

CC8/CCC



Examination into the Soundness of the Cambridge
Local Plan

Matter CC8 – Omission Sites

Matter Statement by Cambridge City Council

March 2017

Contents		Page
	List of Abbreviations	
	Introduction	1
8B	Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club SPO06 and Emmanuel College Playing Field SPO16	
i.	Is the plan unsound without the inclusion of this site, and if so why?	1
8C	Newnham College Sites	
i.	Is the plan unsound without the inclusion of this site, and if so why?	8
 Appendices		
	Appendix 1: List of Reference Documents	15
	Appendix 2: Extract from the Cambridge Local Plan 1996: Policy HE5 and supporting text	17
	Appendix 3: Distribution of Publicly Accessible Outdoor Tennis Courts in Cambridge	19

List of Abbreviations

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SPO	Protected Open Space: Sports Fields
AGS	Protected Open Space: Amenity Green Space
P&G	Protected Open Space: Parks and Gardens
EWCA	England and Wales Court of Appeal

Introduction

1. This statement sets out the Council's response in relation to the Inspectors' Matter CC8 in relation to Omissions Sites: Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club SPO06 and Emmanuel College Playing Field SPO16; and the Newnham College Sites.
2. The documents referred to in this statement are listed in Appendix 1 to this statement. Examination document reference numbers are used throughout for convenience.

CC8B Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club SPO06 and Emmanuel College Playing Field SPO16

i. Is the plan unsound without the inclusion of this site, and if so why?

Overview and History of the Cambridge Tennis and Hockey Club (SPO06) and Emmanuel College Playing Field (SPO16) Sites

3. The Cambridge Tennis and Hockey Club (SPO06) and Emmanuel College Playing Field (SPO16) sites lie within the West Cambridge Conservation Area. Protected Open Space designations for both sites apply due to their environmental and recreational value. The open spaces within the conservation area have an important relationship with the surrounding buildings and provide the setting for views into and out of the City Centre, as they are part of the transition from country to city and vice versa¹. The sites are split by an important group of trees identified in the West Cambridge Conservation Area Appraisal². The many private gardens and the continued use and maintenance of large areas of open green space and woodland within the conservation area, often associated with University sports facilities, has helped the area retain a less built-up, semi-rural character, contrasting with the more intensively developed Colleges in the City Centre³.
4. The Coton ditch which runs alongside the Coton footpath and under Emmanuel College Playing Field, is an important conduit for grass snakes and amphibians. Outside the conservation area, between Stacey Lane and the University Sports Ground, an area of ponds and woodland has been created which is clearly designed to provide a range of suitable habitats for wildlife. This semi-public area is an important recreational and environmental space as well as being part of the green corridor into the city as identified in the Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment⁴. The adjacent Coton Footpath is a major publicly accessible link, by cycle and on foot, to the countryside and the Coton Countryside Reserve.
5. The numerous open spaces in this part of Cambridge help support other issues such as flood risk management, climate change, health and well-being, and biodiversity. Educational institutions own and/or manage many of the open spaces in the city and are amongst the

¹ Paragraph 1.2, Page 2, West Cambridge Conservation Area Appraisal, RD/NE/150

² Appendix 3, West Cambridge Conservation Area Appraisal, RD/NE/150

³ Page 10, West Cambridge Conservation Area Appraisal, RD/NE/150

⁴ Page 11, RD/Strat/190.

most frequent users of playing pitches and other open spaces throughout Cambridge, both on a formal and an informal basis.

6. The majority of the two sites has never been developed and does not fall into the category prioritised by the NPPF of previously developed land of low environmental quality⁵. The sites were in agricultural use until the 20th century, when they became sports fields associated with the collegiate development of West Cambridge.
7. The Emmanuel College Playing Field (SPO16) includes the Emmanuel College Sports Pavilion, a painted brick single storey building constructed in 1910 with colonnaded terrace facing the adjoining sports field. It features as a building of local interest in the conservation area. The Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club (SPO06) contains a low brick building of little architectural merit.
8. Both sites were previously allocated over twenty years ago in the Cambridge Local Plan 1996 for faculty development, student accommodation or affordable or special needs housing for university purposes⁶ subject to the satisfactory relocation of any recreational uses. These sites were also proposed to be allocated in the Local Plan 2006 for College or University development. However, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 did not allocate these sites for any development, instead designating them as Protected Open Space. As well as noting that the Council has made significant provision for the needs of the University in this plan (e.g. West Cambridge and North West Cambridge), the Inspectors' Report into the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 made the following points in relation to these sites (then treated as one site):
 - That the previous Inspector examining the Cambridge Local Plan 1996 had noted the importance and sensitivity of the site in environmental terms, and that its value in meeting future University needs outweighed this environmental contribution⁷;
 - The Colleges and University had made representations stating the site was no longer needed for College or University uses by 2006, and it should instead be allocated for general-purpose housing⁸;
 - The Inspector concluded that the site should be deleted from the 2006 Local Plan and designated as Protected Open Space due to the formal and informal recreation benefits of the site as well as its open space value to the conservation area⁹.
9. The sites Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club (SPO06) and Emmanuel College Playing Field (SPO16) were both discussed in relation to Matter CC1: 1B.2: Appendix C: Designations Schedule, Question x.

⁵ RD/NP/010, paragraph 17, eighth bullet

⁶ See extract of the Cambridge Local Plan 1996 at Appendix 2 of this statement

⁷ RD/AD/310, page 168, paragraph 7.20.1

⁸ RD/AD/310, page 168, paragraph 7.20.3

⁹ RD/AD/310, page 169, paragraph 7.20.6

Sports Facilities

10. The omissions sites form part of a group of sports facilities including the nearby University Athletics Sports Ground where there is potential for the University of Cambridge to increase the number of hockey pitches adjacent to the athletics track¹⁰. It is noted that the representation¹¹ proposing the allocation of these sites for residential development explains that they would provide publicly accessible open space on site as part of a housing development. Much of the current value of the sites in terms of open space, however, is derived from their present open and undeveloped condition. The provision of some open space as part of any housing development would not and could not mitigate that loss. Moreover, no information has been submitted explaining how the relocation of the existing sports facilities will support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing.
11. The recreational opportunities of both Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club (SPO06) and Emmanuel College Playing Field (SPO16) have been assessed as part of the Playing Pitch Strategy 2015-2031¹². The Playing Pitch Strategy was produced in compliance with Paragraph 73 of the NPPF, which confirms that planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision.
12. The grass hockey pitch on Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club (SPO06) has been replaced with football provision which now consists of 1 mini soccer 7v7 football pitch rated as being of good quality. The 7v7 pitch has capacity for 6 games per week and is underplayed by 6 games per week. The outdoor tennis provision was outside the remit of the Playing Pitch Strategy and therefore was not assessed as part of the Playing Pitch Strategy.
13. Emmanuel College Playing Field (SPO16) consists of two adult football pitches, rated as good quality. Emmanuel College Playing Field (SPO16) is also capable of being used for other sporting activities, such as cricket, as detailed on the college website¹³. Two college teams use this pitch for football. Adult pitch capacity for football is 6 games per week, but the pitches are underplayed by 5 games per week. The Action Plan for the site contained in the Playing Pitch Strategy 2015-2031¹⁴ determined that it should continue to be protected. It should also be reiterated that while these pitches may have some spare capacity for additional play, these under play capacity needs to be retained to ensure that as Colleges expand they have sufficient space of their own for play. Colleges' growth in student numbers should not lead to dependency on publicly accessible sports facilities.
14. The Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club (SPO06) consists of 2 grass tennis courts and 13 all-weather tennis courts. The tennis courts on the sites are used by Cambridge Lawn Tennis Club. Some of the courts are flood-lit, thereby allowing for additional evening capacity. Their website¹⁵ explains that they are a community-based not-for-profit club committed to

¹⁰ RD/CSF/190, page 156, paragraph 5.150

¹¹ Representation No. 27257

¹² RD/CSF/190

¹³ <http://www.emma.cam.ac.uk/life/sports/sportsground>

¹⁴ RD/CSF/190 Appendix 1 page 55

¹⁵ <http://www.cambridgeltc.com>

making tennis available to all ages, abilities and social groups in and around the Cambridge area.

15. These tennis courts are located in Newnham ward which forms part of the West Central Area Committee. A simple analysis of publicly accessible tennis courts in Cambridge City Council's boundary – provided in Appendix 3 of this statement – demonstrates that nearly 50% of all publicly accessible tennis courts are currently located in the West Central Area. The second largest number is currently located in the South Area of the city representing 30% of the total number. If the Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club tennis courts were relocated to the site off Long Road, East of Rutherford Road (located in Trumpington ward), the South Area would then have 58% of all publicly accessible tennis courts in Cambridge. The second largest number of tennis courts would then be located in the West Central Area representing 21% of the total number. Compared with the existing distribution of 49% and 30% for the first and second largest concentrations of tennis courts, respectively the resulting distribution of 58% and 21% as a result of the Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club relocation would give rise to a more uneven distribution of outdoor tennis court provision within the city than at present. This can therefore not be considered a sustainable solution. As such, on the information available, it is not possible to conclude that the facility's relocation will provide an equal or improved facility in a suitable location in line with paragraph 74 of the NPPF.
16. Furthermore, the representation proposes relocating the sports facilities to a site on Long Road in the Cambridge Green Belt¹⁶. This site has previously obtained planning permission for playing field use (Planning permission reference 08/0873/FUL) and planning permission (reference 11/0818/REM) for a sports pavilion, machinery store and car park. It is worth noting that these two planning applications were submitted in a different policy context, and both of the existing permissions have now lapsed unimplemented. The NPPF was adopted in 2012 after these two planning permissions, and it deals with the provision of playing fields in the Green Belt in a different manner compared to Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts. The appeal decision of *Timmins & ANOR, R (on the application of) v Gedling Borough Council* [2015] EWCA Civ 10 (22nd January 2015), looking at the development of a crematorium in the Green Belt within Gedling Borough Council, suggests that change of use of land to playing fields is now inappropriate development in the Green Belt and very special circumstances are now required to be demonstrated to justify their development¹⁷.
17. It cannot therefore be assumed that the necessary sports facilities currently available at both sites can be provided without harming the Long Road site's Green Belt designation. Many of the tennis courts have artificial surfaces with floodlighting. There are also residential properties adjacent to the site, along Rutherford Road adjoining the Long Road site to the west, an intensive sports use on the site may well affect their amenity and result in restrictions on the use of the sports facilities. Similarly, there is already some pavilion/storage space available on both existing sites that will need to be satisfactorily replaced on-site. Both of these issues raise doubts about the replacement site's suitability and ability to replace the existing sites' facilities and provide the same level of access as the existing facilities currently enjoy while respecting the Green Belt designation. Further work

¹⁶ Representation ID: 27257, Full Text, Second Sentence

¹⁷ <http://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/format.cgi?doc=/ew/cases/EWCA/Civ/2015/10.html>

regarding the impact of the replacement sports facilities is needed to determine if the replacement site is a suitable location.

18. As discussed in Matter CC1, the Council considers that both sites should retain their designation as Protected Open Space, under Policy 67 in the emerging Local Plan and the sports and recreation provision provided on the site should continue to be protected through Policy 73. Any development which includes the retention of the sports and recreation provision on-site will need to comply with Policy 67. The loss or relocation of the sports facilities would need to comply with Policy 67 and Policy 73 in the emerging Local Plan as well as any other relevant policies. These policies provide some opportunities for redevelopment by subject to appropriate provisos which ensure that the value present on the site is retained or replaced.

The consideration of the sites in the preparation of the emerging Local Plan

19. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011¹⁸ identifies Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club (SPO06) and Emmanuel College Playing Field (SPO16) as satisfying both the environmental and recreational criteria for Protected Open Space. This is addressed in more detail at paragraph 154 of the Council's Matter CC1 statement.
20. The Council's Strategic Housing Availability Assessment 2013¹⁹ identifies Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club (SPO06) and Emmanuel College Playing Field (SPO16) together as 'Emmanuel Sports Ground and City Hockey Club' (Site 182) as unsuitable for residential development²⁰ on the basis of the previous Inspector's report for the 2006 Local Plan and the Protected Open Space designations on the sites..
21. The Council's Issues and Options 2 consultation document – Part 2 Sites options within Cambridge²¹, also identifies these sites as Protected Open Space²². Furthermore, this document also identifies the Emmanuel College Playing Fields (SPO16) as being a rejected option for residential development, due to its designation as Protected Open Space²³.

The proposal for the omission sites

22. The representations²⁴ seek the allocation of these sites for residential use with a suggestion of re-provision of some of these uses on Long Road (although no direct mechanism for re-provision is suggested in the representations). The Council considers that this is not appropriate and would not meet the tests of soundness. The Council's reasoning is set below.

¹⁸ RD/NE/050

¹⁹ RD/Strat/140

²⁰ RD/Strat/140, Annex 15, page 478, Site ID182

²¹ RD/LP/270

²² RD/LP/270, Annex L.3, Table L3.1 and the Protected Open Space Map for Newnham Ward

²³ RD/LP/270, Appendix 1, Residential Table, Site R25

²⁴ Reference IDs: 27257, 28104, 28105

Soundness

23. Paragraph 182 of the NPPF sets out the tests of soundness that should be applied when examining Local Plans. Plans should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. In order to test the soundness of the proposal to allocate sites Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club (SPO06) and Emmanuel College Playing Field (SPO16) for residential development, the four tests of soundness in respect of plan-making have been applied to the proposed residential allocation and relocation of the sports facilities to the alternative site on Long Road.
24. The emerging Local Plan has been **positively prepared** in that it proposes to meet objectively assessed need for housing without the need for this site. The strategy for provision of housing in the emerging Local Plan is to deliver housing on brownfield sites within the city, insofar as this is possible while also protecting open spaces and sports pitches (through policies 67 and 73) as important amenities for local people. The Council has a flexible supply of land to meet housing needs: the Council's most recent Annual Monitoring Report 2015/16²⁵ provides the most up-to-date housing trajectory for the Council's housing target of 14,000 dwellings between April 2011 and the end of March 2031. The report indicates a current surplus of 244 dwellings over the period to 2031. This housing target is based on the objectively assessed housing need, which the Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Further Evidence study²⁶. The Council also has a substantial 5 year housing supply²⁷. Over the next five years (2016/17 to 2020/21) 3,500 dwellings will be required. Projected completions for Cambridge over the next five years are 5,068 dwellings (a 44% increase over the required number of dwellings). These latest figures clearly demonstrate a robust delivery of housing and that the Council has no reliance on the delivery of sites SPO06 and SPO16 to provide additional dwellings. There is however an identified need for the recreational and sporting facilities present on the sites to be retained to meet existing and future demand.
25. The emerging Local Plan is **justified** in that the evidence supporting the protection of this site as open space is up-to-date and set out clearly in the evidence base supporting the emerging Local Plan.
26. The emerging Local Plan is **effective** in that the Council remains unconvinced that the plan will fail to effectively deliver its objectives without this site being allocated for residential development. Indeed, the Council argues that if this site is allocated the plan will fail to effectively deliver on its objectives to protect open space and meet the recreation needs of the city's inhabitants.
27. The emerging Local Plan is **consistent with national policy** in that the plan seeks to meet objectively assessed need²⁸ and also protect open spaces and recreation facilities based on an up-to-date assessment of need²⁹. The sites are not required to meet the need for

²⁵ Executive Summary, page v - RD/AD/490

²⁶ RD/MC/040, page 36, paragraph 5.13

²⁷ Between 6.18 and 7.41 years depending on the method of calculation, RD/AD/490, page 29, table 7

²⁸ RD/NP/010, paragraph 14

²⁹ RD/NP/010, paragraphs 73-74

housing in accordance with the NPPF and are required to be retained as open space and for recreational and sporting purposes, in accordance with the NPPF and without any suitable alternative provision having been satisfactorily identified.

CC8C Newnham College Site

i. Is the plan unsound without the inclusion of this site, and if so why?

Overview and History of the Site

28. Newnham College established its current site on Sidgwick Avenue in 1875, where the core buildings of the College were designed by architect, Basil Champneys. These buildings are now listed. The gardens of the College remain largely similar in layout to their appearance at inception and are considered to be a highly attractive and important areas of open space, which form part of the setting of the listed buildings and contributes positively to their significance, and also to the character and appearance of the West Cambridge Conservation Area, within which Newnham College and its gardens lie. More formal paths and planting lie close to the College buildings, with a wilder, meandering layout in the southern part of the gardens, adjacent to the playing field which stretches down towards Barton Road. This part of the West Cambridge Conservation Area is notable for its high quality listed buildings and for the attractive open spaces in between with many mature trees forming the setting for the buildings.
29. The representations 26714 and 26716 made by Newnham College include an aerial photograph containing sites labelled A to H. These sites are listed as follows with information on their proposed use and their status:

Site	Proposed use and status
Site A: Clare Road	This site was subject to planning application 05/0967/FUL, which was approved for 10 flats. The development has been built out on this site and is occupied. This site does not form part of the College's further discussion of potential allocations in their representation 26714.
Site B: Strachey and Porters Lodge	This site lies partially within the Protected Open Space for Newnham College Gardens (P&G40) and within the West Cambridge Conservation Area. This site was subject to planning application 15/2227/FUL for the demolition of the Strachey Building and Porters Lodge and remodelling of the Fawcett Building and erection of a new replacement building comprising student accommodation, porters lodge, café, offices and ancillary uses. The application was granted in 2016 and works are now underway. This proposal is considered to address the College's requirements for Site B as submitted in representations 26714 and 26716.
Site C: Wordsworth Grove	No planning application has been submitted for this site as yet, which is fallow land lying between Nos. 18 and 23 Wordsworth Grove and to the rear of The Pightle and Principals Lodge (AGS62). The land lies adjacent to Protected Open Space and

Matter CC8: Omission Sites
Statement by Cambridge City Council
March 2017

	was identified as a small site in the Council's SHLAA 2012 (Annex 2) ³⁰ . The SHLAA 2012 states that the identification of these small sites does not indicate that these sites will be developed or are capable of being developed. Instead they represent the types of land uses that can come forward. They are included in this SHLAA to help inform future land supply assumptions ³¹ .
Site D: Barton Road	No planning application has been submitted for this site as yet. This site known as Whitstead, 4 Barton Road, is used for graduate accommodation for Newnham College and comprises a large house with extensive gardens adjacent to Barton Road and the vehicular access to Newnham College Playing Fields (SPO33). It lies outside the Protected Open Space for Newnham College Playing Fields (SPO33). It lies within the West Cambridge Conservation Area. Any application for this site would be determined on its merits. The Council does not consider it appropriate to allocate the large garden of this established property on Barton Road for car parking.
Site E: Grange Road	No planning application has been submitted for this site as yet. This site lies within the Protected Open Space for Newnham College Gardens (P&G40) and within the West Cambridge Conservation Area.
Site F, G and H: Barton Road and Tennis Courts	No planning application has been submitted for these sites as yet. This site lies within the Protected Open Spaces for Newnham College Gardens (P&G40) and Newnham College Playing Fields (SPO33) and within the West Cambridge Conservation Area.

30. The Newnham College sites (AGS62 – The Pightle and Principals Lodge; P&G40 – Newnham College Gardens; and SPO33 – Newnham College Playing Field) featured in Matter CC1: 1B.2 Appendix C: Designations Schedule, Question v.
31. The majority of the sites referred to in the representation by Newnham College – sites E, F, G and H – are designated or partially designated as Protected Open Space and are therefore subject to Policy 67 of the submitted Local Plan. The Council's Matter CC1 statement explained why all three sites referred to above should continue to retain their Protected Open Space designation. However, the retention of the Protected Open Space designation will not preclude development to meet demonstrable educational need so long as the requirements of that policy are met. As such, there is no need for modification to the Plan as proposed through the allocation of these omission sites to meet what appear to be the aspirations of the landowner.
32. The numerous open spaces in Cambridge make a significant contribution to the character of the city. It is important to protect open spaces because these sites can help support other

³⁰ RD/Strat/130, page 104, site reference 30

³¹ RD/Strat/130, page 104, first paragraph

issues such as flood risk management, climate change, health and well-being, biodiversity and green infrastructure. Educational institutions own and/or manage many of the open space in the city and are amongst the most frequent users of playing pitches and other open spaces throughout Cambridge, both on a formal and an informal basis.

33. The Council has recognised the need for Colleges to be allowed to expand their facilities while at the same time needing to continue to protect Cambridge's green spaces that, together, contribute to the setting and character of the city. If the Newnham College sites were allocated for development without understanding the demonstrable educational need for such development, this could lead to unsustainable release of Protected Open Spaces, damaging the character of Cambridge. Rather than precluding such development, through policy 67 and, where applicable, policy 73 the Council seeks to ensure that any proposed development will minimise its impact on the relevant site's environmental and recreational qualities.

The sites in the development of the emerging Local Plan

34. The Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011³² identifies The Pightle and Principals Lodge (AGS62), Newnham College Gardens (P&G40) and Newnham College Playing Field (SPO33) as satisfying both environmental and recreational criteria for Protected Open Space. This is addressed in more detail at paragraphs 132 to 137 of the Council's Matter CC1 statement.
35. The Council's Strategic Housing Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2013³³ did not consider the majority of the sites for housing development as The Pightle and Principals Lodge (AGS62), Newnham College Gardens (P&G40) and Newnham College Playing Field (SPO33) are identified as Protected Open Space and were not put forward by the landowner for residential use as part of the SHLAA process. The site labelled C on the aerial photograph was assessed in the SHLAA 2012³⁴ as a small site (Site 30 Land between 18 and 23 Wordsworth Grove), but was not rolled forward into the SHLAA 2013 as this later SHLAA did not include non-strategic sites for allocation (0.5 hectares or less). There is however nothing to prevent Newnham College's site C coming forward for residential development as a windfall site, and any planning application for this site would be treated on its merits. Site D was not assessed by the Council as part of the SHLAA as it was not put forward for development and was already being used for student accommodation.
36. The Council's Issues and Options 2 consultation document – Part 2 Sites options within Cambridge³⁵, also identifies The Pightle and Principals Lodge (AGS62), Newnham College Gardens (P&G40) and Newnham College Playing Field (SPO33) as Protected Open Space³⁶.

³² RD/NE/050

³³ RD/Strat/140

³⁴ RD/Strat/130

³⁵ RD/LP/270

³⁶ RD/LP/270, Annex L.3, Table L3.1 and the Protected Open Space Map for Newnham Ward

Current treatment of the sites in the emerging Local Plan

37. The emerging Local Plan respects the evidence from the Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011³⁷ and Issues and Options 2 part 2³⁸ consultation, and identifies the majority of the sites as Protected Open Space. This means that these sites are protected by Policy 67, which prevents development that would harm the character of, or lead to the loss of open space of environmental and/or recreational importance unless the open space uses can be satisfactorily be replaced within 400m of the original site. Some flexibility is allowed for in the case of development on school, College and university grounds to meet an educational need. This matter is dealt with in paragraph 7.44 of the supporting text to Policy 67. Appendix 2 in the Council's Matter CC1 Statement explains the proposed modifications to paragraph 7.44 of the Plan to clarify this issue. Applicants will need to submit information to support their application. This information will set out why the proposed development is needed and will also need to identify how they have assessed their site against the criteria set out in Appendix I of the Local Plan for the designation of protected open space to establish where it is most appropriate to develop, taking into account the specific qualities (environmental and/or recreational) of the specific open space. This assessment will need to consider the impact on the character and wider setting of the site.
38. Furthermore, as some of the sites have sports uses on them, including a playing field and tennis courts, Policy 73 in the emerging Local Plan would also protect the facilities from being lost. Policy 73 prevents the loss of sports facilities unless they can be replaced within the new development, or satisfactorily relocated or the facility is no longer needed.

The proposal for the omission sites

39. Newnham College, in their submission to the Plan has indicated their intention to develop parts of site P&G40 adjacent to Sidwick Avenue and Grange Road, and adjacent to the Newnham College Playing Field (SPO 33). These sites are sites B, E, and H in the Newnham College representations 26714 and 26716, and were proposed for student accommodation, educational and ancillary uses, and changing facilities for sports. This would clearly lead to some loss of both the recreational and environmental qualities of the site. The retention of the Protected Open Space designation will not preclude such development in principle. Rather, under Policy 67, it will require much greater consideration of the proposed development in order to minimise the loss of the site's intrinsic qualities and to establish whether the requirements of the policy are met.
40. The information submitted by Newnham College as part of their representation to the Local Plan included an area for redevelopment involving the Strachey Building (Site B) for student accommodation, educational and ancillary uses. Since the submission of the emerging Local Plan in 2014, a planning application was submitted in 2015 for works to buildings on the main Newnham College site. This application sought the demolition of the Strachey Building and Porters Lodge and remodelling of the Fawcett Building and erection of a new

³⁷ RD/NE/050

³⁸ RD/LP/270

replacement building comprising student accommodation, porters lodge, café, offices and ancillary uses³⁹. The application was granted in 2016 and works are now underway.

41. The approval of this application indicates that the need for educational development is likely to have changed since representations were submitted to the Local Plan: Proposed Submission consultation in 2013.
42. In their submission to the Local Plan, Newnham College also indicated their wish to build over existing hard surfaced tennis courts located in the southern part of the site SPO33. The tennis courts would then be re-located to the northern section of the site with new changing facilities. This comprises sites F and G in the Newnham College representations 26714 and 26716, with Site G proposed as the site for relocation of the tennis courts, thereby freeing up Site F for an unspecified form of development. This would lead to some loss of open space, but not of sports facilities. Once again, this is not precluded in principle by the submitted plan but the requirements of policy 73 will need to be met.
43. The development at Newnham College is not the only recent instance of development affecting Protected Open Space within College grounds. A planning application at Ridley Hall (neighbouring Newnham College) involved the loss of open space that was capable of being defined as Protected Open Space, and was therefore protected under policy 4/2 of the Local Plan 2006. This application was for the erection of a new building for teaching, administration, communal and student accommodation (2,228 sqm), and demolition of outbuildings adjoining Principal's Lodge and the Moule Hole, with alterations to the wall along Newnham Walk to provide an additional pedestrian access point⁴⁰. The committee report considering this application recommended approval on the basis that the development, despite resulting in the loss of Protected Open Space, resulted in the positive enhancement of the overall value of the space⁴¹. The application was approved.
44. More recently in 2014, Churchill College submitted a planning application for the erection of new building comprising 68 study bedrooms, shared kitchens, and meeting room, associated external works and tree and shrub planting together with alterations to South Court building (grade II listed) to widen pedestrian/wheelchair access⁴². This proposal involved some loss of Protected Open Space on their main College site at Storeys Way, Cambridge. The application was approved in 2014 and has now been built out and occupied. At pre-application stage, there were discussions between the College and the Council with regard to the most appropriate siting of the new student accommodation to meet the needs of the College and reduce the impact on Protected Open Space and the use of any of the playing fields.
45. The examples above demonstrate that the policies in the existing Local Plan are suitably flexible to be able to ensure that valuable open space is protected, while also allowing for the development of educational uses, and that the Council is able to operate these policies

³⁹ Application reference number: 15/2227/FUL

⁴⁰ Application reference number 11/0313/FUL

⁴¹ https://idox.cambridge.gov.uk/online-applications/files/0E10C610BE2D5963034901AED5AE7CAC/pdf/11_0313_FUL-COMMITTEE_REPORT-597123.pdf page 44, paragraph 8.6

⁴² Application reference number 14/0121/FUL

flexibly. The Council considers that policies 67 and 73 in the emerging Local Plan are similarly flexible, and where an educational establishment can demonstrate a need for development which minimises impact on the open space and any recreational uses are suitable re-located, this will be acceptable.

46. In respects of site C, the Council can confirm that the Local Plan as drafted would not preclude the principle of residential development on Site C as it is not allocated for another form of development and is not designated as Protected Open Space. Although it lies directly adjacent to Protected Open Space at The Pightle and Principals Lodge (AGS62), it is a vacant site on a residential street. An application for residential development on this site would be assessed on its merits. There is no need to allocate such a small site in the Local Plan, as this it would not be the Council's normal practice to allocate non-strategic sites of 0.5 hectares or less.
47. With regard to site D, this site is proposed for car parking. The Council does not normally allocate land specifically for car parking and would not wish to do so in this instance. If an application were to come forward for car parking as part of a larger development at Newnham College, the Council would consider it on its merits. However, it should be noted that the site currently forms the garden to a large house used a graduate accommodation for Newnham College. The garden and house form part of the leafy approach to the city centre along Barton Road and lie within the West Cambridge Conservation Area. Any application for car parking would need to consider the wider setting of the site.

Soundness

48. Paragraph 182 of the NPPF sets out the tests of soundness that should be applied when examining Local Plans. Plans should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. In order to test the soundness of the proposals for these sites, the four tests of soundness in respect of plan-making have been applied to the proposal to develop the sites on Wordsworth Grove and Barton Road, parts of site P&G40 and the proposal to build over existing hard surfaced tennis courts located in the southern part of the site SPO33 which would then be re-located to the northern section of the site with new changing facilities.
49. The emerging Local Plan has been **positively prepared** in that policy 67 is suitably flexible to make provision for the expansion of the College to meet its growth needs while also minimising impact on Protected Open Spaces. Policy 73 secures appropriate protection for recreational uses, ensuring that any uses that are lost are suitably re-provided. There is an identified need for the recreational and sporting facilities present on the sites to be retained to meet existing and future demand.
50. The Council has a flexible supply of land to meet housing needs: the Council's most recent Annual Monitoring Report 2015/16⁴³ provides the most up-to-date housing trajectory for the Council's housing target of 14,000 dwellings between April 2011 and the end of March 2031. The report indicates a current surplus of 244 dwellings over the period to 2031. The Council

⁴³ Executive Summary, page v - RD/AD/490

also has a substantial 5 year housing supply⁴⁴. There is no need therefore for any further land to be allocated to meet housing need during the plan period. The Council considers that there is the potential for Site C on Wordsworth Grove to come forward as a windfall site, subject to the merits of any proposals, but does not require allocation to do so. A windfall allowance has been made within the Council's housing trajectory.

51. The emerging Local Plan is **justified** in that the evidence supporting the protection of these sites as Protected Open Space is up-to-date and set out clearly in the evidence base supporting the emerging Local Plan.
52. The emerging Local Plan is **effective** in that the Council has been successfully operating similar policies for a number of years, and is convinced that the new policies provide an appropriate balance between protecting open space and recreational uses while also allowing educational needs to be met
53. The emerging Local Plan is **consistent with national policy** in that the plan recognises paragraph 73 of the NPPF which explains the important contribution that access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make to the health and well-being of communities.

⁴⁴ Between 6.18 and 7.41 years depending on the method of calculation, RD/AD/490, page 29, table 7.

Appendix 1: List of Reference Documents

National Policy:

- National Planning Policy Framework (RD/NP/010)

Cambridge City Council submission documents:

- Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission (RD/Sub/C/010)

Earlier Stages of Plan Making

- Cambridge City Council Issues and Options 2: Part 2: Site Options within Cambridge 2013 (RD/LP/270)

Adopted development plan documents:

- Cambridge Local Plan Inspector's Report 2006 (RD/AD/310)
- Annual Monitoring Report Nov 2016 (RD/AD/490)

Development Strategy

- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment – 2012 (RD/Strat/130)
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment - Update 2013 (RD/Strat/140)

Protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment:

- Cambridge City Council Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011 (RD/NE/050)
- West Cambridge Conservation Area Appraisal (RD/NE/150)

Communities, Services and Facilities:

- Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Playing Pitch Strategy 2015 – 2031 (RD/CSF/190)

Modifications Consultation

- Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examination – Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Further Evidence (November 2015) (RD/MC/040)

Planning Applications

- 08/0873/FUL: | Change of use of agricultural land to playing field. | Land Adjacent Rutherford Road Long Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire
<https://idox.cambridge.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=K2RDTDPDX03Q00>
- 11/0818/REM: | Erection of Sports Pavilion, machinery store and car park. | Land Adjacent Rutherford Road Long Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire
<https://idox.cambridge.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=LOIZP8DX06P00>
- 05/0967/FUL: | Erection of ten flats with associated car parking and landscaping. | 2 Clare Road Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB3 9HN
<https://idox.cambridge.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=IMCNQEDXH2000>

Matter CC8: Omission Sites
Statement by Cambridge City Council
March 2017

- 14/0121/FUL: | Erection of new building comprising 68 study bedrooms, shared kitchens, and meeting room, associated external works and tree and shrub planting together with alterations to South Court building (grade II listed) to widen pedestrian / wheelchair access. | Churchill College Storeys Way Cambridge CB3 0DS
<https://idox.cambridge.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=N05Z40DX3E000>
- 11/0313/FUL: Erection of new building for teaching, administration, communal and student accommodation (2228 sqm). Demolition of outbuildings adjoining Principal's Lodge and the Moule Hole. Alterations to wall along Newnham Walk to provide additional pedestrian access point at Ridley Hall, Ridley Hall Road, Cambridge, CB3 9HG
<https://idox.cambridge.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=LIGVJRDX03Q00>
- 15/2227/FUL: Demolition of the existing Strachey Building and Porters Lodge and remodelling of Fawcett building and erection of a new replacement building comprising student accommodation, porter's lodge, cafe, offices and ancillary uses and associated access, landscaping and car parking at Newnham College, Sidgwick Avenue, Cambridge, CB3 9DF
<https://idox.cambridge.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=NYS04JDXIU000>

Appeal Court Judgements

- Timmins & ANOR, R (on the application of) v Gedling Borough Council [2015] EWCA Civ 10 (22nd January 2015)
<http://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/format.cgi?doc=/ew/cases/EWCA/Civ/2015/10.html>

Other documents

- Emmanuel College website: <http://www.emma.cam.ac.uk/life/sports/sportsground/>
- Cambridge Lawn Tennis Club website <http://www.cambridgeltc.com>
- Committee report considering application 11/0313/FUL
https://idox.cambridge.gov.uk/online-applications/files/OE10C610BE2D5963034901AED5AE7CAC/pdf/11_0313_FUL-COMMITTEE_REPORT-597123.pdf

needs and environmental sensitivity than the University's proposals in its West Cambridge Strategy (1991). The Emmanuel Ground and Hockey Club are allocated because of the importance of providing a site for Arts and Social Science needs and the shortage of development land in West Cambridge. Development here will take pressure off more sensitive areas.

9.36 Cambridge University has developed an athletics track and associated facilities in the Green Belt adjoining Wilberforce Road. The Council recognises the University's intention to develop an indoor sports centre in West Cambridge. It is less important that it is close to the heart of the University than it is for teaching departments. The very substantial scale of the building, which has been proposed, would be difficult to accommodate in sensitive locations, such as adjoining the built-up area at Wilberforce Road. Developing it as a number of separate buildings could mean that it would be easier to site within the landscape. Policy RL29 will require that public access to the sports complex is considered.

9.37 The Local Plan allocates a site of 35.54 hectares (site 9.7) south of Madingley Road for faculty development, research institutes and the main buildings of the University Sports Centre, staff/student housing, supporting facilities and a park and cycle facility. The site includes the Veterinary School, which will remain in this location. The park and cycle facility may alternatively be developed within the park and ride car park on the north side of Madingley Road (site 14.1). It is intended that the boundaries between the uses should be agreed between the University and the City Council on the basis of a site development appraisal or brief. It may be acceptable to locate some low intensity use open elements of the Sports Centre within the Green Belt in accordance with Policies GB4/1 and GB4/2 of the *Cambridge Green Belt Local Plan* (1992).

9.38 Up to 4.86 hectares within site 9.7 will be available for academic research institutes, developed in accordance with Policy ET10. It may be that Cambridge University will want to develop some of the research institutes within other sites allocated for its development needs in West Cambridge. This may be acceptable, providing

the total area developed for research institute uses within the sites allocated for University development needs in West Cambridge (sites 9.3, 9.4, 9.5, 9.6, 9.7) does not exceed 4.86 hectares.

9.39 Policy ET11 gives guidance on the development of High Cross Research Park, site 10.5. Paragraphs 10.103 and 10.104 indicate that research institute uses may be acceptable within the site.

POLICY HE5

The area south of Madingley Road will be the major area for university faculty development for the plan period and beyond. The opportunity should be taken to provide a new high quality environment which respects the Green Belt to the south and contributes positively to the skyline of Cambridge. The council supports the principle of development for university needs on the following sites:

Site no. Location

- 9.4 Emmanuel/City Hockey Club sports grounds: faculty development; student residential accommodation or affordable or special needs housing for university purposes.**
- 9.7 West Cambridge site: faculty development; student residential accommodation or affordable housing or special needs housing for university purposes; academic research institutes; indoor sports centre; supporting facilities e.g. social centre, pubs, shops; park and cycle.**

Any recreational uses displaced should be satisfactorily relocated. Account needs to be taken of the traffic impact of this development as proposals come forward. The need for transport infrastructure to serve the total development will be considered as part of a transport strategy for West Cambridge as a whole. This will be developed, in conjunction with the highway authority, in the context of proposals by the Department of Transport to upgrade or amend the M11, including the interchanges with Madingley Road and Barton Road.

Gravel Hill Farm Area

9.40 There is a group of sites around Gravel Hill Farm where some development could be relatively easily accommodated. The area is well screened by planting and the shape of the land, or developed with low density, undistinguished buildings. Part has been taken out of the Green Belt. Development should allow the University Farm to function effectively. It would be logical to centralise Earth Sciences in this location, but the area could also be appropriate for other faculty or college or university residential needs. Development should ensure that the cycle-pedestrian network in West Cambridge is extended, so that new and existing university developments are linked. Increased vehicle access onto Huntingdon Road and Storey's Way would be environmentally unacceptable.

POLICY HE6

The City Council supports the principle of development for university faculties, student residential accommodation or affordable or special needs housing for university purposes within the following sites in the Gravel Hill Farm area:

Site no. Location

- 9.5 East of Gravel Hill Farm;**
- 9.6 Part of Gravel hill farm; and**
- 9.16 19 Acre Field (university/college residential only)**

Development should provide public cycleways and footpaths between Madingley Road, Huntingdon Road and Storey's Way. Access for motor vehicles should only be from Madingley Road.

College and University Housing

9.41 Despite the increase in numbers, the colleges have increased the proportion of students that they are able to house. A number provide housing for all students. Much of the growth in numbers is likely to be in graduate students, some of whom need family accommodation.

9.42 Due to relatively low wage levels and high house prices there is a problem of university

and college employees not being able to afford the housing they need and the university may become directly involved in providing affordable housing.

9.43 It is important that the Local Plan allows adequate provision for college and university residential needs. It does this:

- (a) through its long-term allocations for university development which could provide the opportunity for integrated, residential development;
- (b) by taking a positive attitude towards the development of housing sites for student residential accommodation (see the Housing chapter, paragraph 6.32);
- (c) by taking a positive attitude towards provision within existing college sites (Policy HE7);
- (d) by identifying specific sites and taking a positive attitude towards additional sites that come forward (Policy HE8); and
- (e) through its approach to HMOs, where it is acknowledged that the colleges' management policies may help to make proposals acceptable (see the Housing chapter, paragraph 6.57).

9.44 Within the conservation areas the protection of the environment will be the primary criterion in determining whether college proposals will be acceptable. The limited supply of land and the sensitive environment in West Cambridge mean the available sites must be used efficiently. The Local Plan therefore suggests that potential residential sites in college or university ownership should be used for college hostel or university oriented affordable or special needs housing.



Castle Hill: much student housing is in the form of 'external staircases'

Appendix 3 – Distribution of Publicly Accessible Outdoor Tennis Courts in Cambridge

1 - Publicly Accessible Outdoor Tennis Courts in Cambridge

1A1.1 Cambridge City Council in partnership with South Cambridgeshire District Council recently completed an Indoor Sports Facility Strategy⁴⁵ (ISFS) which included an assessment of need for indoor tennis and indoor bowls courts. The ISFS indicated a preference for indoor based tennis courts and bowls greens because they are not dependent on the weather.

1A1.2 Section 2 of this Annex includes:

- The individual publicly accessible tennis courts, grouped by Sub Area Committee (Tables 3-6);
- The individual publicly accessible tennis courts in the South and West & Central Sub Area Committees featuring the relocated Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club) (Tables 7-8);
- The number of publicly accessible tennis courts for each ward, grouped by Sub Area Committee (Tables 9-12);
- The number of publicly accessible tennis courts for each ward in the South and West Central Sub Area Committees featuring the relocated Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club (Tables 13-14).

1A1.3 Only those tennis courts that are either public or private with secured community access and, or community based facilities have been included. Tennis courts either in private gardens or private gyms are not included. An assessment of their quality has not been completed. Cambridge's four Area Committees are as follows:

- North Area: King's Hedges, Arbury, West Chesterton and East Chesterton wards
- East Area: Abbey, Coleridge, Petersfield and Romsey wards
- West Central Area: Castle, Market and Newnham wards
- South Area: Cherry Hinton, Queen Edith's and Trumpington wards

1A1.4 There are 53 publicly accessible courts in Cambridge with 5 additional publicly accessible courts planned in the North and East committee areas. Table 1 below summarises the number of outdoor tennis courts in each sub area.

Table 1 - Tennis Court provision in each Area Committee

Area Committee	Public		Private (with Community Access)		Total No. of Courts	% of Total	Planned
	Grass	Tarmac	Grass	Tarmac			
North Area	0	0	0	4	4	8	4
East Area	0	3	0	4	7	13	1
South Area	0	4	0	12	16	30	0

⁴⁵ RD/CSF/200

Matter CC8: Omission Sites
Statement by Cambridge City Council
March 2017

Area Committee	Public		Private (with Community Access)		Total No. of Courts	% of Total	Planned
	Grass	Tarmac	Grass	Tarmac			
West Central Area	2	9	2	13	26	49	0
Sub Total	2	16	2	33	53		5

1A1.5 Table 1 demonstrates that nearly 50% of all publicly accessible tennis courts are located in the West Central Area Committee area. The second largest number is located in the South area representing 30% of the total number.

1A1.6 The Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club consists of 2 grass tennis courts and 13 all-weather tennis courts⁴⁶. These courts are located in Newnham ward which forms part of the West Central Area. The proposed relocation of these sites to the site off Long Road, East of Rutherford Road would mean they are located in the Trumpington ward, within South Area Committee's area. Table 2 below provides a summary of the number of tennis courts each Area Committee would then have following the transfer of the tennis facilities.

Table 2 - Tennis Court provision in each Area Committee (with relocated Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club)

Area Committee	Public		Private (with Community Access)		Total No. of Courts	% of Total	Planned
	Grass	Tarmac	Grass	Tarmac			
North	0	0	0	4	4	8	4
East	0	3	0	4	7	13	1
South	0	4	2	25	31	58	0
West Central	2	9	0	0	11	21	0
Sub Total	2	16	2	33	53		5

1A1.7 Table 2 demonstrates that 58% of all publicly accessible tennis courts would be concentrated in the South Area. The second largest number of tennis courts would then be located in the West Central Area representing 21% of the total number. Compared with the existing distribution of 49% and 30% for the first and second largest concentrations of courts, respectively the resulting distribution of 58% and 21% would not provide a more even distribution of tennis courts within the city.

⁴⁶ <http://www.cambridgeltc.com/>

2 – Outdoor tennis courts in Cambridge with either full or secured public access:

Table 3 – North Area Committee

Site	Ward	Open Space & Recreation Study (OSRS) Ref. No	No. of Courts		Total No. of Courts	Type of Access	Ownership
			Grass	Artificial			
North Cambridge Academy	King's Hedges	SPO 30 (planning permission granted 16/1045/FUL)	0	4	4	Community Use	School
Chesterton Community College	West Chesterton	SPO 08	0	4	4	Community Use	School
Total			0	8	8		

Table 4 - East Area Committee

Site	Ward	OSRS Ref. No	No. of Courts		Total No. of Courts	Type of Access	Ownership
			Grass	Artificial			
Barnwell Road	Abbey	SPO 01	0	1	1	Full	City Council
Wing Development	Abbey	(expected 2021)	0	1	1	Full	City Council
Coleridge recreation ground	Coleridge	P&G 07	0	2	2	Full	City Council
St Bede's School	Coleridge	SPO 44	0	4	4	Community Use	School
Total			0	8	8		

Table 5 - South Area Committee

Site	Ward	OSRS Ref. No	No. of Courts		Total No. of Courts	Type of Access	Ownership
			Grass	Artificial			
Cherry Hinton Hall	Cherry	P&G 03	0	1	1	Full	City Council

Matter CC8: Omission Sites
Statement by Cambridge City Council
March 2017

	Hinton						
Hills Road Sports Centre (Tennis Courts)	Queen Edith's	SPO 22	0	6	6	Community Use	School
Netherhall School (South)	Queen Edith's	SPO 31	0	6	6	Community Use	School
Nightingale recreation ground	Queen Edith's	P&G 14	0	2	2	Full	City Council
Trumpington recreation ground	Trumpington	P&G 21	0	1	1	Full	City Council
Total			0	16	16		

Table 6 - West Central Area Committee

Site	Ward	OSRS Ref. No	No. of Courts		Total No. of Courts	Type of Access	Ownership
			Grass	Artificial			
Christ's Pieces	Market	P&G 06	0	4	4	Full	City Council
Jesus Green	Market	P&G 09	2	4	6	Full	City Council
Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club	Newnham	SPO 06	2	13	15	Community Use	University
Lammas Land	Newnham	P&G 11	0	1	1	Full	City Council
Total			4	22	26		

Table 7 - South Area Committee (with relocated Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club)

Site	Ward	OSRS Ref. No	No. of Courts		Total No. of Courts	Type of Access	Ownership
			Grass	Artificial			
Cherry Hinton Hall	Cherry Hinton	P&G 03	0	1	1	Full	City Council
Hills Road Sports Centre (Tennis Courts)	Queen Edith's	SPO 22	0	6	6	Community Use	School
Netherhall School (South)	Queen Edith's	SPO 31	0	6	6	Community Use	School
Nightingale recreation ground	Queen Edith's	P&G 14	0	2	2	Full	City Council
Trumpington recreation ground	Trumpington	P&G 21	0	1	1	Full	City Council
Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club	Newnham	SPO 06	2	13	15	Community Use	University
Total			2	29	31		

Table 8 - West Central Area Sub-Area Committee (with relocated Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club)

Site	Ward	OSRS Ref. No	No. Courts		Total No. Courts	Type of Access	Ownership
			Grass	Artificial			
Christ's Pieces	Market	P&G 06	0	4	4	Full	City Council
Jesus Green	Market	P&G 09	2	4	6	Full	City Council
Lammas Land	Newnham	P&G 11	0	1	1	Full	City Council
Total			2	9	11		

