance of street cleanliness.  Too general, needs to be more robust and specific.
4/14	Air Quality Management Areas	22	3	1		Needs better enforcement.
4/15	Lighting	33	1	1	1	Lighting need to be sensitive in Conservation Areas & adjoining listed buildings
<b>5. Living in Cambridge</b>						
5/1	<b><u>Housing</u></b> Housing Provision	108	2	2		The policy is generally OK
5/2	Conversion of Large Properties	18		1	5	Lack of clarity in interpretation. Need to consider retrofit for energy efficiency.
5/3	Housing Lost to Other Uses	3				
5/4	Loss of Housing	14				
5/5	Meeting Housing Needs	16		5	3	All evidence needs updating, e.g. key workers, may need to consider targets and types of affordable housing.

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
						Works in terms of affordable housing, but this does not always link into consideration of the impact on service development in terms of changing mix of service needs.  Review threshold for affordable housing; include student housing in affordable housing. S106 requirement – funding top priority.
5/7	Supported Housing/Housing in Multiple Occupation	10		1		
5/8	Travellers	0			2	Surprised this hasn't been referred to. Even though provision is mainly geographically S Cambs, service provision is from Cambridge City. Demand for authorised stopping over provision.  Some provision needed!
5/9	Housing for People with Disabilities	7	1			
5/10	Dwelling Mix	11		2		
5/11	<b><u>Community Facilities</u></b> Protection of Existing Facilities	9		1	8	Existing policy on community facilities is unsatisfactory because it doesn't afford protection to some important facilities, notably pubs.  Marketing requirement when community facilities are closed and before reuse for alternative (more profitable) uses can be considered.
5/12	New Community Facilities	21	1	2		Policies on development of new community facilities are sound – provided such facilities include pubs.
5/13	Community Facilities in the Areas of Major Change	4	2	1		But timescale for implementation needs to be enforced.
5/14	Provision of Community Facilities through New Development	79		3	1	Needs better definition.  Not appropriate to always accept contributions for off site provision of facilities / transport /education etc. There need to be a mechanism to ensure opportunities are available for appropriate provision to be made.
5/15	Addenbrooke's	4	1	1	2	Better links with City Centre essential.
<b>6. Enjoying Cambridge</b>						

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
6/1	<b><u>Leisure</u></b> Protection of Leisure Facilities	4	2	1	1	River Cam has been turned into a liner marina alongside Stourbridge and Midsummer Commons.
6/2	New Leisure Facilities	13		3		Need a policy on new community stadium for Cambridge.
6/3	<b><u>Tourism</u></b> Tourist Accommodation	5	1		2	Hotels policy vague – seems to be an excessive development of budget hotels – they look awful, they will provide limited employment opportunities & do we know if there is sufficient demand for them?
6/4	Visitor Attractions	3				
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		1	1	Seems impossible to resist developments like Tesco who can subsidise unviable stores like Mill Road at expense of local traders.
6/8	Convenience Shopping	6				
6/9	Retail Warehouses	2		1	1	We need to be careful of the level of open A1 permitted in retail warehouses to protect vitality of City – this does not always happen – the challenges faced by City Centre retailing are considerable.  No more changes to open A1 use should be permitted.
6/10	Food and Drink Outlets	35			2	Existing policy militates against the development of certain new community facilities, e.g. new pubs (as against bars/clubs)

### ***7. Working and Studying in Cambridge***

7/1	<b><u>Employment</u></b> Employment Provision	7	1	4		Employment provision alternatives to Cambridge East required. Densification of existing allocated sites.
7/2	Selective Management of the Economy	20		1	4	Yet shoot self in foot as selective restraint now means no manufacturing at cost to economic diversification.  Retain principle; is there scope to include production facilities that are linked to local knowledge transfer?
7/3	Protection of Industrial and Storage Space	10	1			
7/4	Promotion of Cluster	1	2	2		Promote clean tech sector cluster

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
	Development					
7/5	<u>Higher and Further Education</u> Faculty Development in the Central Area, University of Cambridge	1	3			Like the fact it exists and its scope – it needs a further revision.  Needs to be updated/refined.  This policy should not be seen as permitting demolition on Mill Lane (Mill Lane SPD) – review is needed.
7/6	West Cambridge, South of Madingley Road	11	2	1		Needs work
7/7	College and University of Cambridge Staff and Student Housing	7	3			
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			6	Open up purpose built student accommodation to non university language and educational providers.  Policy must not constrict colleges from developing buildings on their campus sites nor on other sites around the City. Remove open space protection policies on campus land.
7/11	Language Schools	8			13	Lifting ban on increasing teaching facilities of existing long-established language schools contributing massively to local economy.  7.55 Summer centres – need to limit to accredited sector.  Policy is too restrictive. Policy cannot restrict businesses in the local economy in a recession. Language schools need to expand over 10% floorspace and businesses need to adapt and deliver successfully. Where there is no loss to dwellings / existing houses proposals should be accepted.
<b>8. Connecting and Servicing Cambridge</b>						
8/1	<u>Transport</u> Spatial Location of Development	12	2	2		Road infrastructure not integrated with County Council.  Integration with South Cambs poor – see Orchard Park, which has all kinds of problems but is in South Cambs.
8/2	Transport Impact	159		5		Evidence from Transport Corridor Plans questionable.

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
8/3	Mitigating Measures	36		6		Needs a specific policy for travel plans, which must be implemented.
8/4	Walking and Cycling Accessibility	46	2	3		Walking/cycling accessibility – works within major developments to a degree. However, does not work for integrating between sites and wider provision effectively.
8/5	Pedestrian and Cycle Network	11		2	6	Works within major sites to a degree, but does not effectively work for integration with wider transport networks.  Cycle provision should be separate from bus lanes & off road.  Very weak – will not facilitate Dutch quality provision.
8/6	Cycle Parking	174		6	4	Cycle parking standards fail to specify location of practical cycle parking.  Cycle parking standards are not being enforced time & time again.
8/7	Public Transport Accessibility	10	4	1	10	Need to reduce congestion/bus waiting times by introducing smart payment/ticket only service, with drivers just driving & not selling tickets.
8/8	Land for Public Transport	5	3	3	2	
8/9	Commercial Vehicles and Servicing	13				
8/10	Off-Street Car Parking	163	4	1	5	Increase parking allowance for spaces facilitating electric car charging exclusively.  Tax City Centre commercial car parking to limit City Centre car use.  Need to deal with delays in adoption – pavement parking epidemic.  Insufficient parking provision for all types of development, e.g. retirement homes – 1 space for every 6 units – do we want old people to be housebound and have no visitors?
8/11	New Roads	6	1	1		Start need to be made on underground routes.  New roads need 4m cycle paths, not 1m wide dotted lines.
8/12	<b><u>Cambridge Airport</u></b> Cambridge Airport	0	2			

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
8/13	Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone	1				
8/14	<b><u>Telecommunications</u></b> Telecommunications Development	10				
8/15	Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lords Bridge	1	2			Retain.
8/16	<b><u>Energy Resources</u></b> Renewable Energy in Major New Developments	31			9	Needs strengthening.
8/17	Renewable Energy	11			7	Needs strengthening.  Substantial review relating to energy security, carbon reduction.  Focus on carbon reduction. Refine – distinguish between building loads and process loads.  Include energy efficiency in target for carbon reduction.
8/18	<b><u>Water, Sewerage and Drainage Infrastructure</u></b> Water Sewerage and Drainage Infrastructure	22			3	More detail required on water efficiency.  Consider pressures on water resources – is development sustainable.  Consider CfSH but look into cost effective & carbon footprint involved.
<b>9. Areas of Major Change</b>						
9/1	Further Policy/Guidance for the Development of Areas of Major Change	9	1	1		Needs updating & more detailed guidance.
9/2	Phasing of Areas of Major Change	6	1		2	More needed about promoting closer working relationships between City Council & other Cambs wide councils to develop wider range of employment opportunities, including manufacturing of R&D idea developed in Cambridge.
9/3	Development in the Urban extensions	8	2			
9/5	Southern Fringe	9	2		2	No further development in attractive Green Belt areas. Sole exception to be new P&R at Cherry Hinton.
9/6	Northern Fringe	3	1	1		Outdated – needs to be revisited & key to development success is achieving 'values' on site.

Policy	Name	Policy Usage	Green	Yellow	Red	Your view
9/8	Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road	3			1	Opportunity missed to improve traffic movement by introducing inner ring road.
9/9	Station Area	12		2	2	Rail capacity improvements should be focussed.  More priority needed for pedestrian & cycling infrastructure.
<b>10. Implementation</b>						
10/1	Infrastructure Improvements	86				

## Appendix 1

### Cambridge Local Plan

### Pre Issues and Options Consultation

### *Stakeholders Workshop*

**Date:** 31st 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><li>○ Spatial strategy and options</li></ul></li><li>• Service delivery capacity for stakeholders</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 policies 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><li>• Where are the major gaps?</li></ul>
12.45	<b>Summing up and next steps</b>
1.00	<b>Close &amp; Lunch</b>

## Appendix 2

### Attendance

Name		Organisation	Present
Sandy	Lynam	Anglia Ruskin University	X
Jonathan	Coy	Autonomy	
Jeremy	Tuck	Bidwells	X
Rob	Hopwood	Bidwells/Emmanuel College	X
David	Keeling	BPHA	
Jon	Barnett	Cambridge Academy	X
Simon	Bunn	Cambridge City Council	X
Debbie	Kaye	Cambridge City Council	X
Jo	Dicks	Cambridge City Council	X
Martin	Lucas-Smith	Cambridge Cycle Campaign	X
Nigel	Howlett	Cambridge Housing Society	
Robert	Boorman	Cambridge Older Peoples Enterprise (COPE)	X
Terry	Gilbert	Cambridge Past Present and Future & Design Panel Member	X
Peter	Landshoff	Cambridge Past Present and Future & Gough Way Resident's Association	X
Chris	Lang	Cambridge Regional College	
Dearbhla	Lawson	Cambridgeshire County Council	
David	Nuttycombe	Cambridgeshire County Council	X
Sheryl	French	Cambridgeshire County Council	X
Stephen	Conrad	Cambridgeshire County Council	
Jeremy	Smith	Cambridgeshire County Council - Transport	X
Jill	Tuffnell	Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	X
Paul	Ainsworth	CAMRA	X
Michael	Wiseman	CBRE Management Services Ltd	X
David	Ball	Christ's College	
D P	Hearn	Clare College	X
John	Adams	Conservators of the River Cam	
Paul	Warren	Corpus Christi College	
Nicola	Morrison	Department of Land Economy - Cambridge University	X
Richard	Taplin	Downing College	
Ulrike	Wegner	EF International Language Schools	X
Katharine	Fletcher	English Heritage	X
Adam	Ireland	Environment Agency, Anglian Region Central Area	X
Samantha	Bunce	Environment Agency, Anglian Region Central Area	X
Paul	Milliner	Estate Management & Building Service	X
Andrew	Powell	Fitzwilliam College	
Alan	Jeremy	Gonville & Caius College	
John	O'Shea	Grand Arcade	X

<b>Name</b>		<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Present</b>
Deborah	Sharples	Hewitsons LLP	X
David	Abbott	Highways Agency	X
Gale	Bryan	Homerton College	X
Paul	Kitson	Homes and Communities Agency	
Phil	Murton	Iceni Homes Ltd	X
Adrian	Kyndt	John Lewis	
Christine	Houghton	Lucy Cavendish College	X
Steve	Sillery	Marshall of Cambridge	X
John	Edwards	Metropolitan Housing Partnership	X
Janet	Nuttall	Natural England, Consultation Service	X
Joanna	Lewington	Network Rail	X
Inger	O'Meara	NHS Cambridgeshire	X
Maxine	Estop	Nuffield Hospital Cambridge	X
Ken	Brewer	Papworth NHS Trust	X
Chris	Blencowe	Pembroke College	X
Colin	Macrae	Ridley Hall	X
Jon	Dixon	South Cambridgeshire District Council	X
Philip	Raiswell	Sport England (East Region)	X
Andy	Campbell	Stagecoach	X
David	Webb	Sustainability East	X
Richard	Moseley	The Cam Too Project	X
Martin	Baker	The Wildlife Trust	X
Becky	Churms	Tourism	X
Dr R A	Pullen	Trinity College	X
Mary	Sanders	Local Access Forum	X
Christopher	Lawrence	Wolfson College	X
Liz	Steele	Grand Arcade	
Simon	Phipps	Prupim	X
		Cambridge Cycle Campaign	X
David	Gretch	English Heritage	X
Gill	Pragnall	Chambers of Commerce	X
Richard	Pillsworth	Bidwells	X
Jenifer	Brook	Churchill College	X
Peter	Brindle	Darwin College	X
Rob	Lewis	County Council	X