

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Public Participation Report - Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee May 2012

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|
|------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|

1. Introduction

1.4

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|--|--|--|
| 6182 - Grosvenor Developments | Object | <p>The Council's position in relation to reducing the level of housing provision needs to be justified and tested through the review of the local plan. It is likely to have significant economic, environmental and social consequences. It risks undermining the Cambridge economy, exacerbating affordability issues and increasing carbon emissions from car travel into Cambridge from more distant locations.</p> <p>Until such a time as the local plan has been reviewed the information which underpinned the adopted Regional Strategy and was tested through the examination and found sound, will remain a significant material consideration.</p> | <p>The SHLAA is a technical document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision.</p> <p>The level of future housing provision is being reconsidered through the Local Plan Review and the SHLAA feeds into this process. The RSS figures are still in place but the 14,000 dwelling figure for new provision between 2011-2031 was a starting point and will be tested. It is not an adopted target. It is for the Local Plan Review to set an appropriate level of provision.</p> <p>It was considered reasonable to do this on the basis that the Government indicated that for those Councils who decide to revise their housing targets, it was appropriate to use the targets that have been agreed between individual local authorities the Regional Planning Body and published in the draft RSS. These figures known as option 1 figures, were the figures agreed through the response to the review of the East of England Plan in 2009 and included in the draft version of the East of England Plan in March 2010.</p> | |
|-------------------------------|--------|--|--|--|

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|--|---|---------------|
| 6212 - Cambridge South Consortium | Object | It is considered that while the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy is still in place and in the absence of any background technical work specifically considering locally derived housing needs, including aspects such as affordability, it is premature to make reference to, and base the housing trajectory included within the SHLAA on a housing provision of 14,000 dwellings between 2011 and 2031. | <p>The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) is in the process of being abolished following the Localism Act 2011.</p> <p>The SHLAA however is a technical document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision.</p> <p>The level of future housing provision is being reconsidered through the Local Plan Review and the SHLAA feeds into this process. The RSS figures are still in place but the 14,000 dwelling figure for new provision between 2011-2031 was a starting point and will be tested. It is not an adopted target. It is for the Local Plan Review to set an appropriate level of provision.</p> <p>It was considered reasonable to do this on the basis that the Government indicated that for those Councils who decide to revise their housing targets, it was appropriate to use the targets that have been agreed between individual local authorities the Regional Planning Body and published in the draft RSS. These figures known as option 1 figures, were the figures agreed through the response to the review of the East of England Plan in 2009 and included in the draft version of the East of England Plan in March 2010.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|-------------------------------|---------------|--|---|---------------|
| 6183 - Grosvenor Developments | Object | Until the local plan has been replaced the housing trajectory should be based on the figures in the Adopted Regional Strategy. that should be the case even if the RS is revoked as the figures within that plan were tested and found sound and the Council's alternative has not been subject of Strategic Environmental Assessment or an independent testing. | <p>The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) is in the process of being abolished following the Localism Act 2011.</p> <p>The SHLAA however is a technical document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision.</p> <p>The level of future housing provision is being reconsidered through the Local Plan Review and the SHLAA feeds into this process. The RSS figures are still in place but the 14,000 dwelling figure for new provision between 2011-2031 was a starting point and will be tested. It is not an adopted target. It is for the Local Plan Review to set an appropriate level of provision.</p> <p>It was considered reasonable to do this on the basis that the Government indicated that for those Councils who decide to revise their housing targets, it was appropriate to use the targets that have been agreed between individual local authorities the Regional Planning Body and published in the draft RSS. These figures know as option 1 figures, were the figures agreed through the response to the review of the East of England Plan in 2009 and included in the draft version of the East of England Plan in March 2010.</p> <p>The Local Plan Review will be subject to independent testing.</p> | |

Representations***Nature Summary of Main Issue******Council's Assessment******Action******2. Background******2.8***

6184 - Grosvenor Developments

Object

Until the local plan has been replaced the housing trajectory should be based on the figures in the Adopted Regional Strategy. that should be the case even if the RS is revoked as the figures within that plan were tested and found sound and the Council's alternative has not been subject of Strategic Environmental Assessment or an independent testing.

The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) is in the process of being abolished following the Localism Act 2011.

The SHLAA however is a technical document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision.

The level of future housing provision is being reconsidered through the Local Plan Review and the SHLAA feeds into this process. The RSS figures are still in place but the 14,000 dwelling figure for new provision between 2011-2031 was a starting point and will be tested. It is not an adopted target. It is for the Local Plan Review to set an appropriate level of provision.

It was considered reasonable to do this on the basis that the Government indicated that for those Councils who decide to revise their housing targets, it was appropriate to use the targets that have been agreed between individual local authorities the Regional Planning Body and published in the draft RSS. These figures known as option 1 figures, were the figures agreed through the response to the review of the East of England Plan in 2009 and included in the draft version of the East of England Plan in March 2010.

The Local Plan Review will be subject to independent testing.

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|--|--|---------------|
| 6213 - Cambridge South Consortium | Object | It is considered that while the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy is still in place and in the absence of any background technical work specifically considering locally derived housing needs, including aspects such as affordability, it is premature to make reference to, and base the housing trajectory included within the SHLAA on a housing provision of 14,000 dwellings between 2011 and 2031. | <p>The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) is in the process of being abolished following the Localism Act 2011.</p> <p>The SHLAA however is a technical document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision.</p> <p>The level of future housing provision is being reconsidered through the Local Plan Review and the SHLAA feeds into this process. The RSS figures are still in place but the 14,000 dwelling figure for new provision between 2011-2031 was a starting point and will be tested. It is not an adopted target. It is for the Local Plan Review to set an appropriate level of provision.</p> <p>It was considered reasonable to do this on the basis that the Government indicated that for those Councils who decide to revise their housing targets, it was appropriate to use the targets that have been agreed between individual local authorities the Regional Planning Body and published in the draft RSS. These figures known as option 1 figures, were the figures agreed through the response to the review of the East of England Plan in 2009 and included in the draft version of the East of England Plan in March 2010.</p> <p>The Local Plan Review will be subject to independent testing.</p> | |
| 2.9 6081 | Object | "physical capacity" for residential development but does this account for required green space etc as part of those developments? | Open space provision will be a requirement as part of those developments. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|--|--|---------------|
| 6214 - Cambridge South Consortium | Object | It is considered that while the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy is still in place and in the absence of any background technical work specifically considering locally derived housing needs, including aspects such as affordability, it is premature to make reference to, and base the housing trajectory included within the SHLAA on a housing provision of 14,000 dwellings between 2011 and 2031. | <p>The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) is in the process of being abolished following the Localism Act 2011.</p> <p>The SHLAA however is a technical document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision.</p> <p>The level of future housing provision is being reconsidered through the Local Plan Review and the SHLAA feeds into this process. The RSS figures are still in place but the 14,000 dwelling figure for new provision between 2011-2031 was a starting point and will be tested. It is not an adopted target. It is for the Local Plan Review to set an appropriate level of provision.</p> <p>It was considered reasonable to do this on the basis that the Government indicated that for those Councils who decide to revise their housing targets, it was appropriate to use the targets that have been agreed between individual local authorities the Regional Planning Body and published in the draft RSS. These figures known as option 1 figures, were the figures agreed through the response to the review of the East of England Plan in 2009 and included in the draft version of the East of England Plan in March 2010.</p> <p>The Local Plan Review will be informed by other sources and will be subject to independent testing.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------|
| 4. Policy Context | | | | |
| 4.1 | | | | |
| 6145 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | The County Council requests that the City Council takes not only housing needs into account but also the supporting service needs, particularly, as far as Children and Young Persons' Services Infrastructure is concerned, the need for early years and school places. The request is not just for the City Council to recognise this as a Section 106 need but rather that sites need to be earmarked/retained for the services, particularly schools and early years' provision, to support housing expansion within the City. | Noted | |
| 6147 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Community Services As noted in representations pertaining to Highways and Access and Education, the County Council expects to work in tandem with the City Council to ensure that requirements are appropriately considered. The same is true of Community Services more broadly as the provision of additional housing will trigger the requirement for additional Community Services, and so the County Council expects to work with the City Council to ensure the timely provision of these services. | Noted. | |
| 6143 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Highways and Access The County Council has been asked for preliminary views on issues such as the ability of sites to be accessed safely and practicably and a Development Control Engineer has attended various meeting regarding the SHLAA to provide relevant input. There have been various correspondences relating to specific sites and the suitability of access. These have been very much in principle rather than detail however as the process continues and development on sites becomes more likely, we would expect to work in tandem with the City Council to ensure that Highways and Access requirements are appropriately considered. | Noted. | |
| 6144 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Ecology The County Council is aware that the City Council's ecologist will be reviewing the SHLAA and as such, we do not feel it is necessary to provide separate comments relating to biodiversity etc. | Noted | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|--|--|---|
| 6175 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology Individual representations have been submitted pertaining to each individual site however it should be noted that reassessment of sites may be appropriate as and when new information becomes available. | Noted. The SHLAA will be reviewed over time as indicated in Stage 11 of the report. | |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| <i>4.3.3</i> 6082 | Support | "the framework states that local planning authorities should set out their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances". Yes - this provides a mandate for the council to reflect the significant pre-existing density of development and congestion in Cambridge in future planning i.e. not adding to these issues. | Noted | |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| <i>4.6</i> 6083 | Object | I can't see that the key issue of traffic/congestion is mentioned? | It is accepted that traffic levels and congestion are important issues. The County Council are preparing a Transport Strategy for Cambridge and this will include detailed traffic modelling. Individual traffic assessments will be required as part of any planning applications, which subsequently come forward. | Add reference to Policy 8/1 8/2 and 8/3 |
| <hr/> | | | | |

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue****Council's Assessment****Action****5. Methodology for the Study****5. Methodology for the Study**

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|--|--|---------------------------------|
| 6255 | Object | whilst welcoming the approach to develop brownfield sites within the city, I am concerned that several of them are on sites currently used for commercial purposes providing local employment. Changing to residential use may drive businesses to the city fringe or out of Cambridge altogether, thus losing valuable jobs. The City Council should give rigorous examination to the social impact of transferring use of some of the sites identified - for example, site number 70 on the Mill Road. | <p>The SHLAA is a technical document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision.</p> <p>The Council is also updating its Employment Land Review alongside the SHLAA. This will be assessing the supply and distribution of land for new employment. There is limited land in the City and many competing uses. The Local Plan Review will be seeking to ensure balance in the allocation of new land.</p> | |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| 5.3 6845 | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>St Johns College Playing Field Grange Road (Site 899) 10.31ha</p> <p>Additional accommodation could be constructed along the periphery of each of these playing fields while leaving the central portion facing the principal streetscape as open space/playing field.</p> <p>No. Of Units: Not known</p> <p>Potential alternative uses: As underutilised college playing field</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| 6318 - Januarys Consultant Surveyors | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>Site 922 (formally site 620) Rigeons Site, Cromwell Rd Area not known yet</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| <hr/> | | | | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 6844 | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>Trinity Olf Fields Playing Field Grange Road (Site 898) 3.90ha</p> <p>Additional accommodation could be constructed along the periphery of each of these playing fields while leaving the central portion facing the principal streetscape as open space/playing field.</p> <p>No. Of Units: Not known</p> <p>Potential alternative uses: As underutilised college playing field</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6843 | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>St Catherine's College Playing Field Granchester Road (Site 897) 2.71ha</p> <p>Additional accommodation could be constructed along the periphery of each of these playing fields while leaving the central portion facing the principal streetscape as open space/playing field.</p> <p>No. Of Units: Not known</p> <p>Potential alternative uses: As underutilised college playing field</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6435 - Queens' College | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>Site 921 Land to the north and south of Barton Road 34.9ha in Cambridge (148ha in total) 600+ units in Cambridge (2,500 in total)</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 6304 - Bidwells | Object | Additional Site Suggestion: Site 910 Land between 21-29 Barton Rd 0.555ha 14 family dwellings | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6307 | Object | Additional Site Suggestion: Site 913 Clifton Industrial Estate, Clifton Rd 4 ha Resi density 215-409 units Resi & business density 95-181 units Potential alternative uses: extend leisure & recreation, providing different forms of employment land | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6834 - Cambridgeshire County Council Property and Procurement Division | Object | Additional Site Suggestion: Site 908 Cambridge Student Support Centre (CSSC) Ascham Road 0.58 ha No. of units not known Potential alternative uses: offices | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6848 | Object | Resubmission of Rejected Site: Site 182 Emmanuel College Playing Field Wilberforce Road (Site 182) 6.44ha Additional accommodation could be constructed along the periphery of each of these playing fields while leaving the central portion facing the principal streetscape as open space/playing field. No. Of Units: Not known Potential alternative uses: As underutilised college playing field | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--------------------------------|---------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 6847 | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>West's Renault RUFC Granchester Road (Site 901) 8.55ha</p> <p>Additional accommodation could be constructed along the periphery of each of these playing fields while leaving the central portion facing the principal streetscape as open space/playing field.</p> <p>No. Of Units: Not known</p> <p>Potential alternative uses: As underutilised college playing field</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6294 | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>Site 893 189 Coleridge Road Size not known 12 apartments</p> <p>Potential other uses: residential</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6437 - Jesus College | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>Site 921 Land to the north and south of Barton Road 34.9ha in Cambridge (148ha in total) 600+ units in Cambridge (2,500 in total)</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6319 - University of Cambridge | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>Site 886 34a Storeys Way, Cambridge 0.79 ha No. of dwellings not yet known</p> <p>Site re-submitted for assessment</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 6293 - unex holdings limited | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>Site 892 64-68 Newmarket Road 0.272 ha Capacity for 81 houses</p> <p>Potential alternative uses: retail, hotel, leisure and education</p> | Noted. | Review additional site within SHLAA |
| 6833 - Cambridgeshire County Council Property and Procurement Division | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>Site 909 Shire Hall Site, Old Police Station, Castle Mound and 42 Castle Street 2.9 ha No. of units not known</p> <p>Potential alternative uses: offices, hotel, student housing, university uses</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6311 - Savills | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>Site 916 Land at Grange Farm, Cambridge 44 ha 1,500 approx(assuming net developable area of 35 ha and a density of 40 dph)</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6840 | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>Site 914a Land west of Hauxton Rd 4.65 ha in City (36 ha in total) 500 dwellings (in total - no. in the city TBC)</p> <p>Potential alternative uses: Cambridge Sporting Village & Community Stadium</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6298 - Cambridgeshire County Council Property and Procurement Division | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>Site 903 Glebe Farm, North of Addenbrookes Access Rd 1 ha 40 units</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 6312 - Januarys | Object | Additional Site Suggestion: Site 917 Auckland Rd Clinic, Auckland Rd c0.11 ha 10-13 units | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6315 - Icen Projects Limited | Object | Additional Site Suggestion: Site 920 Former Blue Circle Site, Coldhams Lane 9,182 ha c300 units | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6838 - Bidwells | Object | Additional Site Suggestion: Site 911 Cambridge South-East: Land south of Fulbourn Road, rear of Peterhouse Tech. Park extending south and west of Beechwood on Worts Causeway, land west of Babraham P&R 182.4 ha 2367 dwellings in the city area (plus 740 in South Cambs) | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6309 - Savills (L&P) Ltd | Object | Additional Site Suggestion: Site 914b Land west of Hauxton Rd, Trumpington 4.65 ha in the city (36 ha in total) None in the city - the City element site to be site of new Community Stadium (420 dwellings in SCDC boundaries) Potential alternative uses: sporting, retail | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6314 - Drivers Jonas Deloitte | Object | Additional Site Suggestion: Site 919 Mount Pleasant House, Mount Pleasant, Cambridge 0.566 ha c100 units (houses / flats) Potential alternative uses: Student housing | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 6322 - Savills | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>Site 877 Land south of Emmanuel playing fields (south of Staceys Lane) 0.6 ha No. of units not yet known</p> <p>Site re-submitted</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6842 | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>Pembroke College Playing Field Granchester Road (Site 896) 3.76ha</p> <p>Additional accommodation could be constructed along the periphery of each of these playing fields while leaving the central portion facing the principal streetscape as open space/playing field.</p> <p>No. Of Units: Not known</p> <p>Potential alternative uses: As underutilised college playing field</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6321 - Cambridgeshire County Council Property and Procurement Division | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>Site 629 Horizons Centre, Coldhams Lane</p> <p>Site could be re-submitted for consultation if updated Environment Agency modelling shows no adverse flooding impact.</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 6295 | Object | Additional Site Suggestion: Site 894 Rear of 551,553 & 555 Newmarket Road 0.2 ha (approx) 10-12 units Potential alternative uses: light industrial on part of site (rear of 551) | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6316 | Object | Additional Site Suggestion: Site 921 Land to the north and south of Barton Rd 34.9 ha in the Cambridge (148 ha in total) 600+ units in Cambridge (2,500+ in total) | Noted. | Assess additional site in SHLAA. |
| 6671 - University of Cambridge | Object | Additional Site Suggestion: Site 923 Land at George Nuttall Close 0.13ha 21 Units Potential alternative uses: None proposed | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6433 - King's College | Object | Additional Site Suggestion: Site 921 Land to the north and south of Barton Road 34.9ha in Cambridge (148ha in total) 600+ units in Cambridge (2,500 in total) | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6835 - Cambridgeshire County Council Property and Procurement Division | Object | Additional Site Suggestion: Site 906 Camfields Resource Centre, Ditton Walk 0.32 ha No. of units not known at this stage | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 6841 - Januarys | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>Site 918 18 Vinery Road, Cambridge 0.2 ha 10-12 units</p> <p>Potential alternative uses: Redevelopment to provide new B1 office accommodation</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6310 - Januarys Consultant Surveyors | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>Site 915 169-173 High St, Chesterton 0.2 ha (approx) 12 units (11 houses and a flat above a shop)</p> <p>Potential alternative uses: housing/commercial</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6323 - Bidwells | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>Site 878 Cambridge South, land east of Hauxton Rd Area not yet known No. of dwellings not yet known</p> <p>Site re-submitted for assessment in the context of Cambridge South proposal.</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 6296 | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>Site 895 :</p> <p>Downing College Playing Field Granchester Road (Site 895) 4.83ha</p> <p>Additional accommodation could be constructed along the periphery of each of these playing fields while leaving the central portion facing the principal streetscape as open space/playing field.</p> <p>No of Units: Not known</p> <p>Potential alternative uses: As underutilised college playing field</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6846 | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>Corpus Christi College Playing Field west of Leckhamton House Road (Site 900) 4.29ha</p> <p>Additional accommodation could be constructed along the periphery of each of these playing fields while leaving the central portion facing the principal streetscape as open space/playing field.</p> <p>No. Of Units: Not known</p> <p>Potential alternative uses: As underutilised college playing field</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6839 - Bidwells | Object | <p>Additional Site Suggestion:</p> <p>Site 912 (previously site 28) Owlestone Croft 1.078 ha 72 dwellings (unconstrained capacity of site)</p> | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 6836 - Cambridgeshire County Council Property and Procurement Division | Object | Additional Site Suggestion: Site 905 Cambridge Professional Development Centre, Padget Rd (Trumpington) 3.15 ha No. of units: not known Potential alternative uses: School | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6832 - Cambridgeshire County Council Property and Procurement Division | Object | Additional Site Suggestion: Site 907 Libraries & Info Service HQ Roger Ascham Site, Ascham Road 0.26ha No. of units not known Potential alternative uses: offices | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6837 - Cambridgeshire County Council Property and Procurement Division | Object | Additional Site Suggestion: Site 904 Land south of Addenbrookes Access Rd 9.22 ha c250 units | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |
| 6297 - David Russell Associates | Support | Additional Site Suggestion: Site 902 (formally site 222) Land at and south of The Ship Public House Northfield Avenue 0.372 ha 15-20 units | Noted | Assess additional site in SHLAA |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|---|--|---------------|
| 5.5 6084 | Object | The HMP membership appears significantly weighted in favour of those interest groups that have a vested interest in development with only a single residents' association member present? | <p>The Council has consulted widely on its draft SHLAA in the interests of transparency. This included widespread consultation with key stakeholders residents associations and other organisations to agree the assessment criteria and the approach to density methodology in 2009. This is detailed in Annex 8 of the SHLAA. Annex 12 also included a list of consultees for the consultation in September 2011. In addition consultation letters were sent to approximately 4,750 residents living near all suitable SHLAA sites.</p> <p>Annex 6 of the SHLAA outlines the terms of reference of the HMP and its composition. The Council consulted the Federation of Cambridge Residents Association regarding representation on the HMP.</p> | |
| 5.7 6085 | Object | I would take issue with the "community" as having been consulted when I have never seen this advertised anywhere other than on the Council website and no-one that I have spoken to has ever heard of it. Also, the 74pg PDF document whilst comprehensive is very difficult to read and comment on given its enormous size and complexity. | <p>The SHLAA is a technical piece of work to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision. However the Council has consulted widely on its draft SHLAA in the interests of transparency. This included widespread consultation with key stakeholders residents associations and other organisations to agree the assessment criteria and the approach to density methodology in 2009. This is detailed in Annex 8 of the SHLAA. Annex 12 also included a list of consultees for the consultation in September 2011. In addition consultation letters were sent to approximately 4.750 residents living near all suitable SHLAA sites.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|--|---|---------------|
| 5.8 6086 | Object | "detailed consultation with residents and stakeholders". I would take issue with this statement given no-one that I speak to seems to have ever heard of this consultation. | The SHLAA is a technical piece of work to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision. However the Council has consulted widely on its draft SHLAA in the interests of transparency. This included widespread consultation with key stakeholders residents associations and other organisations to agree the assessment criteria and the approach to density methodology in 2009. This is detailed in Annex 8 of the SHLAA. Annex 12 also included a list of consultees for the consultation in September 2011. In addition consultation letters were sent to approximately 4.750 residents living near all suitable SHLAA sites. | |
| 5.10 6087 | Object | I'd be interested to know who from the community has been involved in scrutinising this document and these plans as I'm not currently aware of anyone who has? Would it be possible to outline which community members have had input? | The SHLAA is a technical piece of work to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision. However the Council has consulted widely on its draft SHLAA in the interests of transparency. This included widespread consultation with key stakeholders residents associations and other organisations to agree the assessment criteria and the approach to density methodology in 2009. This is detailed in Annex 8 of the SHLAA. Annex 12 also included a list of consultees for the consultation in September 2011. In addition consultation letters were sent to approximately 4.750 residents living near all suitable SHLAA sites. Respondents to this consultation are all posted on the Council's website. | |
| Row 8 6088 | Object | The 2002 Urban Capacity document is almost 10 years out of date. Given the significant growth and development of the city since this time do the findings and recommendations from this document still apply in 2011? | National Guidance on the preparation of SHLAA's advises sites identified in Urban Capacity Studies should be taken into account and their assumptions reviewed if they are still available. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------|
| <i>5.20</i> | | | | |
| 6130 - Andrew Roberts | Support | The Trumpington Residents' Association notes the comments on the approved major development sites in the Southern Fringe (Trumpington Meadows, Glebe Farm and Clay Farm). We stress the dramatic impact these will have on Trumpington which will lead to an increase in dwellings and population greater than in any other part of the city. We stress the need to avoid any further substantial development in Trumpington ward or the immediately surrounding South Cambridgeshire District Council area. | Noted. | |
| 6204 | Support | (Submitted on behalf of the Nineteen Acre Field RA) Two major developments - NIAB and North West Cambridge - will between them use virtually all land suitable for development in Castle Ward in the coming years. It is unsurprising, therefore, that no additional sites (other than a couple of "small" ones) have been identified in Castle. As local residents we would be opposed to the loss of further green space for building. | Noted. | |
| <i>What has been excluded from the Assessment?</i> | | | | |
| 6195 - North Newnham Res.Ass | Support | On behalf of the NNRA (North Newnham Residents Association), we support the exclusion of the Green Belt, Protected Open space and Private gardens and protected Industrial sites for the reasons given in this assessment. Penny Heath. Chair NNRA. | Noted. | |
| 6262 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | We also note that paragraphs 5.23 to 5.27 set out what types of site have been excluded from the SHLAA and that this includes sites in the Green Belt, Protected Open Space, Private Gardens and Protected industrial sites. The Society strongly supports such exclusions and must emphasise the need for the City Council to maintain its resolve on this. | Noted | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|---|--|---------------|
| <i>5.23</i> | | | | |
| 6186 - Grosvenor Developments | Object | We consider there is a clear strategic case for reviewing the Cambridge Green Belt. It is vital that the economy of Cambridge continue to be supported. The non-availability of land at Cambridge East and the delays to Northstowe require that the role and implications of the Green Belt be revisited through the local plan review. | It is not the role of the SHLAA to review the Green Belt. These issues will be explored as part of the Review of the Local Plan. | |
| 6090 | Object | Benefits of fringe development acknowledged in SHLAA document. Can further 7,000 dwellings really be obtained within the city? Current green belt land is not of immediate public benefit. Why not purchase further land for fringe development to avoid exacerbating current city centre overcrowding and congestion? | The SHLAA is a technical document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision. It is not the role of the SHLAA to review the Green Belt. This is for the Local Plan Review to undertake should it prove necessary. Since the Localism Act 2011 the Council can now set its own levels of future housing provision. This is also being reconsidered through the Local Plan Review. The SHLAA feeds into this process. | |
| 6216 - Cambridge South Consortium | Object | We wish to object to the SHLAA methodology and the wording in Paragraph 5.24. It is considered that the methodology used in the SHLAA, with reference to Level 1 Considerations, such as the Green Belt, has resulted in an unduly constrained SHLAA. In terms of Paragraph 5.24, it is premature to advise that it is not necessary to remove any land from the Green Belt since the Local Plan Review has not yet commenced and the associated growth strategy, including the level and the location of future growth has not yet been consulted upon or considered through a public examination. | It is not the role of the SHLAA to review the Green Belt. This is a role for the Local Plan should it be proven to be necessary. The criteria used in the SHLAA were agreed with members and consulted upon with stakeholders. The criteria used provide a balanced approach in terms of suitability assessment. The scope has not been purposely narrowed down in order to constrain development. A very extensive number of sites were assessed. The national guidance for SHLAA's states that policy restrictions such as designations and protected areas in existing policy can be taken into account and particular types of land can be excluded from the assessment where justified. The SHLAA is not premature and has been based on the best information available to it at the time. The SHLAA is not a static document and will be reviewed periodically as pointed out in Stage 11 paragraph 5.91. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|--|--|---------------|
| 6196 - North Newnham Res.Ass | Support | On behalf of the NNRA,(North Newnman Residents' Ass). we support the Council policy to exclude the Green Belt around Cambridge and would hope the Council will robustly defend the existing National Policies that protect and recognise the importance of the Green belt to the Cambridge Setting. Penny Heath. Chair NNRA. | Noted | |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| <i>5.24</i> | | | | |
| 6091 | Object | "It is not intended or necessary to remove any more land from the Green Belt." Totally disagree with this statement - even if it is "technically" feasible to build sufficient houses within existing boundaries, building on every square inch of brownfield site will surely have a hugely negative impact on existing congestion? | National planning policy guidance has for some time been encouraging the planning system to make the most efficient use of land. Building within the existing City boundary will enable more people to live closer to where they work and should help reduce congestion. | |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| 6217 - Cambridge South Consortium | Object | <p>We wish to object to the SHLAA methodology and the wording in Paragraph 5.24.</p> <p>It is considered that the methodology used in the SHLAA, with reference to Level 1 Considerations, such as the Green Belt, has resulted in an unduly constrained SHLAA.</p> <p>In terms of Paragraph 5.24, it is premature to advise that it is not necessary to remove any land from the Green Belt since the Local Plan Review has not yet commenced and the associated growth strategy, including the level and the location of future growth has not yet been consulted upon or considered through a public examination.</p> | <p>It is not the of role of the SHLAA to review the Green Belt. This is a role for the Local Plan should it be proven to be necessary. The criteria used in the SHLAA were agreed with members and consulted upon with stakeholders. The criteria used provide a balanced approach in terms of suitability assessment. The scope has not been purposely narrowed down in order to constrain development. A very extensive number of sites were assessed. The national guidance for SHLAA's states that policy restrictions such as designations and protected areas in existing policy can be taken into account and particular types of land can be excluded from the assessment where justified.</p> <p>The SHLAA is not premature and has been based on the best information available to it at the time. The SHLAA is not a static document and will be reviewed periodically as pointed out in Stage 11 paragraph</p> | |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| 6187 - Grosvenor Developments | Object | We consider there is a clear strategic case for reveiwng the Cambridge Green Belt. It is vital that the economy of Cambridge continue to be supported. The non-availability of land at Cambridge East and the delays to Northstowe require that the role and implications of the Green Belt be revisited through the local plan review. | It is not the role of the SHLAA to review the Green Belt. This is a role for the Local Plan should it be proven to be necessary. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|--|---|---------------|
| 6197 - North Newnham Res.Ass | Support | On behalf of the NNRA,(North Newnman Residents' Ass). we support the intention that the Council will not remove any more land from the Green Belt until all existing developments are completed and the impact of loss of green belt on the Cambridge setting is fully assessed. In west Cambridge the eventual completion of the West Cambridge site footprint could be considered as changes within the Green belt or boundary area since 1999. | Noted | |
| 6131 - Andrew Roberts | Support | The Trumpington Residents' Association welcomes and strongly supports the decision to exclude the Green Belt from the assessment and stresses the vital importance of the remaining areas of Green Belt to the local community. | Noted | |
| 5.25 | | | | |
| 6209 - Emmanuel College and Gonville & Caius College | Object | <p>We wish to object to the methodology. The SHLAA Practice Guidance (2007) published by the Department of Communities and Local Government advises in Paragraph 21 that 'the scope of the assessment should not be narrowed down by existing policies designed to constrain development'. The Planning Advisory Service confirmed in January/February 2008 that Paragraph 21 'seeks to avoid areas which might have housing potential from being excluded from the outset'.</p> <p>It is considered that the methodology used in the SHLAA, with particular reference to Level 1 Considerations such as protected open space has resulted in an unduly constrained SHLAA.</p> | The criteria used in the SHLAA were agreed with members and consulted upon with stakeholders. The criteria used provide a balanced approach in terms of suitability assessment. The scope has not been purposely narrowed down in order to constrain development. A very extensive number of sites were assessed. The national guidance for SHLAA's states in paragraph 38 that policy restrictions such as designations and protected areas in existing policy can be taken into account and particular types of land can be excluded from the assessment where justified. | |
| 6132 - Andrew Roberts | Support | The Trumpington Residents' Association strongly supports the decision to exclude Protected Open Spaces from the assessment and stresses the vital importance of protected open space to the local community. | Noted | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------------|---------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------|
| 6198 - North Newnham Res.Ass | Support | On behalf of the NNRA,(North Newnman Residents' Ass). we strongly support the Council policy to protect Open spaces around Cambridge and fully support the methodology for this technical document and the tandem Open space and Recreation strategy consultation and methodology of assessment. Penny Heath. Chair NNRA. | Noted. | |
| 6206 | Support | (Submitted on behalf of the Nineteen Acre Field RA) NAFRA notes that protected open spaces have been excluded from consideration "to protect the amenity and infrastructure of existing and future residents", and we agree that this is fundamentally critical to the development of the city. It is also important that significant private open spaces (mostly college playing fields and gardens) in Castle do not fall prey to development given the dearth of open spaces generally in this ward. | Noted | |
| <i>5.26</i> | | | | |
| 6199 - North Newnham Res.Ass | Support | On behalf of the NNRA,(North Newnman Residents' Ass). we support the Council policy to classify gardens as green field development and no longer Brown field development. As an area of early 20th C. family houses with gardens - there was a threat to the character of the conservation area. Penny Heath. Chair. NNRA. | Noted | |
| 6133 - Andrew Roberts | Support | The Trumpington Residents' Association also welcomes the exclusion of private gardens from the assessment. | Noted | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---|---------------|--|---|---------------|
| 5.29 6218 - Cambridge South Consortium | Object | <p>We wish to object to the SHLAA methodology and the wording in Paragraph 5.24.</p> <p>It is considered that the methodology used in the SHLAA, with reference to Level 1 Considerations, such as the Green Belt, has resulted in an unduly constrained SHLAA.</p> <p>In terms of Paragraph 5.24, it is premature to advise that it is not necessary to remove any land from the Green Belt since the Local Plan Review has not yet commenced and the associated growth strategy, including the level and the location of future growth has not yet been consulted upon or considered through a public examination.</p> | <p>It is not the role of the SHLAA to review the Green Belt. This is a role for the Local Plan should it be proven to be necessary. The criteria used in the SHLAA were agreed with members and consulted upon with stakeholders. The criteria used provide a balanced approach in terms of suitability assessment. The scope has not been purposely narrowed down in order to constrain development. A very extensive number of sites were assessed. The national guidance for SHLAA's states that policy restrictions such as designations and protected areas in existing policy can be taken into account and particular types of land can be excluded from the assessment where justified.</p> <p>The SHLAA is not premature and has been based on the best information available to it at the time. The SHLAA is not a static document and will be reviewed periodically as pointed out in Stage 11 paragraph 5.91.</p> | |
| 5.30 6092 | Object | <p>The 2002 Urban Capacity study is almost 10 years out of date. Is it not dangerous to assume that there will have been no change in these sites during this time?</p> | <p>National Guidance on the production of SHLAA's advises Urban Capacity Studies are a relevant source of information to use where sites haven't come forward provided sites are reassessed. This is the process the Council has followed as well as looking to identify other new sites.</p> | |
| 5.34 6093 | Object | <p>My concern with this statement is that new, high density housing developments can then act as a precedent for other developments such that an entire area can then be rendered out of proportion with its surroundings - for example the developments along Cromwell Road.</p> | <p>All developments need to be designed in such a way that they are appropriate to their context and that prevailing density in an area is taken into account. It is also important to make the best use of land in sustainable locations.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|--|---|---------------|
| 5.40 6219 - Cambridge South Consortium | Object | <p>We wish to object to the SHLAA methodology and the wording in Paragraph 5.24.</p> <p>It is considered that the methodology used in the SHLAA, with reference to Level 1 Considerations, such as the Green Belt, has resulted in an unduly constrained SHLAA.</p> <p>In terms of Paragraph 5.24, it is premature to advise that it is not necessary to remove any land from the Green Belt since the Local Plan Review has not yet commenced and the associated growth strategy, including the level and the location of future growth has not yet been consulted upon or considered through a public examination.</p> | <p>It is not the role of the SHLAA to review the Green Belt. This is a role for the Local Plan should it be proven to be necessary. The criteria used in the SHLAA were agreed with members and consulted upon with stakeholders. The criteria used provide a balanced approach in terms of suitability assessment. The scope has not been purposely narrowed down in order to constrain development. A very extensive number of sites were assessed. The national guidance for SHLAA's states that policy restrictions such as designations and protected areas in existing policy can be taken into account and particular types of land can be excluded from the assessment where justified.</p> <p>The SHLAA is not premature and has been based on the best information available to it at the time. The SHLAA is not a static document and will be reviewed periodically as pointed out in Stage 11 paragraph 5.91.</p> | |
| 6210 - Emmanuel College and Gonville & Caius College | Object | <p>We wish to object to the methodology. The SHLAA Practice Guidance (2007) published by the Department of Communities and Local Government advises in Paragraph 21 that 'the scope of the assessment should not be narrowed down by existing policies designed to constrain development'. The Planning Advisory Service confirmed in January/February 2008 that Paragraph 21 'seeks to avoid areas which might have housing potential from being excluded from the outset'.</p> <p>It is considered that the methodology used in the SHLAA, with particular reference to Level 1 Considerations such as protected open space has resulted in an unduly constrained SHLAA.</p> | <p>The criteria used in the SHLAA were agreed with members and consulted upon with stakeholders. The criteria used provide a balanced approach in terms of suitability assessment. The scope has not been purposely narrowed down in order to constrain development. A very extensive number of sites were assessed. The national guidance for SHLAA's states in paragraph 38 that policy restrictions such as designations and protected areas in existing policy can be taken into account and particular types of land can be excluded from the assessment where justified.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---|---------------|--|---|---------------|
| 5.41 6211 - Emmanuel College and Gonville & Caius College | Object | <p>We wish to object to the methodology. The SHLAA Practice Guidance (2007) published by the Department of Communities and Local Government advises in Paragraph 21 that 'the scope of the assessment should not be narrowed down by existing policies designed to constrain development'. The Planning Advisory Service confirmed in January/February 2008 that Paragraph 21 'seeks to avoid areas which might have housing potential from being excluded from the outset'.</p> <p>It is considered that the methodology used in the SHLAA, with particular reference to Level 1 Considerations such as protected open space has resulted in an unduly constrained SHLAA.</p> | <p>The criteria used in the SHLAA were agreed with members and consulted upon with stakeholders. The criteria used provide a balanced approach in terms of suitability assessment. The scope has not been purposely narrowed down in order to constrain development. A very extensive number of sites were assessed. The national guidance for SHLAA's states in paragraph 38 that policy restrictions such as designations and protected areas in existing policy can be taken into account and particular types of land can be excluded from the assessment where justified.</p> | |
| 5.47 6220 - Cambridge South Consortium | Object | <p>We wish to object to the SHLAA methodology and the wording in Paragraph 5.24.</p> <p>It is considered that the methodology used in the SHLAA, with reference to Level 1 Considerations, such as the Green Belt, has resulted in an unduly constrained SHLAA.</p> <p>In terms of Paragraph 5.24, it is premature to advise that it is not necessary to remove any land from the Green Belt since the Local Plan Review has not yet commenced and the associated growth strategy, including the level and the location of future growth has not yet been consulted upon or considered through a public examination.</p> | <p>It is not the role of the SHLAA to review the Green Belt. This is a role for the Local Plan should it be proven to be necessary. The criteria used in the SHLAA were agreed with members and consulted upon with stakeholders. The criteria used provide a balanced approach in terms of suitability assessment. The scope has not been purposely narrowed down in order to constrain development. A very extensive number of sites were assessed. The national guidance for SHLAA's states that policy restrictions such as designations and protected areas in existing policy can be taken into account and particular types of land can be excluded from the assessment where justified.</p> <p>The SHLAA is not premature and has been based on the best information available to it at the time. The SHLAA is not a static document and will be reviewed periodically as pointed out in Stage 11 paragraph 5.91.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|---|---|---------------|
| 5.49 6094 | Object | The Housing Market Partnership are a body composed predominantly (on paper) of bodies with interests in promoting housing development. I'd like to emphasise the need for a better communication with the community and residents who I still believe are largely unaware of these plans. | Annex 6 of the SHLAA outlines the terms of reference of the HMP and its composition. The HMP assisted the Council in its assessment of deliverability of sites. The Federation of Cambridge Residents Associations was consulted regarding representation on the HMP. The Council has done much more by way of consultation than is required in the SHLAA guidance. It has consulted widely on its draft SHLAA in the interests of transparency. Key stakeholders, residents associations and other organisations were consulted on the assessment criteria and the approach to density methodology in 2009. This is detailed in Annex 8 of the SHLAA. Annex 12 also included a list of consultees for the consultation in September 2011. In addition consultation letters were sent to approximately 4,750 residents living near all suitable SHLAA sites. | |
| 5.52 6095 | Object | Further to previous comments, I feel that residents' interests were significant under-represented in this meeting due to the presence of only one committee member from a non pro-development interest group. | Annex 6 of the SHLAA outlines the terms of reference of the HMP and its composition. The HMP assisted the Council in its assessment of deliverability of sites. The Federation of Cambridge Residents Associations was consulted regarding representation on the HMP. The Council has done much more by way of consultation than is required in the SHLAA guidance. It has consulted widely on its draft SHLAA in the interests of transparency. Key stakeholders, residents associations and other organisations were consulted on the assessment criteria and the approach to density methodology in 2009. This is detailed in Annex 8 of the SHLAA. Annex 12 also included a list of consultees for the consultation in September 2011. In addition consultation letters were sent to approximately 4,750 residents living near all suitable SHLAA sites. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|--|---|---------------|
| <i>5.57</i> | | | | |
| 6215 - Cambridge South Consortium | Object | It is considered that while the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy is still in place and in the absence of any background technical work specifically considering locally derived housing needs, including aspects such as affordability, it is premature to make reference to, and base the housing trajectory included within the SHLAA on a housing provision of 14,000 dwellings between 2011 and 2031. | <p>The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) is in the process of being abolished following the Localism Act 2011.</p> <p>The SHLAA however is a technical document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision.</p> <p>The level of future housing provision is being reconsidered through the Local Plan Review and the SHLAA feeds into this process. The RSS figures are still in place but the 14,000 dwelling figure for new provision between 2011-2031 was a starting point and will be tested. It is not an adopted target. It is for the Local Plan Review to set an appropriate level of provision.</p> <p>It was considered reasonable to do this on the basis that the Government indicated that for those Councils who decide to revise their housing targets, it was appropriate to use the targets that have been agreed between individual local authorities the Regional Planning Body and published in the draft RSS. These figures known as option 1 figures, were the figures agreed through the response to the review of the East of England Plan in 2009 and included in the draft version of the East of England Plan in March 2010.</p> <p>The Local Plan Review will be informed by other sources and will review these levels of provision. These will be reflected in future updates of the SHLAA.</p> | |
| <i>Sites Currently Identified as Suitable in the SHLAA</i> | | | | |
| 6134 - Andrew Roberts | Support | The Trumpington Residents' Association supports the outcome that there are only a small number of potential sites in the Ward, most of which are rejected in the report, given the scale of already approved development which will take place in the Ward from 2011-2021. | Noted | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|--|---|---------------|
| <i>Bullet 8</i> | | | | |
| 6096 | Object | Further to previous comments the HMP scrutiny of these sites as a triage step for future developable sites seems to have been performed in the absence of a balanced panel? | Annex 6 of the SHLAA outlines the terms of reference of the HMP and its composition. The HMP assisted the Council in its assessment of deliverability of sites. The Federation of Cambridge Residents Associations was consulted regarding representation on the HMP. The Council has done much more by way of consultation than is required in the SHLAA guidance. It has consulted widely on its draft SHLAA in the interests of transparency. Key stakeholders, residents associations and other organisations were consulted on the assessment criteria and the approach to density methodology in 2009. This is detailed in Annex 8 of the SHLAA. Annex 12 also included a list of consultees for the consultation in September 2011. In addition consultation letters were sent to approximately 4,750 residents living near all suitable SHLAA sites. | |
| <i>Table 4</i> | | | | |
| 6099 | Object | Abbey ward appears to be earmarked for a significant proportion of the developments planned. This is an already heavily congested entrance to the city. Other areas (such as west Cambridge) seem little affected - will this not lead to lop-sided development of the city? | The west side of the City has already committed to significant urban extensions at NIAB and NW Cambridge. It will be for the spatial strategy of the Local Plan Review to conclude on the best locations for future growth. | |
| 6207 | Support | (Submitted on behalf of the Nineteen Acre Field RA) We note that the only sites in Castle Ward included in the initial list of sites considered suitable were both then reclassified as "small sites". This confirms our view that Castle really is close to "full". | Noted. | |
| <i>Ref 1</i> | | | | |
| 6097 | Object | Further development in this area will negatively impact on an area of very high traffic congestion (Coldham's Lane/Newmarket Road junction) | Site 46 Wests Garage has already been withdrawn by the landowner. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---|--|---------------|
| <i>Ref 4</i> | | | | |
| 6098 | Object | Newmarket Road is one of the most congested entrances to the city and a quick examination of the likely sites for significant development (including the Cambridge United site) seems to show that Abbey will be disproportionately bear the brunt of residential development. I would like to know how these plans are compatible with the East Area gate vision which identified traffic and congestion (in particular associated with the retail activity close to the Abbey Stadium)? | It is accepted that traffic levels and congestion are important issues. The County Council are preparing a Transport Strategy for Cambridge and this will include detailed traffic modelling. Individual traffic assessments will be required as part of any planning applications, which subsequently come forward. | |
| 5975 | Support | This is an excellent area for housing redevelopment and I feel strongly that this should set the trend of redeveloping the rest of Newmarket Road from retail use to housing, moving the retail and industrial elements further out of the City. The common land and transport system will be utilised more efficiently and the Newmarket Road area will benefit. | Noted | |
| <i>Ref 42</i> | | | | |
| 6010 | Support | The Site (102) borders a residential area and is therefore suitable for new housing - individual houses, NOT highrise flats. | Noted | |
| <i>SHLAA Draft Trajectory</i> | | | | |
| 6253 | Object | The target of 14,000 new homes for the City between 2911 and 2031 (ie 700 dwellings per annum over this period), a figure taken from the Joint Interim Assessment agreed with other Cambridgeshire local authorities, seems ambitious in the current economic climate but could possibly be deliverable in the second half of the period. Certainly it is more credible than the unrealistic target of 19,000 new homes previously agreed with the now discarded 2009 Regional Spatial Strategy, and in that context it is welcome. | Noted. It is for the Local Plan Review rather than the SHLAA to decide the appropriate level of future provision. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---|---------------|---|--|---------------|
| 6261 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | The Society notes that the City Council has taken 14,000 new homes as its overall housing target between 2011 and 2031 (i.e. 700 dwellings per annum over the period) and that this figure is taken from the Joint Interim Assessment agreed with other Cambridgeshire Councils. We also note that the corresponding figure in the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England was 19,000 new homes. CambridgePPF had suggested an annual building rate of 720 up to 2036 for Cambridge in our response to the RSS (in November 2009). CambridgePPF would therefore support the City Council's adopted target | Noted. It is not however an adopted target. It is for the Local Plan Review to set an appropriate level of provision. | |
| <i>5.71</i> 6100 | Object | Therefore these figures demonstrate that even if every possible site identified is developed (is this realistic or desirable in terms of its impact on the city centre?) then the target of 14,000 dwellings is still unachievable. This is a strong argument to re-examine the current stance of not considering further development of green belt land. | It is not the role of the SHLAA to review the Green Belt. This is a role for the Local Plan should it be proven to be necessary. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|--|---|---------------|
| <i>Table 6</i> | | | | |
| 6223 - Cambridge South Consortium | Object | It is considered that while the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy is still in place and in the absence of any background technical work specifically considering locally derived housing needs, including aspects such as affordability, it is premature to make reference to, and base the housing trajectory included within the SHLAA on a housing provision of 14,000 dwellings between 2011 and 2031. | <p>The SHLAA is a technical document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision.</p> <p>The level of future housing provision is being reconsidered through the Local Plan Review and the SHLAA feeds into this process. The RSS figures are still in place but the 14,000 dwelling figure for new provision between 2011-2031 was a starting point and will be tested. It is not an adopted target. It is for the Local Plan Review to set an appropriate level of provision.</p> <p>It was considered reasonable to do this on the basis that the Government indicated that for those Councils who decide to revise their housing targets, it was appropriate to use the targets that have been agreed between individual local authorities the Regional Planning Body and published in the draft RSS. These figures known as option 1 figures, were the figures agreed through the response to the review of the East of England Plan in 2009 and included in the draft version of the East of England Plan in March 2010.</p> <p>The 14,000 figure is therefore a starting point for the review of the Local Plan process, which will also be informed by other sources of evidence.</p> | |
| 6254 | Support | <p>Table 6 in the SHLAA summarises the sources of developable/deliverable sites up to 2031 which could yield some 12,000 new homes, with the 28 sites identified in the SHLAA contributing some 950 dwellings. The bulk of the 2031 target is therefore covered, and presumably the balance can be made up through judicious extensions to current major developments.</p> <p>The big unknown for both the City and South Cambs SHLAA is the future of Marshall's Cambridge East. I think it is correct to assume that Cambridge East is unlikely to come forward before 2031 and that alternative housing provision will be required.</p> | Noted. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|-------------------------------|---------------|--|--|---------------|
| <i>Row 11</i> | | | | |
| 6188 - Grosvenor Developments | Object | Until the local plan has been replaced the housing trajectory should be based on the figures in the Adopted Regional Strategy. that should be the case even if the RS is revoked as the figures within that plan were tested and found sound and the Council's alternative has not been subject of Strategic Environmental Assessment or an independent testing. | <p>The SHLAA is a technical document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision.</p> <p>The level of future housing provision is being reconsidered through the Local Plan Review and the SHLAA feeds into this process. The RSS figures are still in place but the 14,000 dwelling figure for new provision between 2011-2031 was a starting point and will be tested. It is not an adopted target. It is for the Local Plan Review to set an appropriate level of provision.</p> <p>It was considered reasonable to do this on the basis that the Government indicated that for those Councils who decide to revise their housing targets, it was appropriate to use the targets that have been agreed between individual local authorities the Regional Planning Body and published in the draft RSS. These figures know as option 1 figures, were the figures agreed through the response to the review of the East of England Plan in 2009 and included in the draft version of the East of England Plan in March 2010.</p> <p>The Local Plan Review will be subject to independent testing.</p> | |

Table 7

| | | | | |
|------|---------|--|-------|--|
| 6208 | Support | (Submitted on behalf of the Nineteen Acre Field RA) 34a Storeys Way is reported as having been "withdrawn" following the 2008/9 consultation. This site has also been kept outside the boundary of the North West Cambridge development, despite being owned by the University and immediately adjacent to the NWC site. NAFRA will be watching with interest to see what, if anything, is proposed for this site in the coming years. | Noted | |
|------|---------|--|-------|--|

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <i>Site 182</i> | | | | |
| 6227 - Emmanuel College and Gonville & Caius College | Object | <p>We wish to object to the methodology. The SHLAA Practice Guidance (2007) published by the Department of Communities and Local Government advises in Paragraph 21 that 'the scope of the assessment should not be narrowed down by existing policies designed to constrain development'. The Planning Advisory Service confirmed in January/February 2008 that Paragraph 21 'seeks to avoid areas which might have housing potential from being excluded from the outset'.</p> <p>It is considered that the methodology used in the SHLAA, with particular reference to Level 1 Considerations such as protected open space has resulted in an unduly constrained SHLAA.</p> | <p>The criteria used in the SHLAA were agreed with members and consulted upon with stakeholders in July to August 2009. The criteria used provide a balanced approach in terms of suitability assessment. The scope has not been purposely narrowed down in order to constrain development. A very extensive number of sites were assessed. The national guidance for SHLAA's states in paragraph 38 that policy restrictions such as designations and protected areas in existing policy can be taken into account and particular types of land can be excluded from the assessment where justified.</p> <p>The Council has fully assessed all sites against its agreed criteria. Sites were not excluded from this process from the outset. It has however applied relevant policy designations and constraints in reaching its conclusions.</p> | |
| 6201 - North Newnham Res.Ass | Support | <p>On behalf of North Newnham Residents Association , we support the Methodology and results of the assessment to protect Open spaces & recreation land and exclude this specific site Emmanuel playing field, for development. Penny Heath. Chair NNRA</p> | Noted | |
| <i>Site 854</i> | | | | |
| 6228 - DB Schenker Rail (UK) Ltd | Object | <p>It should be noted that for Site 854; Railway Sidings West of Rustat Road, the Employment Land Review (July 2008) concluded that the site has potential for '10,700 sq m B1 (a) Office scheme with residential.....' and the SHLAA is therefore factually incorrect in the conclusions made in respect of this site and in its assessment that the site is not suitable for residential development on the basis of the Employment Land Review.</p> | <p>Noted. This is a factual error. The landowner Network Rail have confirmed their continued interest in pursuing mixed residential and employment use in the longer term. Because the site was rejected primarily to safeguard its employment potential in the Employment Land Review it should be reassessed for mixed use including residential.</p> | Reassess site 854 in the SHLAA. |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|--|---|---------------|
| <i>Site 876</i> | | | | |
| 6202 - North Newnham Res.Ass | Support | On behalf of North Newnham residents Association, we support all considerations for protecting the Green belt. Penny Heath. Chair. NNRA | Noted. | |
| <i>Site 877</i> | | | | |
| 6203 - North Newnham Res.Ass | Support | On behalf of North Newnham Residents Association we support National Policies to protect the Green Belt and the Councils policies to exclude further development of the existing Green Belt. Penny Heath. Chair NNRA. | Noted. | |
| <i>Site 878</i> | | | | |
| 6224 - Cambridge South Consortium | Object | <p>We wish to object to the SHLAA methodology and the wording in Paragraph 5.24.</p> <p>It is considered that the methodology used in the SHLAA, with reference to Level 1 Considerations, such as the Green Belt, has resulted in an unduly constrained SHLAA.</p> <p>In terms of Paragraph 5.24, it is premature to advise that it is not necessary to remove any land from the Green Belt since the Local Plan Review has not yet commenced and the associated growth strategy, including the level and the location of future growth has not yet been consulted upon or considered through a public examination.</p> | <p>It is not the role of the SHLAA to review the Green Belt. This is a role for the Local Plan should it be proven to be necessary. The criteria used in the SHLAA were agreed with members and consulted upon with stakeholders. The criteria used provide a balanced approach in terms of suitability assessment. The scope has not been purposely narrowed down in order to constrain development. A very extensive number of sites were assessed. The national guidance for SHLAA's states that policy restrictions such as designations and protected areas in existing policy can be taken into account and particular types of land can be excluded from the assessment where justified.</p> <p>The SHLAA is not premature and has been based on the best information available to it at the time. The SHLAA is not a static document and will be reviewed periodically as pointed out in Stage 11 paragraph 5.91.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---|---------------|---|--|---------------|
| <i>5.74</i> | | | | |
| 6230 - Cambridge South Consortium | Object | If there is a shortfall in the potential housing supply from identified sites within Cambridge City, consideration should be given in the SHLAA to new broad locations for future housing growth, rather than existing allocations, and this may involve the need to review Green Belt boundaries around the City. | It is not the role of the SHLAA to review the Green Belt. This is a role for the Local Plan should it be proven to be necessary. | |
| 6263 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | In paragraph 5.74 broad locations are identified which could be considered if sufficient specific sites cannot be identified to meet the 15 year target. One such location is Marshall's Cambridge East. In the document it is stated that Cambridge East is unlikely to come forward before 2031 and the Society supports this prudent assertion. | Noted | |
| <i>5.75</i> | | | | |
| 6231 - Cambridge South Consortium | Object | If there is a shortfall in the potential housing supply from identified sites within Cambridge City, consideration should be given in the SHLAA to new broad locations for future housing growth, rather than existing allocations, and this may involve the need to review Green Belt boundaries around the City. | It is not the role of the SHLAA to review the Green Belt. This is a role for the Local Plan should it be proven to be necessary. | |
| 6205 | Support | (Submitted on behalf of the Nineteen Acre Field RA) Two major developments - NIAB and North West Cambridge - will between them use virtually all land suitable for development in Castle Ward in the coming years. It is unsurprising, therefore, that no additional sites (other than a couple of "small" ones) have been identified in Castle. As local residents we would be opposed to the loss of further green space for building. | Noted. | |
| <i>5.76</i> | | | | |
| 6232 - Cambridge South Consortium | Object | If there is a shortfall in the potential housing supply from identified sites within Cambridge City, consideration should be given in the SHLAA to new broad locations for future housing growth, rather than existing allocations, and this may involve the need to review Green Belt boundaries around the City. | It is not the role of the SHLAA to review the Green Belt. This is a role for the Local Plan should it be proven to be necessary. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|--|--|---------------|
| <i>5.77</i> | | | | |
| 6102 | Object | The bullet points associated with this main point seem to be a tacit confirmation that future high density development of the city centre is a preferred option in order to achieve the target of 14,000 dwellings. This despite an acknowledgement elsewhere (5.81) that Cambridge is already a "highly build up city with its tight boundary surrounded by Green Belt". Further large-scale high density development can surely only be detrimental to the city and its already highly congested infrastructure. | The points made are merely observations on the Cambridge housing market. The SHLAA is not a policy document. | |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| 6233 - Cambridge South Consortium | Object | If there is a shortfall in the potential housing supply from identified sites within Cambridge City, consideration should be given in the SHLAA to new broad locations for future housing growth, rather than existing allocations, and this may involve the need to review Green Belt boundaries around the City. | It is not the role of the SHLAA to review the Green Belt. This is a role for the Local Plan should it be proven to be necessary. | |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| <i>Bullet 1</i> | | | | |
| 6101 | Object | But if city centre over-development is allowed to happen then this trend will conceivably soon reverse. | Increases in supply may help stem the rate of increase in prices. The opposite effect would occur if development were curtailed. | |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| <i>5.78</i> | | | | |
| 6189 - Grosvenor Developments | Object | The Cambridge housing market is proving to be extremely resilient to the recession. House prices continue to rise, in part due to the lack of available supply. New sites being brought to the market are selling extremely well. It is the difficulty in obtaining planning which is holding back delivery of sites. | Noted. The statements in this paragraph are the Council's perception based on discussions with developers as part of Annual monitoring. | |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| <i>5.79</i> | | | | |
| 6193 - Grosvenor Developments | Object | It is inappropriate to include an allowance for small sites as they have not been subject to an assessment. It can not therefore be considered that such sites are suitable, achievable or available. | The Council did assess the suitability of a large number of small sites and are using them as an example of the types of site which may come up in broad locations as explained in paragraphs 5.79-5.86. | |
| <hr/> | | | | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|---|--|---------------|
| 5.80 6103 | Object | "windfalls should not be included in the first 10 years of supply unless robust evidence of genuine local circumstances that prevent specific sites or broad locations being identified." Surely Cambridge is one of the fastest growing cities in the UK and is acknowledged to be a "highly built up City with its tight boundary surrounded by Green Belt land" (5.81)? Is this, and challenges of finding sites demonstrated by the SHLAA, not "evidence of genuine local circumstances that prevent specific sites or broad locations being identified"? | The Council has been able to identify small sites in broad locations. The SHLAA guidance provides for also including windfalls but care needs to be taken to avoid double counting sites identified in broad locations where these have been identified. The NPPF has recently changed the rules regarding an allowance for windfalls in the first 5 years. This will be explored through the SHLAA. | |
| 5.81 6104 | Support | Agree - the statement confirms that Cambridge is already a highly built-up and physically constrained city. On the basis of the statement in this point I find it difficult to understand why the council is not entertaining the idea of further use of the green belt land, which I still maintain is of little benefit to Cambridge or surrounding environs. | Noted. It is not a role of the SHLAA however to review the Green Belt. | |
| 5.83 6190 - Grosvenor Developments | Object | the supply of small sites can not continue indefinitely. Given the high level of land value in Cambridge it is likely that most land which could be developable has come forward and that this source of supply will diminish quickly. In addition, the Council has recently been taking a strong line against development of garden land, which in the past would have constituted a significant element of the small site supply. | The SHLAA will need monitoring on a regular basis as pointed out in Stage 11 paragraph 5.91 | |
| 5.86 6192 - Grosvenor Developments | Object | It is inappropriate to include small sites as they have not been subject to an assessment. It can not therefore be considered that they are suitable, achievable or available. | The Council did assess the suitability of a large number of small sites and are using them as an example of the types of site which may come up in broad locations as explained in paragraphs 5.79-5.86. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|--|--|---------------|
| 5.88 6107 | Object | The tone of this point is that "enough is enough" when it comes to consideration of the green belt as a potential source of land for development. However, it also highlights that Cambridge is a "constrained urban area". I would prefer a more holistic approach, without ruling out options such as green belt usage, which appears to stem from the prior release of green belt for development. Previous release of green belt land was surely driven by a significant need and has this really changed? | Significant releases of Green Belt land have recently been made through the current Local Plan. These provide a large land supply for some time to come. The SHLAA will be monitored over time as pointed out in Stage 11 paragraph 5.91 | |
| 5.89 6105 | Object | What are the "genuine local circumstances" if not significant difficulty in identifying sites that will not lead to overdevelopment of the city? The SHLAA document has potentially found suitable sites that could yield dwellings that are still below the required level (5.71), surely indicative of a "genuine local circumstance" i.e. issue with developing an already highly-developed city? | The SHLAA is a live document and will need regular updating to ensure it keeps up with commitments through planning decisions. Council has reserved its position on whether it wants to rely on windfalls until it has done more work following the recent changes introduced by the National Planning Policy Framework. | |
| 5.90 6106 | Object | "Genuine local reasons" are unclear to me if not exemplified by the difficulty, as demonstrated in the SHLAA document, of finding sufficient sites to meet dwelling targets. | The SHLAA is a live document and will need regular updating to ensure it keeps up with commitments through planning decisions. Council has reserved its position on whether it wants to rely on windfalls until it has done more work following the recent changes introduced by the National Planning Policy Framework. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|
|------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|

6. Conclusions

6. Conclusions

| | | | | |
|------|---------|---|--------|--|
| 6109 | Support | <p>Thanks to the council for organising this consultation but please - it has not been publicised enough and surely there can be few responders to it from the public.</p> <p>Please do not allow the over-development of Cambridge to meet targets and to improve the appearance of areas/buildings above all other considerations. Residents have to live with the consequences. The green belt has been used in previously and please do not rule this out. At the risk of sounding flippant no-one wants a skyscraper skyline to save a few fields of oilseed rape.</p> | Noted. | |
|------|---------|---|--------|--|

6.2

| | | | | |
|------|--------|---|---|--|
| 6108 | Object | <p>I would argue that sufficient community members/residents have not been engaged - surely these are one of the key stakeholders. I have recently contacted the head of our local residents association to see if they were adequately consulted and they recalled that minimal consultation was made (i.e. a letter announcing the consultation was starting, in a period when they had received notification of many other consultations too). It is fantastic that the council even has a consultation but it has not been adequately advertised or is very user-friendly to find and read.</p> | <p>The SHLAA is a technical piece of work to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision. However the Council has consulted widely on its draft SHLAA in the interests of transparency. This included widespread consultation with key stakeholders residents associations and other organisations to agree the assessment criteria and the approach to density methodology in 2009. This is detailed in Annex 8 of the SHLAA. Annex 12 also included a list of consultees for the consultation in September 2011. In addition consultation letters were sent to approximately 4,750 residents living near all suitable SHLAA sites.</p> | |
|------|--------|---|---|--|

Representations

Nature Summary of Main Issue

Council's Assessment

Action

7. Next Steps

7. Next Steps

6009 - Natural England

Support

We have no specific comments to make on individual sites contained in the SHLAA, nor do we have any sites we wish to suggest for future development. We would, however, request full consideration of our interests in the process of selecting and assessing sites for allocation through the Local Development Framework (LDF).

Noted

These interests include biodiversity; geodiversity; landscape character and quality; green infrastructure; access to the countryside and other open space; the protection and enhancement of soils; and environmental land management.

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue****Council's Assessment****Action****Annex 1: Assessment Criteria****Annex 1: Assessment Criteria**

6225 - Cambridge South Consortium

Object

We wish to object to the SHLAA methodology and the wording in Paragraph 5.24.

It is considered that the methodology used in the SHLAA, with reference to Level 1 Considerations, such as the Green Belt, has resulted in an unduly constrained SHLAA.

In terms of Paragraph 5.24, it is premature to advise that it is not necessary to remove any land from the Green Belt since the Local Plan Review has not yet commenced and the associated growth strategy, including the level and the location of future growth has not yet been consulted upon or considered through a public examination.

It is not the role of the SHLAA to review the Green Belt. This is a role for the Local Plan should it be proven to be necessary. The criteria used in the SHLAA were agreed with members and consulted upon with stakeholders. The criteria used provide a balanced approach in terms of suitability assessment. The scope has not been purposely narrowed down in order to constrain development. A very extensive number of sites were assessed. The national guidance for SHLAA's states that policy restrictions such as designations and protected areas in existing policy can be taken into account and particular types of land can be excluded from the assessment where justified.

The SHLAA is not premature and has been based on the best information available to it at the time. The SHLAA is not a static document and will be reviewed periodically as pointed out in Stage 11 paragraph 5.91.

6226 - Emmanuel College and Gonville & Caius College

Object

We wish to object to the methodology. The SHLAA Practice Guidance (2007) published by the Department of Communities and Local Government advises in Paragraph 21 that 'the scope of the assessment should not be narrowed down by existing policies designed to constrain development'. The Planning Advisory Service confirmed in January/February 2008 that Paragraph 21 'seeks to avoid areas which might have housing potential from being excluded from the outset'.

It is considered that the methodology used in the SHLAA, with particular reference to Level 1 Considerations such as protected open space has resulted in an unduly constrained SHLAA.

The criteria used in the SHLAA were agreed with members and consulted upon with stakeholders. The criteria used provide a balanced approach in terms of suitability assessment. The scope has not been purposely narrowed down in order to constrain development. A very extensive number of sites were assessed. The national guidance for SHLAA's states in paragraph 38 that policy restrictions such as designations and protected areas in existing policy can be taken into account and particular types of land can be excluded from the assessment where justified.

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| <i>Annex 1A: Flood Risk Assessment</i> | | | | |
| <i>Annex 1A: Flood Risk Assessment</i> | | | | |
| 6320 - Cambridgeshire County Council Property and Procurement Division | Object | Site 629 should not have been dismissed on grounds of flooding. It is understood that the data modelling on which this decision was made may be inaccurate. Thus, the site should not be rejected until new data from the Environment Agency has been received, and the County has had an opportunity to seek its own advice on the revised data. The site has no known history of flooding. | The data modelling is being reviewed by the Environment Agency. This won't be completed for another 8 weeks. | Reinstate the site in the SHLAA until the conclusions are available. |
| 6241 - Cambridgeshire County Council Property and Procurement Division | Object | Rejected site 629 Horizons Site, Coldhams Lane: The County Council objects to this site being dismissed due to concerns based on flooding. It is understood that the data modelling upon which this decision was made may be inaccurate and thus the site should not be rejected until the new data from the EA has been received and the County Council has had the opportunity to seek its own advice regarding the revised data. The site is currently in beneficial use and has to the best of my knowledge no known history of flooding. | The data modelling is being reviewed by the Environment Agency. This won't be completed for another 8 weeks. | Reinstate the site in the SHLAA until the conclusions are available. |

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue****Council's Assessment****Action****Annex 2: Small Identified Sites****Paragraph 1**

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|---|--|
| 6191 - Grosvenor Developments | Object | It is inappropriate to include these sites as they haven't been subject to an assessment. It can not therefore be considered that they are suitable, achievable or available. | The Council did assess the suitability of a large number of small sites and are using them as an example of the types of site which may come up in broad locations as explained in paragraphs 5.79-5.86. |
|-------------------------------|--------|---|--|

Row 6

| | | | |
|------|--------|--|--|
| 5971 | Object | The shortage of available off-street parking in many areas around Cambridge is apparent. Many residential roads have properties with no garages or driveways and vehicles are left parked along the sides of roads. This reduced the width of road space available to other road users, e.g. drivers and cyclists, and can make navigation of Cambridge on a bicycle quite dangerous in some places. Removing garages will only increase the quantity of vehicles left parked at the roadside. | The County Council are producing a Transport Strategy for Cambridge, which will shortly be the subject of consultation. Should any SHLAA sites end up being allocated within the Local Plan Review and or be the subject of any subsequent planning applications, a Transport Impact Assessment would be required to assess any mitigate any adverse impact on on-street parking in adjoining streets. |
|------|--------|--|--|

Row 13

| | | | |
|------|--------|--|---|
| 5972 | Object | Why build on car parks? Where are people supposed to park their cars? There is a big difference between encouraging people to make use of buses, trains and bicycles and forcing them to leave their vehicles at the roadside. | The County Council are producing a Transport Strategy for Cambridge, which will shortly be the subject of consultation. This will review future policy towards traffic and parking. |
| 5992 | Object | The site is appropriate for housing. However, an opportunity for commercial uses at ground floor should be explored because of its riverside location. Flats above with the potential to incorporate steps down from Elizabeth Way bridge to improve accessibility between riverside and bridge. | Noted. This would have to be reviewed in the context of any future planning application on the site. |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|--|--|---------------|
| <i>Row 69</i> | | | | |
| 5998 | Object | ADJACENT 11 UPHALL ROAD ALSO ADJACENT TO MY PROPERTY - 13 UPHALL ROAD! SMALL AREA OF PROPERTIES BUILT IN THE 1950'S- VERY SMALL GARAGE AREA PROPOSED WOULD INFRINGE EXCESSIVELY ON BOTH MENTIONED PROPERTIES AND SMALL ESTATE MENTIONED. ACCESS POINT TO BARNWELL NATURE RESERVE WHICH IS USED CONSIDERABLY BY THE LOCAL & NOT SO LOCAL COMMUNITIES. AN ACCESS POINT TO MY OWN BACK GARDEN, MY ONLY OUTSIDE ACCESS! THE AREA ITSELF IS TOO SMALL FOR HOUSES AND FLATS WOULD BE TOTALLY OUT OF CHARACTER FOR THE AREA. TRAFFIC OUTBOUND IS ALREADY DIFFICULT ONTO COLDHAMS LANE | The small sites are included only as examples of the types of site which might come up over the period of the next Plan. They will not be allocated for residential uses in the Local Plan as they are too small. Should an planning application come up on this site these issues can be more fully explored at the time. | |
| <i>Row 70</i> | | | | |
| 5999 | Object | ADJACENT TO 11 UPHALL ROAD IT IS IN FACT ALSO ADJACENT TO MY PROPERTY 13 UPHALL ROAD!SMALL AREA OF PROPERTIES BUILT IN THE 1950'S VERY SMALL GARAGE AREA PROPOSED WOULD INFRINGE EXCESSIVELY ON BOTH MENTIONED PROPERTIES AND SMALL ESTATE MENTIONED.CURRENTLY AN ACCESS POINT TO BARNWELL NATURE RESERVE WHICH IS USED CONSIDERABLY BY THE LOCAL AND NOT SO LOCAL COMMUNITIES.AN ACCESS POINT TO MY OWN BACK GARDEN, MY ONLY OUTSIDE ACCESS POINT!THE AREA ITSELF IS TOO SMALL FOR HOUSES AND FLATS WOULD BE TOTALLY OUT OF CHARACTER FOR THE AREA AS A WHOLE.TRAFFIC ACCESS OUTBOUND IS ALREADY DIFFICULT ONTO COLDHAMS LANE | The small sites are included only as examples of the types of site which might come up over the period of the next Plan. They will not be allocated for residential uses in the Local Plan as they are too small. Should an planning application come up on this site these issues can be more fully explored at the time. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|--|---|---------------|
| <i>Row 76</i> | | | | |
| 5979 | Object | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Removal of parking, forcing more cars onto already busy street parking. 2. Unsuited shape of building plot with a limited access. 3. Crammed in buildings giving a detrimental impact on local area. 4. 19 Wadloes Road and properties either side would be overlooked by proposed development. | The small sites are included only as examples of the types of site which might come up over the period of the next Plan. They will not be allocated for residential uses in the Local Plan as they are too small. Should an planning application come up on this site these issues can be more fully explored at the time. | |
| <i>Row 338</i> | | | | |
| 6246 | Object | Some of the houses on Ainsworth Street that abut the development site have ground floor habitable room that face, and are less than 20 meters from, the boundary. Unless the height of any development of the site is severely restricted it will affect the amenity of the Ainsworth Street properties through overlooking of habitable rooms and gardens and consequent loss of privacy. There would also be a loss of amenity through loss of sunlight. The existing workshop and garage that are on the site support employment and create daytime activity which also contributes to the amenity of the area. | The role of the SHLAA is merely to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision. Should sites be progressed through the Local Plan Review or planning applications decisions will have to be made on how best to promote good design. These are not issues for the SHLAA as it is a technical exercise. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|--|---|---------------------|
| <i>Part 3 Annex 1 - Potential Sites</i> | | | | |
| <i>Site 105: Abbey Stadium (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6179 - Grosvenor Developments | Object | We consider that Boston Road should be removed from the site - it is not an adopted public highway and there is no intention or need to take vehicular access from Boston Road. A single point of access for vehicles can be achieved from Newmarket Road, although it may be desirable to provide a point of access for cyclists and/or pedestrians from Boston Road. | Noted. Site boundary should be amended to exclude Boston Road | Amend site boundary |
| 5973 | Object | -Newmarket Road cannot handle the extra rush-hour traffic; -Crime (inc. ASB, burglary, criminal damage) is a problem in the vicinity at present, so adding more people will not help; -New housing will not include garages or driveways for cars, meaning that they will be left on roads. | The Highway Authority have not raised the issue of rush hour traffic as a constraint inhibiting the development of the site. The role of the SHLAA is merely to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the Districts future housing provision. Should sites be progressed through the Local Plan Review other policies in the Plan aim to tackle how best to promote good design and crime considerations. These are not issues for the SHLAA as it is a technical exercise. | |
| 6054 | Object | Concerned that if houses built on the site that Cut Throat Lane would be used as access, as the road is not suitable for a high number of vehicles. Also hope that Elflada Road wont be used for parking by residents of new hosues, as there is already an issue with parking space here. Also hope that if hosues are built here, that the trucks working on the buildings will not use our Lane as a cut through. | Details of suitable access to the site will be explored as part of the Local Plan Review and any subsequent planning application. The Highway Authority have been consulted on the broad principles of development and their comments have been incorporated in the assessment for the site. Construction traffic would be considered and regulated appropriately in conjunction with any subsequent planning application. | |
| 6178 - Grosvenor Developments | Object | Work is under way on a development brief for the site for agreement with the Council regarding principles for development. We consider that the scale of development is likely to fall in the range from 154 (as identified in the SHLAA) to around 200 units. | Comments noted. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|-------------------------------|---------------|--|---|---|
| 6050 | Object | <p>I'm not objecting and am merely commenting.</p> <p>Two requests if this site is developed please:</p> <p>1) Ensure that Elfleda Road remains a cul de sac and is not used for vehicular access to the development</p> <p>2) Ensure that the height of development is in keeping with the local area, currently predominantly two-storey. 154 units would almost certainly mean building higher than this, in which case please graduate height increase sympathetically, i.e. not five storeys hard on the boundary of existing two-storey properties.</p> <p>Any local facilities incorporated in the new development would be welcome as this part of town is not currently well served.</p> | <p>Comments noted. The Highway Authority have been consulted on the broad principles of development and access to the site. Their comments have been incorporated in the assessment for the site.</p> <p>Should the site progress to an allocation in the Local Plan Review, the detailed design of any development would have to be considered in the context of any subsequent planning application.</p> <p>The Council will have to consider the impact of the development on community facilities and if necessary seek contributions via the Community Infrastructure Levy or S106 contributions to mitigate any adverse impacts</p> | |
| 5982 | Object | <p>Please view full written justification.</p> <p>In my view, the proposed use changes for site 105 will result in the following issues:</p> <p>An unacceptable increase in road traffic and congestion on Newmarket Road</p> <p>Proposed development will likely cause an unmanageable increase in the use of already constrained local amenities</p> <p>The addition of 154 properties, in the absence of sufficient road access at the main site, will likely increase road traffic along the un-adopted and poorly surfaced lane colloquially referred to as Cutthroat Lane</p> <p>Development has the potential to have a negative effect on the market value of existing properties in the area.</p> | <p>The County Council are preparing a Transport Strategy for Cambridge and this will include detailed traffic modelling. Individual traffic assessments will be required as part of any planning applications, which subsequently come forward.</p> <p>The City Council will also have to consider the impact of the development on community facilities and if necessary seek S106 contributions to mitigate adverse impacts.</p> <p>The Highway Authority have also been consulted on the broad principles of development including access. Their comments have been incorporated in the assessment for the site.</p> | |
| 6181 - Grosvenor Developments | Object | <p>The covenant in relation to the south stand needs to be considered by the Council, but it is not a barrier to bringing forward the majority of the site.</p> | <p>Noted. However the site boundary may need amendment.</p> | <p>Council to give a formal response in relation to the covenant. Amend boundary as appropriate</p> |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---|---------------|--|--|---|
| 6024 | Object | The football ground is a much-loved and very important civic amenity within the Cambridge metropolitan area. In addition, it borders a very small but important area of natural significance. Any housing development here would be detrimental, and would be too much for the local infrastructure to cope. | <p>The SHLAA assessment has recognised the importance of the football ground and has stated that the site will only be considered suitable for development if the protected open space use on the site can be satisfactorily replaced elsewhere and is similarly accessible to its users.</p> <p>The significance of constraints in the immediate surroundings have been acknowledged in the assessment.</p> | |
| 6180 - Grosvenor Developments | Object | <p>In terms of the lease on the vehicle depot, this is not a barrier to development as the lease includes a notice period in order to gain possession of the site.</p> <p>It is possible that this part of the sould come forward ahead of the stadium relocation.</p> | Agree but to avoid piecemeal development it should be designed flexibly to be compatible with the development of the rest of the site, or as standalone development, should a satisfactory replacement not be found for protected open space on the larger site. | |
| 6177 - Grosvenor Developments | Object | The SHLAA should be amended to ensure consistency with the tests set out in Policy 4/2 and Policy 5/11 of the local plan - namely references to "equally accessible" should be replaced by references to satisfactory replacement (4/2) and similar accessibility (5/11). | Noted. | Amend the wording in the SHLAA assessmernt. |
| 6176 - Grosvenor Developments | Support | We support the identification of the site for residential redevelopment subject to the relocation of existing stadium. The SHLAA identifies a number of amber ratings against detailed elements of the site. Many of these are detailed points of design consideration rather than points of principle which would prevent redevelopment. The Level 1 conclusion that development of the site will not have a negative impact on any of the strategic considerations is supported. | Noted. | |
| 6265 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | agree with assessment conclusion and criteria set | Noted. | |
| 6148 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | <p>Archaeology Located in an area known for its 18th and 19th century industry, evidence for Roman and Saxon settlement has been identified to the north (HER 17486). Of particular significance is Stourbridge Chapel to the north west, dating from the 12th century (HER 04781).</p> | Noted. Archaeology officers at the County Council have been consulted as part of the SHLAA assessment process. | Add additional comments to SHLAA Assessment |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| <i>Site 105 Map</i> | | | | |
| 5981 | Object | <p>Please view full written justification.</p> <p>In my view, the proposed construction and demolition activities for site 105 will result in the following issues:</p> <p>Negative impact to existing residents parking and property access along the boundary of Boston Road.</p> <p>Negative impact to existing residents rights to light and air along the boundary of Boston Road.</p> <p>Increase in overlook of private properties along the boundary of Boston Road.</p> <p>Negative impact of demolition and construction activities on health, disruption and structure and cosmetics of existing residents and properties.</p> | <p>Noted. The landowner has requested the removal of Boston Road from the site. The issues raised would also be considered should the Local Plan decide to allocate the site for residential use. Any future planning application would need to take these issues into account in order to minimise any disruption to residents during the construction phase.</p> | Amend site boundary of site 105 |
| <i>Site 202: 1 Ditton Walk (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6025 | Object | <p>Fen Ditton represents an important green lung in the city of Cambridge. Any development adjacent to green spaces should be discouraged.</p> | <p>The sites proximity to Stourbridge Common which is in the Green Belt has been noted. By way of update the site has subsequently been the subject of an outline planning application for 12 dwellings and which has been approved 10/086/OUT. This will be picked up in the 2012 Annual Monitoring Report.</p> | |
| 6264 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Object | <p>site should also be considered to be retained for employment purposes (i.e. light industry/ employment) to ensure a mixed community is retained</p> | <p>The Council's Employment Land Review recommended releasing this site for residential development. By way of update the site has subsequently been the subject of an outline planning application for 12 dwellings and which has been approved 10/086/OUT. This will be picked up in the 2012 Annual Monitoring Report.</p> | |
| 6149 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | <p>Archaeology Located in an area known for its 18th and 19th century industry, evidence for Roman and Saxon settlement has been identified to the west (HER 17486). Of particular significance is Stourbridge Chapel to the west, dating from the 12th century (HER 04781).</p> | <p>Noted. Archeology officers at the County Council have been consulted as part of the SHLAA assessment process. By way of update the site has subsequently been the subject of an outline planning application for 12 dwellings and which has been approved 10/086/OUT. This will be picked up in the 2012 annual monitoring report.</p> | Update SHLAA record with archaeology comments. |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---|---------------|---|---|---------------|
| <i>Site 430: Catholic Church of St Vincent de Paul (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6026 | Object | The loss of the church would be a regrettable loss of an important civic amenity. | Noted. Land owner has indicated this is a longer term aspiration. The proposal would have to be tested against the Council's policy towards the loss of community facilities and whether any satisfactory relocation or alternative provision was possible. | |
| 6150 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology Located in an area with little previous investigation. Roman settlement is known to the south east (HER 14647). | Noted | |
| 6267 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | support subject to: agree with assessment conclusion and criteria set and any new scheme schemes should maximise wider community usage and integration at the heart of Abbey | Noted | |
| <i>Site 443: 636-656 Newmarket Road (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 5974 | Object | Removal of these valuable facilities and replacement with more new homes will have a detrimental effect on the local community. Again, having lived around this area for >2 years I am very aware that there are groups of youths engaging in under-age drinking, vandalism and anti-social behaviour. Adding more people will only exacerbate the problems. Perhaps knocking down the existing flats and building some nicer ones would be a suitable alternative? | It is anticipated the redevelopment of the site will seek to retain and improve the existing community facilities as part of the development. | |
| 6027 | Support | In principle, I am not opposed to development here. However, any development would absolutely have to replace - and indeed, improve, the civic amenities of the area. Good quality design is paramount. I'm not sure the city has a good enough understanding of what good design actually is. | Noted. | |
| 6266 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | support subject to: scope for greater use on site if 1 or more of community uses became available for redevelopment; their continuation on site could be subject to better integration into scheme | Noted. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|--|---|---------------------|
| 6151 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology Archaeological investigations undertaken on the adjacent Barnwell Road site revealed a cemetery of probable Saxon date (HER 16936). Additional burials or associated settlement evidence may extend into the proposal area. | Noted. Archaeology officers at the County Council have been consulted as part of the SHLAA assessment process. | Update SHLAA record |
| 6234 | Support | Quality community building(s) would be required if scheme went ahead. Preserve/relocate the outdoor hard court used by local young people. Trees - more existing trees need protecting on the site. Some parts of the site need greening up - quite bleak at the moment | Noted. | |
| <i>Site 443 Map</i> | | | | |
| 5977 | Object | As a resident in Peverel Road near to the proposed site I am concerned about a couple of things. 1. not enough parking spaces now in this section of Peverel Rd with some parking on the grass verges and across the pavement. 2.The lack of amenities for local people. This is not just a community centre, there are playing courts and a church hall. Will all these be replaced at an equivalent size? 4. The eyesore all the extra buildings will cause. I can see trees and blue sky from my house! I don't want to look out onto buildings. | Any redevelopment would aim to substantially improve the the built environment and reprovide the existing community facilities as part of the redevelopment. Parking issues would be reviewed as part of any future planning application should the site be allocated in the Local Plan Review. | |
| <i>Site 870: Ditton Fields Nursery School (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6028 | Object | I regret the loss of nursery facilities, which are much needed. This part of Abbey needs wholesale re-consideration - beginning with the McDonalds, which is a blight and contributes little to the area. Any development here, or on the other side of Newmarket Road, should begin with the replacement of McDonalds with a series of independent shops and cafes - which should be the first step in contributing to a sense of place. | The nursery provision has been transferred to Abbey Meadows Primary School in Galfrid Road. The Council would not be able to replace McDonalds unless they voluntarily relocated from the site. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---|---------------|---|---|---------------------|
| 5984 | Object | Adding more residential housing to this location would not serve the community. There are already a large number of residential addresses in this area, with very little in the way of community or commercial buildings. Furthermore, the noise from McDonald's and its car park would be a significant nuisance to anyone moving into a residential property on site 870. | The nursery provision has been transferred to Abbey Meadows Primary School in Galfrid Road. A noise assessment would need to be prepared in conjunction with any planning application, which would guide any mitigation measures needed. | |
| 5980 | Object | This area is already built up and my concerns are for parking amenities for residents, depending on the type of housing there is already little space locally for street car parking. Secondly, accessing the said development by cars from the already busy Wadloes Road. Any loss or damage to any trees or habitat within the property. Noise to other residents. | These are considerations which would be taken into account in any subsequent planning application. Site is suitable for development. | |
| 6152 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology Archaeological investigations undertaken to the south revealed a cemetery of probable Saxon date (HER 16936). | Noted. Archaeology officers at the County Council have been consulted as part of the SHLAA assessment process. | Update SHLAA record |
| 6268 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | support subject to: CambridgePPF's concern that this site provides a good location for community facilities being at the heart of Abbey Ward and retention and good integration of such facilities is essential | Noted | |
| <i>Site 855: 1 Ditton Walk (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6269 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | support subject to: it is marginal site and perhaps better retained as commercial site for light employment | Noted | |
| 6153 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | The site is located between an area of known Roman settlement to the east (HER 14647) and a cemetery of probable Saxon date to the south (HER 16936). | Noted | |
| <i>Site 012: 162-184 Histon Road (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6270 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | agree with assessment conclusion and criteria set | Noted | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|---|--|---|
| 6154 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology Previous development of this site is likely to have removed any significant archaeological remains. | Noted. Archaeology officers at the County Council have been consulted as part of the SHLAA assessment process. | Add additional comments to SHLAA Assessment |
| <i>Site 312: Land R/O 129-133 Histon Road (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6271 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | agree with assessment conclusion and criteria set | Noted. | |
| 6155 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology The site is located between the Roman town at Cambridge and an area of late Iron Age and Roman settlement to the north west (HER 17974). | Noted. Archaeology officers at the County Council have been consulted as part of the SHLAA assessment process. | Add additional comments to SHLAA Assessment |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|--|---|---------------|
| <i>Site 057: BP Garage - 452 Cherry Hinton Road (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6014 | Object | <p>What would happen to the WELL USED BP garage if it was to be taken for housing?</p> <p>Do you anticipate the garage being closed and moved? Why do you think this address could be used for housing?</p> <p>Perhaps four houses could be fitted in this plot, more if the garages behind the BP Garage in Rothmere Road were used in conjunction.</p> | <p>Whilst the Council fully acknowledges the public support for retaining the petrol filling station, it cannot be considered as a building / facility in community use. It does not serve an immediate local community in the way that other facilities do, such as a public house or village shop. A petrol filling station is not the type of local facility that community policies in the local plan, seek to safeguard.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are alternative petrol filling stations currently in 8 other locations across the City the nearest being at Sainsbury's Coldhams Lane, Teversham Corner Newmarket Road, Elizabeth Way, High St Trumpington, Newnham Road, 159 Histon Road, Huntingdon Road, and Tesco Milton. Depending on the route being taken out of the City this still provides for some choice.</p> <p>Many independently owned fuel stations although branded with the name of a major oil company have to buy fuel from independent fuel wholesalers adding another layer of cost. Independent petrol stations face tough competition currently with supermarkets and sites owned by major oil companies. There is also an issue with the very high rate of duty charged on petrol, which creates cash flow problems for smaller operators. Margins are very narrow if other retail functions are not included. This garage does have limited retail functions but the area is well served by three local shopping centres nearby on Cherry Hinton High Street, Adkins Corner and Wulfstan Way</p> <p>If the station were to close during the next 20 years an alternative use will need to be found for the site. The Council consider in this situation the loss of the petrol station would be regrettable but on balance would be outweighed by the strong need for housing land.</p> | |
| 6063 | Object | <p>In removing the existing garages you will create parking problems for local residents increasing the number of cars that will be parked on the road and decreasing the spaces on the road in which to park.</p> | <p>Many of the garages are not in use as they are not suited to modern vehicles. There are several laybys on the estate which allow for off carriageway parking.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|---|--|---------------|
| 6136 | Object | This petrol station is a community asset. 10 years ago there were 4 petrol stations in the vicinity, now there are two, one this site, the other Sainsburys. It is important to retain an alternative to the supermarket station as part of choice for residents, to avoid yet more congestion at the Sainsbry roundabout, and as part of the objective of retaining diversity of facilities in the area. | <p>Whilst the Council fully acknowledges the public support for retaining the petrol filling station, it cannot be considered as a building / facility in community use. It does not serve an immediate local community in the way that other facilities do, such as a public house or village shop. A petrol filling station is not the type of local facility that community policies in the local plan, seek to safeguard.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are alternative petrol filling stations currently in 8 other locations across the City the nearest being at Sainsbury's Coldhams Lane, Teversham Corner Newmarket Road, Elizabeth Way, High St Trumpington, Newnham Road, 159 Histon Road, Huntingdon Road, and Tesco Milton. Depending on the route being taken out of the City this still provides for some choice.</p> <p>Many independently owned fuel stations although branded with the name of a major oil company have to buy fuel from independent fuel wholesalers adding another layer of cost. Independent petrol stations face tough competition currently with supermarkets and sites owned by major oil companies. There is also an issue with the very high rate of duty charged on petrol, which creates cash flow problems for smaller operators. Margins are very narrow if other retail functions are not included. This garage does have limited retail functions but the area is well served by three local shopping centres nearby on Cherry Hinton High Street, Adkins Corner and Wulfstan Way</p> <p>If the station were to close during the next 20 years an alternative use will need to be found for the site. The Council considers in this situation the loss of the petrol station would be regrettable but on balance would be outweighed by the strong need for housing land.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|---|--|---------------|
| 6001 | Object | Although many of the garages off Glenmere Close are not in regular use, this is not true of them all! The garages are too narrow for today's cars, but are used as lockable storage areas. Many of the properties in the area are maisonettes; the occupants of the first floors have no access to rear gardens or sheds, but are responsible for maintenance of the gardens to the front of these properties. Commonly lawnmowers and other gardening equipment are stored in the garages. Cycles are also stored in these garages. Provision of alternative lockable storage areas would negate this objection. | Comments noted. The SLAA is a Technical Document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision. If many of the garages are not in use or are not suited to modern vehicles they do not represent an efficient use of land given the City's housing needs. Should the site be allocated it may be possible to negotiate some alternative storage provision as mitigation for the loss of this facility. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|--|---|---------------|
| 6064 | Object | <p>The BP Garage is a valuable and important amenity. It provides a 24 hour service Petrol, shop, non-charging cashpoint, post office and car-related facilities - car wash.</p> <p>It is thriving business that is crucial to the local community, many of whom are elderly as well as people using park, church or passing through. There are few garages/shops with these facilities in this area of town.</p> <p>I STRONGLY object to this proposal This is a nice pleasant neighbourhood that should stay as it is. The site is small where housing will benefit very few people. I WILL actively campaign locally against this proposal.</p> | <p>Whilst the Council recognises the public support for retaining the petrol filling station, it cannot be considered as a building / facility in community use. It does not serve an immediate local community in the way that other facilities do, such as a public house or village shop. A petrol filling station is not the type of local facility that community policies in the local plan, seek to safeguard.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are alternative petrol filling stations currently in 8 other locations across the City the nearest being at Sainsbury's Coldhams Lane, Teversham Corner Newmarket Road, Elizabeth Way, High St Trumpington, Newnham Road, 159 Histon Road, Huntingdon Road, and Tesco Milton. Depending on the route being taken out of the City this still provides for some degree of choice.</p> <p>Many independently owned fuel stations although branded with the name of a major oil company have to buy fuel from independent fuel wholesalers adding another layer of cost. Independent petrol stations face tough competition currently with supermarkets and sites owned by major oil companies. There is also an issue with the very high rate of duty charged on petrol, which creates cash flow problems for smaller operators. Margins are very narrow if other retail functions are not included. This garage does have limited retail functions but the area is well served by three local shopping centres nearby on Cherry Hinton High Street, Adkins Corner and Wulfstan Way</p> <p>If the station were to close during the next 20 years an alternative use will need to be found for the site. The Council consider in this situation the loss of the petrol station would be regrettable but on balance would be outweighed by the strong need for housing land.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|---|--|---|
| 6003 | Object | The proposal will undo the City Council's previous planning decisions: a large building opposite the BP Garage was pulled down for development in the 1970s giving rise to Coe's Court and bungalows (note the parking provision and building height considerations) all in keeping with the suburban area. Around the same time my grandfather stopped Marshalls from expanding onto Cherry Hinton Rd. to the left and right of number 388, otherwise the road would now have car showrooms like Newmarket Road. | The role of the SHLAA is merely to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision. Should sites be progressed through the Local Plan Review decisions will have to be made on how best to promote amenity and good design. These are not issues for the SHLAA as it is a technical exercise. | |
| 6156 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology Cherry Hinton Hall and its grounds, to the north east, were established in the mid 19th century, but may be located on the site of a small Priory (HER 04907, 09927). | Noted. Archaeology officers at the County Council have been consulted as part of the SHLAA assessment process. | Add additional comments to SHLAA Assessment |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---|---------------|--|---|---------------|
| 6275 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | support subject to: agree with assessment conclusion and criteria set but concern of loss of petrol station in this part city may be unacceptable; overall location and accessibility of local refuelling stations need to be tackled as an important issue as part of the LOCAL PLAN REVIEW prior to considering removal of this site as petrol station | <p>Whilst the Council fully acknowledges the public support for retaining the petrol filling station, it cannot be considered as a building / facility in community use. It does not serve an immediate local community in the way that other facilities do, such as a public house or village shop. A petrol filling station is not the type of local facility that community policies in the local plan, seek to safeguard.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are alternative petrol filling stations currently in 8 other locations across the City the nearest being at Sainsbury's Coldhams Lane, Teversham Corner Newmarket Road, Elizabeth Way, High St Trumpington, Newnham Road, 159 Histon Road, Huntingdon Road, and Tesco Milton. Depending on the route being taken out of the City this still provides for some choice.</p> <p>Many independently owned fuel stations although branded with the name of a major oil company have to buy fuel from independent fuel wholesalers adding another layer of cost. Independent petrol stations face tough competition currently with supermarkets and sites owned by major oil companies. There is also an issue with the very high rate of duty charged on petrol, which creates cash flow problems for smaller operators. Margins are very narrow if other retail functions are not included. This garage does have limited retail functions but the area is well served by three local shopping centres nearby on Cherry Hinton High Street, Adkins Corner and Wulfstan Way</p> <p>If the station were to close during the next 20 years an alternative use will need to be found for the site. The Council consider in this situation the loss of the petrol station would be regrettable but on balance would be outweighed by the strong need for housing land.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|--|---|---------------|
| <i>Site 057 Map</i> | | | | |
| 6051 | Object | Petrol station is only one left in this sector of Cambridge. Nearest ones are Sainsburys or Trumpington. The area must have station or many unnecessary journeys will occur just to get petrol. The station is a community facility. | <p>Whilst the Council fully acknowledges the public support for retaining the petrol filling station, it cannot be considered as a building / facility in community use. It does not serve an immediate local community in the way that other facilities do, such as a public house or village shop. A petrol filling station is not the type of local facility that community policies in the local plan, seek to safeguard.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are alternative petrol filling stations currently in 8 other locations across the City the nearest being at Sainsbury's Coldhams Lane, Teversham Corner Newmarket Road, Elizabeth Way, High St Trumpington, Newnham Road, 159 Histon Road, Huntingdon Road, and Tesco Milton. Depending on the route being taken out of the City this still provides for some choice.</p> <p>Many independently owned fuel stations although branded with the name of a major oil company have to buy fuel from independent fuel wholesalers adding another layer of cost. Independent petrol stations face tough competition currently with supermarkets and sites owned by major oil companies. There is also an issue with the very high rate of duty charged on petrol, which creates cash flow problems for smaller operators. Margins are very narrow if other retail functions are not included. This garage does have limited retail functions but the area is well served by three local shopping centres nearby on Cherry Hinton High Street, Adkins Corner and Wulfstan Way</p> <p>If the station were to close during the next 20 years an alternative use will need to be found for the site. The Council consider in this situation the loss of the petrol station would be regrettable but on balance would be outweighed by the strong need for housing land.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|--|---|---------------|
| 6060 | Object | This petrol station and shop are very important amenities to local community and drivers further afield. We would have to drive 2 miles to get petrol; there are always queues for petrol & the shop is used continuously. Local people as they get older and can't walk great distances would always have more need of the shop. This community facility is vital to retain as others are being eroded. | <p>Whilst the Council fully acknowledges the public support for retaining the petrol filling station, it cannot be considered as a building / facility in community use. It does not serve an immediate local community in the way that other facilities do, such as a public house or village shop. A petrol filling station is not the type of local facility that community policies in the local plan, seek to safeguard.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are alternative petrol filling stations currently in 8 other locations across the City the nearest being at Sainsbury's Coldhams Lane, Teversham Corner Newmarket Road, Elizabeth Way, High St Trumpington, Newnham Road, 159 Histon Road, Huntingdon Road, and Tesco Milton. Depending on the route being taken out of the City this still provides for some choice.</p> <p>Many independently owned fuel stations although branded with the name of a major oil company have to buy fuel from independent fuel wholesalers adding another layer of cost. Independent petrol stations face tough competition currently with supermarkets and sites owned by major oil companies. There is also an issue with the very high rate of duty charged on petrol, which creates cash flow problems for smaller operators. Margins are very narrow if other retail functions are not included. This garage does have limited retail functions but the area is well served by three local shopping centres nearby on Cherry Hinton High Street, Adkins Corner and Wulfstan Way</p> <p>If the station were to close during the next 20 years an alternative use will need to be found for the site. The Council consider in this situation the loss of the petrol station would be regrettable but on balance would be outweighed by the strong need for housing land.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| <i>Site 755: 78 and 80 Fulbourn Road (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6276 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | support subject to: agree with assessment conclusion and criteria set; ensure setting, openness and access to Green Belt, reestablishment of right of way or new for bridleway access to the countryside in the long-term (link Fulbourn Road with countryside/ Gog Magog Hills to south for the varied countryside users and linkage with recreational network) | Noted | |
| 6157 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology Activity of Bronze Age date includes ring ditch remains of burial mounds to the south east (HER 08880). | Noted. Archaeology officers at the County Council have been consulted as part of the SHLAA assessment process. | Add additional comments to SHLAA Assessment |
| <i>Site 755 Map</i> | | | | |
| 5997 | Support | (I just wanted to comment on this but the drop down menu only had support or object) Just to let you know that the top half of this site has already been developed with new houses, so not much opportunity to comment its suitability now! I guess the bottom half will be done as well eventually but you can only see that from the new houses so no bother to me over the road. | Noted. The assessment does mention this. | The boundary of Site 755 needs amendment in the SHLAA. |
| <i>Site 063: Garages adjacent to 2 Derwent Close (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 5987 5988 6000 6004 6005 6012 6062 6079 6123 6141 6251 - Derwent Close Residents Association | Object | All garages are in active use and half of the garages are owned freehold with the remainder owned on a leasehold basis. Land assembly would therefore be very difficult without willing landowners. The redevelopment will result in on street parking problems, environmental issues, loss of character, and problems with the continued servicing of the Anglian Water Pumping Station. | The SHLAA has to take into account the availability of land for development. This usually involves a developer expressing an intention to develop or a landowner expressing an intention to sell the land. The complexity of ownership and opposition from some of the landowners suggests that the overall site is not likely to become available for development during the plan period. The Anglian Water Pumping Station also represents a constraint on development. | Remove the site from the SHLAA |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---|---------------|---|---|---|
| 6015 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Object | Please note that the bus services serving this site are the C2 and C3, not C1 and C3 as incorrectly stated in the Annex. The C1 and C2 routes changed recently and the C1 no longer travels along Cherry Hinton Road. | The C2 service does still travel along Cherry Hinton Road between Walpole Road, near the site, and Wulfstan Way. The C1 route however no longer travels along Cherry Hinton Road. | Amend assessment. |
| 6272 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | agree with assessment conclusion and criteria set | Noted. The SHLAA has to take into account the availability of land for development. This usually involves a developer expressing an intention to develop or a landowner expressing an intention to sell the land. The complexity of ownership on this site is such that it is not likely to come forward for development. | |
| 6158 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology Cherry Hinton Hall and its grounds, to the east, were established in the mid 19th century, but may be located on the site of a small Priory (HER 04907, 09927). | Noted. | |
| <i>Site 081: 152 Coleridge Road (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6159 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology It is not anticipated that significant archaeological remains would survive in this area. | Noted. Archaeology officers at the County Council have been consulted as part of the SHLAA assessment process. | Add additional comments to SHLAA Assessment |
| 6273 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | agree with assessment conclusion and criteria set | Noted. | |
| <i>Site 872: 82-90 Hills Road and 57-63 Bateman Street (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6252 | Support | I think this site is entirely appropriate for residential accommodation development. | Noted. | |
| 6173 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology The site is located close to the probable line of the Roman road approaching the Roman town at Cambridge from the south east. | Noted. Archaeology officers at the County Council have been consulted as part of the SHLAA assessment process. | Add additional comments to SHLAA Assessment |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---|---------------|--|--|---|
| 6034 | Support | This is currently a visually unattractive area, and would benefit from development. However, any building would have to carefully represent the visual character of Bateman Street AND also acknowledge its proximity to the Botanic Gardens behind. | Noted. The assessment acknowledges the existence of these constraints which would have to be taken into account in any development. | |
| 6291 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | agree with assessment conclusion and criteria set | Noted. | |
| <i>Site 583: Car park east of 1 to 12 Porson Court (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6018 | Object | The parking of cars not owned by, or visiting, residents of Porson Road is an ongoing issue. Any conversion of car parking land to housing will only exacerbate the problem. | The landowner of the site proposes to reduce the amount of commercial floorspace on the adjoining telephone exchange site. This should reduce the demand for parking in the area. The adjoining telephone exchange site is allocated for housing already and it makes sense to consider extending this to cover its car park in the SHLAA as the parking there is wholly related to the telephone exchange use. There doesn't appear to be any right of way into the BT site from Porson Road. | |
| 6174 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology The site is located on the probable line of a Roman road identified at Addenbrookes and Long Road College. There is also substantial evidence for Bronze Age settlement from the excavations at Clay Farm to the south (HER ECB2165). | Noted. Archaeology officers at the County Council have been consulted as part of the SHLAA assessment process. | Add additional comments to SHLAA Assessment |
| 6290 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | support subject to: agree with assessment conclusion and criteria set - however we are concerned that this site may prove difficult to be integrated with the surrounding residential area; lack of informal/ formal Open Space in area - i.e. with reference to the recent adopted Open Space & Recreation Strategy the Trumpington ward (as existing) has below average provision of Public Open Space | Noted. Open space provision would be considered within any application, which might follow the extension of the allocation. | Amend assessment to include comment about open space provision in area. |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|---|---|---|
| <i>Site 087: 149 Cherry Hinton Road (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6135 | Object | This laundry is a community asset. In an area which is heavily residential, local people wish to retain a diversity of facilities within the area, both for convenience and to avoid increased travel, usually by car. This well used laundry provides one such service. There is no other dry cleaner within a mile of this site. Additionally, it provides a full laundry service widely used residents and businesses throughout Cambridge. This site needs to be retained, not developed. | The SHLAA has identified the potential for residential use on the site. The landowner intends to continue the business for as long as it can but they consider that they may decide to move or close the business before the end of the plan period in 2031. The Council is merely considering this eventuality but not forcing it. | |
| 6239 - The Swiss Laundry Ltd | Object | In the shorter term, small development and adaptation plans are likely, in order to maintain the current activities and employment. However, due to the age of the current building, it is unlikely to be suitable as a commercial laundry by the end of this consultation timeframe 2031. One of the possible alternative change of use applications, that would be considered, is towards housing. | Noted. The site is suitable for residential development. Any policy in the Local Plan would not preclude the existing use continuing in the medium term. | |
| 6274 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | agree with assessment conclusion and criteria set | Noted | |
| 6160 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology It is not anticipated that significant archaeological remains would survive in this area. | Noted. Archaeology officers at the County Council have been consulted as part of the SHLAA assessment process. | Add additional comments to SHLAA Assessment |
| <i>Site 087 Map</i> | | | | |
| 6240 - The Swiss Laundry Ltd | Object | "In the shorter term, small development and adaptation plans are likely, in order to maintain the current activities and employment. However, due to the age of the current building, it is unlikely to be suitable as a commercial laundry by the end of this consultation timeframe 2031. One of the possible alternative change of use applications, that would be considered, is towards housing." | Noted. The site is suitable for residential development. Any policy in the Local Plan would not preclude the existing use continuing in the medium term. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 5993 | Object | <p>1. Mixed use good - single use (residential bad). Thumbs up to status quo.</p> <p>2. Access and egress? May be grounds for vehement objection.</p> | <p>The SHLAA has identified the potential for residential use on the site. The landowner intends to continue the business for as long as it can but they consider that they may decide to move or close the business before the end of the plan period in 2031.</p> <p>The highway authority have not raised any issues with the access.</p> | |
| <i>Site 352: Shirley Infants School (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6011 | Object | We cannot give an opinion one way or the other, as we have no computer. Our main concern would be how many houses would fit in this small space. Access here is not very wide, thus would be even more cars in Chesterton and there are too many already. | The assesement had taken the local context into account. The highway authority did not raise any concerns with the access. The land owner has now decided however that they would like to retain the school use so the site will be removed from the SHLAA. | |
| 6146 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Object | The County Council's Cabinet agreed to rescind its previous decision to declare this site as surplus to educational requirements in view of the demographic pressures in the north of Cambridge and particularly in the Shirley catchment area. The site is being assessed alongside others in the north of the City and will form part of a detailed options appraisal paper, which is being produced at present, on how to meet this need. | Noted. The landowner has decided that given the demand for school places they wish to retain the current use for the period covered by the Local Plan Review. | Remove the site from the SHLAA |
| 5996 | Object | <p>Shirley Infants School objection:</p> <p>Loss of amenities: School and Scout Hut, expect school to re-open;</p> <p>Density is too high: means parking problems in surrounding streets;</p> <p>Trees: TPOs exist, trees will make high-density dwellings very dark;</p> <p>Loss of amenity to surrounding dwellings: noise, privacy, security, because a school is only used during weekdays daytime.</p> | The SHLAA assessment had taken these points in to account. However the landowner has now decided to retain the site for education use so the site is to be removed from the SHLAA. | |
| 5986 | Object | Commenting: Please retain the trees that run along the alley way at the side of the newsagents shop (Antony's) on green end road. These trees shield our gardens (corner of kendal way and green end road) from this site. The site also needs to provide sufficient car parking for all houses as there is no available car parking spaces on green end road. | Noted. The landowner has decided that given the demand for school places they wish to retain the current use for the period covered by the Local Plan Review. | Remove the site from the SHLAA |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---|---------------|--|--|---|
| 6257 - Cambridgeshire County Council Property and Procurement Division | Object | Just to confirm that this site is for the foreseeable future (up to the next SHLAA review anyway) to be retained in educational use so it can be deleted as a potential housing site. | Noted. | Remove the site from the SHLAA. |
| 6277 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | agree with assessment conclusion and criteria set | Noted. | |
| <i>Site 151: Land R/O 1-28 Jackson Road (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6161 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology Cropmarks and archaeological investigations to the north west have revealed an extensive landscape of late prehistoric and Roman activity. | Noted. Archaeology officers at the County Council have been consulted as part of the SHLAA assessment process. | Add additional comments to SHLAA Assessment |
| 6279 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | agree with assessment conclusion and criteria set | Noted. | |
| <i>Site 230: Garages South of Hawkins Road (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6016 6066 6067 6125 6128 6139 6142 6185 - Grove Primary School 6236 6237 6238 6243 6248 6249 6250 | Object | The site is very narrow with poor access. Furthermore the removal of garages and parking spaces combined with the new housing would cause problems with on-street parking and vital rear access to the sub station and for emergency vehicles needing to get to the back of the school. Such access is not available from the front. The development will also cause problems of overlooking and will result in the loss of garages rented by local residents. | Noted. The landowner however has decided that they wish to retain the current use for the period covered by the Local Plan Review. | Remove the site from the SHLAA |
| 6280 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | agree with assessment conclusion and criteria set | Noted. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---|---------------|---|---|------------------------|
| 6162 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology Extensive archaeological remains relating to the late prehistoric and Roman settlement of the area are known to the north and west. Archaeological investigations in the grounds of Manor College suggest that evidence for this settlement continues in close proximity to this site (HER 16487). | Noted. | |
| <i>Site 230 Map</i> | | | | |
| 5985 | Object | This housing would overlook a primary school and many houses in the surrounding roads. Many of us have vehicular access to the rear of our properties, for which we pay an annual fee. The site is also used by the Grove School for parent parking and is the only Emergency and maintenance access to the school. So, the site does "provide access to properties". So apart from the access issues, what about the vehicles which use this site, where will they go? forced onto the surrounding roads with all the congestion issues. Is it really worth it? | Noted. By way of update the landowner has asked for this site to be removed from the SHLAA | |
| 6126 | Object | The Grove Primary School playing fields would back onto the proposed site. This seems a crazy idea. There is also a gate which gives emergency access to the school. Where would emergency access be made after building takes place? Children arriving by car for school are dropped off by a parent in this area. Where would this happen if the development goes ahead, on Campkin Road! As for cars which already park in this area, they would have to park on Hawkins Road causing even more congestion than at present. | Noted. By way of update the landowner has asked for this site to be removed from the SHLAA | |
| <i>Site 236: Vindis Garage Milton Road (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6282 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | Support subject to: agree with assessment conclusion and criteria set but site should also be considered for employment purposes (i.e. light industry/ employment) | Noted. By way of update the landowner has asked for this site to be removed from the SHLAA. | Delete site from SHLAA |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|---|---|---|
| 6163 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology It is not anticipated that significant archaeological remains would survive in this area. | Noted. By way of update the landowner has asked for this site to be removed from the SHLAA. | Delete site from SHLAA |
| <i>Site 236 Map</i> | | | | |
| 5994 | Object | As a resident of Lovell Road I do not support this proposed development. One of the reasons I purchased my property was the fact that there was no housing at the rear of my house and I have no complaints at all with the garage being there and would not like this to change. I think this site is totally unsuitable as there are serious traffic considerations with the site being next to the guided busway and the science park, surely not a suitable site for any housing. | Noted. By way of update the landowner has asked for this site to be removed from the SHLAA | |
| <i>Site 887: 98-144 Campkin Road (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6281 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | agree with assessment conclusion and criteria set | Noted. | |
| 6164 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Cropmarks and archaeological investigations to the north west have revealed an extensive landscape of late prehistoric and Roman activity. | Noted. Archaeology officers at the County Council have been consulted as part of the SHLAA assessment process. | Add additional comments to SHLAA Assessment |
| <i>Site 222: Land South of the Ship (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6278 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Object | site adjoins/ is part of the pub area and important asset to ensure viability and retention of pub at the heart of the community; loss of open space is unacceptable in this area; refer also to recent adopted Open Space & Recreation Strategy: Arbury Ward has very low average provision of Public Open Space and any further loss is unacceptable and creation of improved or new spaces should be explored (such as community market next to pub etc) to make up the deficiency of public open space. | The site, located in the King's Hedge Ward, does not meet the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space. Site 222 does not include the Ship Public House (PH) however an additional SHLAA site that included Site 222 and the Ship PH was submitted under reference (Site 902) as a landowner re-submission and was treated as an additional site. The closure of public houses in the City has become a local concern and in response, the Council has commissioned consultants to complete a Public House Study for Cambridge and to provide interim policy guidance to inform planning decisions until the new Local Plan has been adopted. This policy guidance will be applicable to all applications involving a public house. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---|---------------|---|---|---|
| 6124 - Charles Wells Ltd | Support | Taking account of the proposed boundary, there is an even stronger case for the site's inclusion as a residential development site than that made by the SHLAA. It would be available at an early stage (0-5 years) in the Council's future housing programme trajectory. It scores green against all criteria at Stages 1 and 2 of the Assessment. It scores green against twenty-two out of twenty-five of the criteria employed at Stage 3. The three remaining amber scores relate to distance from the City centre, local centre and archaeological assessment. The site is clearly developable. | Comments noted. | |
| 6165 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology The site is located on the site of a Roman villa complex, known through cropmarks and previous archaeological investigations. | Noted. | |
| <i>Site 204: 48-61 Burleigh Street (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6057 | Object | Question the feasibility of using the rear of this site for residential use whilst retaining service access to the shops on Burleigh Street, which is close to vehicular traffic after its junction with Adam and Eve Street. The shops are currently serviced from Paradise Street. There are also general traffic problems at the T-junction of Paradise Street and City Road caused by large vehicles trying to manoeuvre. This can cause dangers to other road users and pedestrians. | It may be possible to service the shops from Burleigh St as part of any redevelopment. This happens in other pedestrianised streets such as Petty Cury. This would enable the rear of the site to be considered for residential use which in turn would lessen commercial traffic on Paradise Street. | |
| 6283 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | agree with assessment conclusion and criteria set | Noted. | |
| 6166 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology This site was originally developed as part of the Victorian expansion of Cambridge. Evidence for this development and for earlier structures may survive in the area. | Noted. Archaeology officers at the County Council have been consulted as part of the SHLAA assessment process. | Add additional comments to SHLAA Assessment |
| 6029 | Support | This part of Burleigh Street is in urgent need of development. I welcome this plan. I would like the council to very carefully consider what development would be appropriate here - the Grafton Centre should be an example of what NOT to build. Shops to face directly onto Burleigh Street, please. | Noted. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|---|---|---------------|
| <i>Site 204 Map</i> | | | | |
| 5978 | Support | While the map has my general support, I ask you to consider also including numbers 43-45 as well. No. 45, in particular, a disused bakery has the distinct smell of mould and mildew from outside, meaning that only extensive renovation at a price or more likely replacement will be feasible. Please deal with it now before it becomes more of a hazard. | Noted. These are issues for environmental health rather than the SHLAA however. | |
| 6030 | Support | Why can't the whole area be improved? The Grafton Centre is a shocking blight on the area and would be much better flattened and replaced with proper shopping streets. | Noted. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|
|------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|

Site 028: Owlstone Croft (Assessment)

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|---|---|---------------------------------|
| 5995 6007 6008 6019 6031 6055 6056 6059 6061 6076 6078 6089 6127 6138 6140 6256 6259 6325 6326 6327 6328 6329 6330 6331 6332 6333 6334 6335 6336 6337 6338 6339 6341 6346 6347 6349 6353 6354 6355 6356 6357 6358 6360 6361 6366 6367 6368 | Object | <p>Large number of strong objections (180 objections plus 367 person petition and only 6 supports):-</p> <p>Proposed access is wholly inadequate.</p> <p>Owlstone Road is already very difficult to travel along. If traffic increases it will become unsafe. Small children play in the street. The bend is tight and almost a blind corner. Commercial vehicles (such as refuse lorries, removals and home delivery vans) need to make special arrangements to travel down the road. Parking is already a difficult issue in the area.</p> <p>Grantchester Street is narrow and access is tight, which can cause opposing traffic conflicts throughout the day, this is because of the single lane nature of the road and on street parking.</p> <p>The proposed development will add many additional trips from this site would make traffic situation even worse.</p> <p>Owlstone Road is narrow and does not provide for two way movement with on-street parking. The lane from Granchester Street is even narrower and refuse lorries have difficulty negotiating it safely.</p> <p>Impact on Paradise Nature Reserve should the road need widening to include two lanes and a footpath. Hazzards to large numbers of walkers using the path through Paradise Nature Reserve and heading on to Granchester Meadows. Also hazards arising from garages, which open out onto the track.</p> <p>Proposed access is over a quiet footpath used to access Paradise Nature reserve. This would transform it into a busy thoroughfare. It is not wide enough to accommodate two lanes and a footpath so pedestrians would have to walk on what would be a busy road and lives would be put at risk.</p> <p>Assessment of Local Nature conservation should be changed to red in the site assessment to reflect impact of access alterations.</p> <p>Access on site assessment should also be red.</p> | <p>Site 912 (former Site 28) is not suitable for open market residential development because of its potential impacts upon the character of the Conservation Area; the lack of consideration of ecology impacts upon the adjacent Paradise Nature Reserve and Cam corridor; concerns over safe access and egress by large numbers of walkers from the Nature Reserve; difficult vehicular access issues as a result of restricted road widths in adjoining streets, and heavy reliance on on-street parking. The development for open market housing will also result in the loss of much needed student accommodation. The development is also not achievable as the proposed access is in multiple ownership and support for alterations is not likely to be forthcoming.</p> | Remove the site from the SHLAA. |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------|
| 6369 6370 6371 6372 6373 6374 6375 6376 6377 6378 6379 6380 6381 6382 6383 6384 6385 6386 6387 6388 6389 6390 6393 6394 6395 6396 6397 6398 6399 6400 6401 6402 6403 6404 6405 6406 6407 6408 6409 6410 6411 6412 6413 6414 6415 6416 6417 | | <p>It is not within 400m of a high quality public transport service providing 10 min service.</p> <p>Dangers to pedestrians and cyclists including school children, the elderly and walkers from the nature reserve and beyond.</p> <p>Legal concerns over the ownership of the land constituting the access road.</p> <p>Impact on character of conservation area and biodiversity. Potential threats to wildlife and plant life on borders of Paradise Nature reserve acknowledged in councils assessment.</p> <p>Communal residences should be excluded from the SHLAA.</p> <p>Flooding-the land is liable to flooding.</p> <p>Design capacity of site is 29 dwellings but this represents only a marginal improvement to the housing stock.</p> <p>Student accommodation offers greatest density without creating adverse traffic problems.</p> <p>Site should be reserved for sheltered or elderly persons accommodation given the shortage of such accommodation trends in ageing population and the large numbers in Newham Croft.</p> <p>The information in the transport assessment is misleading. Newnham is badly served by public transport. Bus frequency figures incorrect .as only one bus an hour.</p> <p>Access Appraisal is far too limited in scope it makes no reference to local traffic conditions.</p> <p>Both Cambridge and Anglia Ruskin University are expanding and increasing pressures and the need for student housing. Removing what's there is not appropriate as student accommodation in short supply.</p> <p>Marginal improvement in dwellings numbers it won't alleviate city's overall requirement for more housing.</p> | | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------|
| 6418 | | | | |
| 6419 | | Queens College a poor curator of their built | | |
| 6420 | | environment. | | |
| 6421 | | | | |
| 6431 | | Access appraisal misrepresents the current status of | | |
| 6432 | | the road. It is unlikely the landlord or highway authority | | |
| 6434 | | has control of the proposed access route. | | |
| 6436 | | | | |
| 6438 | | | | |
| 6439 | | | | |
| 6440 | | | | |
| 6441 | | | | |
| 6445 | | | | |
| 6446 | | | | |
| 6447 | | | | |
| 6448 | | | | |
| 6449 | | | | |
| 6450 | | | | |
| 6451 | | | | |
| 6452 | | | | |
| 6453 | | | | |
| 6454 | | | | |
| 6455 | | | | |
| 6456 | | | | |
| 6457 | | | | |
| 6458 | | | | |
| 6459 | | | | |
| 6460 | | | | |
| 6461 | | | | |
| 6462 | | | | |
| 6463 | | | | |
| 6464 | | | | |
| 6465 | | | | |
| 6466 | | | | |
| 6467 | | | | |
| 6468 | | | | |
| 6470 | | | | |
| 6476 | | | | |
| 6478 | | | | |
| 6479 | | | | |
| 6488 | | | | |
| 6490 | | | | |
| 6491 | | | | |
| 6492 | | | | |
| 6493 | | | | |
| 6494 | | | | |
| 6495 | | | | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|
| 6496 | | | | |
| 6500 | | | | |
| 6502 | | | | |
| 6506 | | | | |
| 6524 | | | | |
| 6525 | | | | |
| 6526 | | | | |
| 6527 | | | | |
| 6528 | | | | |
| 6529 | | | | |
| 6530 | | | | |
| 6531 | | | | |
| 6532 | | | | |
| 6533 | | | | |
| 6534 | | | | |
| 6535 | | | | |
| 6536 | | | | |
| 6537 | | | | |
| 6538 | | | | |
| 6539 | | | | |
| 6540 | | | | |
| 6541 | | | | |
| 6542 | | | | |
| 6543 | | | | |
| 6544 | | | | |
| 6545 | | | | |
| 6546 | | | | |
| 6547 | | | | |
| 6548 | | | | |
| 6549 | | | | |
| 6550 | | | | |
| 6551 | | | | |
| 6553 | | | | |
| 6666 | | | | |
| 6828 | | | | |
| 6829 | | | | |
| 6830 | | | | |
| 6831 | | | | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---|---------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------|
| 6002 | Support | There is already development on the site, and while some parts are derelict and development and the attendant tidying up would be welcome, there should only be very limited increase in numbers resident because there is limited access, enough traffic already in the vicinity, the need to protect local wildlife and general amenity considerations. Demolition of current building and erection of modern facilities, with onsite parking, but no increase in traffic density would be an asset for the area. | Noted. | |
| 6469 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | support subject to: redevelopment for residential purposes is marginal and based on information from the current assessment this site should not be judged undevelopable; suggest sheltered accommodation or similar | Noted. | |
| 6340 | Support | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current land use is sub-optimal - Current buildings are in disrepair and unsightly - Residential development enhances the local micro-economy, encouraging local business and services - Negative impact of additional travel can be ameliorated by parking permit scheme - Residential units should be predominantly private as I am concerned that social housing may be associated with anti-social behaviour. | Noted. | |
| 6167 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology High status Iron Age burials are known to the west (HER 5161, 4429). Extensive evidence for Roman activity is known to the south of the river. | Noted. | |
| 6284 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | support subject to: redevelopment for residential purposes is marginal and based on information from the current assessment this site should not be judged undevelopable; suggest sheltered accommodation or similar | Noted. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------|
| 6359 | Support | <p>Access and traffic issues over-exaggerated by those against development.</p> <p>Much needed student accomodation is an issue for Queens not the Newnham residents.</p> <p>The Croft would benefit from an infusion of more permanent residents.</p> <p>he site represents a rare opportunity for an exceptional housing scheme with restricted car ownership and access.</p> <p>Car constraints are not new to the city.</p> <p>The 40% affordable component (30/40 dwellings?) is perhaps the most welcome feature.</p> <p>Cycle/pedestrian access direct to the Mill should be possible adjacent to the nature reserve</p> <p>The site frankly is an eyesore</p> <p>A resident's parking scheme is already necessary. This-could-bring-one-about.</p> | Noted. | |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| <i>Site 028 Map</i> | | | | |
| 5989 | Object | <p>Concerns -</p> <p>Increased congestion in Grantchester Street, main access route to this site.</p> <p>Additional parking restrictions may not take into account 'essential visitors' eg carers.</p> | To be completed | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---|---------------|--|---|---------------|
| <i>Site 102: Mill Road Depot (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6053 | Object | Loss of existing employment use. Limited vehicular Access for private motor vehicles. Current lack of open spaces and community facility within Petersfield. Lack of secure and affordable housing, which previous housing developments within Petersfield have contributed to. Conservation Area issues. | The SHLAA is a technical document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision. Should sites be progressed through the Local Plan Review and subsequent planning applications are made, negotiations would have to be undertaken with any prospective developer on how best to contribute to community facilities, local employment opportunities and local housing needs. The Council recognises there are deficiencies in terms of open space provision in this Ward. Opportunities to provide additional open space onsite provision should be explored. | |
| 6068 | Object | A new residential area will attract more traffic and parking problems. Hooper Street is not a through flow street at present, and whilst the assessment says residential area may lead to a reduction in traffic flows I find that highly improbable. If a residential area is to be built on the new site, it should have restricted parking for up to 30% of residents, the remainder should use bikes and public transport. The development should not result in the destruction or permanent removal of any trees Would also be problems overlooking Hooper Street. Please revise the assessment to say this | The SHLAA is a technical document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision. Should sites be progressed through the Local Plan Review and subsequent planning applications are made, negotiations would have to be undertaken with any prospective developer on how best to overcome transport and access issues. The site is within the Central Conservation Area and this means all the trees onsite are protected from development. Any development proposal would also need to respond to local context, in particular how any new development overlooks neighbouring streets / properties. | |
| 6247 | Object | Given the Highways Department's views that vehicular ingress and egress onto Mill Rd would be impractical, the development of the site would lead to a substantial increase of traffic on Sturton Street and Ainswoth Street. This would be severely detrimental to the amenity of the existing dwellings on those streets and the streets leading to them. Mill Rd is the natural and historical vehicular entry and exit to the site. The site should not be developed unless a suitable Mill Rd vehicular entry and exit to the site can be formed. | The role of the SHLAA is merely to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision. Should sites be progressed through the Local Plan Review and subsequent planning applications are made, negotiations would have to be undertaken with any prospective developer on how best to overcome transport and access issues, including possible access onto Mill Road. Any development proposal would also need to respond to local context. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|--|---|---------------|
| 6069 | Object | <p>The proposal suggests that access may be gained via Hooper Street, Ainsworth Street and Sturton Street. These road are already overcrowded and increased traffic volumes would be totally unacceptable.</p> <p>Additionally it would involve the demolition of the garages which are currently used by many local residents. The use of these garages reduces the number of cars parked in these already congested streets and their removal would put unacceptable pressure on parking in the surrounding streets.</p> <p>This development makes no sense at all and will be vigorously opposed by all residents in teh affected area.</p> | <p>The SHLAA is a technical document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision. Should sites be progressed through the Local Plan Review and subsequent planning applications are made, negotiations would have to be undertaken with any prospective developer on how best to provide / replace car parking spaces and garage provision. Site access issues would also need to be overcome. Any development proposal would also need to respond to local context.</p> | |
| 6129 | Object | <p>I live immediately opposite this site. I need to know more about the 'significant contamination issues that need tackling' before I can give the proposal my support.</p> | <p>The concerns relating to Contamination relate to its previous and present uses (smelting works and council depot and railway land).</p> | |
| 6194 | Object | <p>Potential loss of garages; lack of existing on-street parking; concern re existing trees and need for more public open space in Petersfield including allotments, not more development; legal implications with existing garage leases; concerns of garages users who have not been consulted directly.</p> | <p>The SHLAA is a technical document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision. Should sites be progressed through the Local Plan Review and subsequent planning applications are made, negotiations would have to be undertaken with any prospective developer on how best to overcome transport and access issues and provide / replace car parking spaces and garage provision.</p> <p>The site is within the Central Conservation Area and this means all the trees onsite are protected from development. Any development proposal would also need to respond to local context. This could include opportunities to provide additional open space onsite. The Council recognises there are deficiencies in terms of open space provision in this Ward.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|---|--|---------------|
| 6242 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT) | Object | <p>Loss of employment that changing the use of the site would entail.</p> <p>If site 102 were to be subject to a change of use, top priority should be to provide recreational open space - of which Petersfield is in acutely short supply.</p> <p>Any housing were to be provided on this site, the priority should be for social housing, together with ample open public space to compensate for the open space deficit in Petersfield.</p> <p>Since the land of site 102 is owned by the City Council, PACT would expect priority to the needs of local residents - not to property speculators.</p> | <p>The SHLAA is a technical document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision. Should sites be progressed through the Local Plan Review and subsequent planning applications are made, negotiations would have to be undertaken with any prospective developer on how best to promote local employment opportunities and local housing needs.</p> <p>The Council recognises there are deficiencies in terms of open space provision in this Ward. Opportunities to provide additional open space onsite provision should be explored.</p> | |
| 6119 | Object | <p>Concerned about traffic entering Mill Rd from site and difficulties created for those trying to cross from Kingston St to Devonshire Rd.</p> <p>Increased pressure on streets adjacent to Hooper St from traffic returning to site.</p> <p>Loss of Grade 2 building.</p> | <p>The SHLAA is a technical document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision. Should sites be progressed through the Local Plan Review and subsequent planning applications are made, negotiations would have to be undertaken with any prospective developer on how best to overcome transport and access issues. Any development proposal would need to respond to local context.</p> | |
| 6013 | Object | <p>The conclusion that development at this location is not optimal seems to be rather objective in nature. The site is currently not hosting that many jobs, and probably could provide mixed commercial residential uses greater than a glorified parking lot with some mechanic jobs could justify. If the fire station near parkers piece can be sold for development, I think this site could be as well. Also, the site is a motor vehicle services location- which by the nature of the work could be moved further outside the city center opening up room for walking friendly businesses or housing.</p> | <p>The SHLAA is a technical piece of work to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision. The results of the SHLAA will be fed into the review of the Local Plan, which will be the subject of public consultation starting with the Issues Options stage this summer.</p> | |
| 6021 | Object | <p>I strongly object to this development. Mill Road is already overcrowded and the existing infrastructure cannot support additional traffic. The Grade 2 ex-library is a valuable civic amenity and important aspect of the conservation area. I'm disappointed the council could even countenance its demolition - this would be a very, very unpopular decision and will be vigorously opposed.</p> | <p>It is highly unlikely that the Grade II listed building will be demolished. Any development proposal would need to respond to local context. This could include opportunities to provide additional open space onsite. The Council recognises there are deficiencies in terms of open space provision in this Ward.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|--|--|---------------|
| 6023 | Object | This area would be far better served as a park. Petersfield and Romsey are in dire need of public green space. | The Council recognises there are deficiencies in terms of open space provision in this Ward. Opportunities to provide additional open space onsite provision should be explored. | |
| 6122 | Object | <p>Increased traffic volumes from 167 new dwellings would be totally unacceptable in adjoining streets. Access should only be from Mill Road.</p> <p>The removal of 40 recently built garages will put unacceptable pressure on on street parking in surrounding streets.</p> <p>Most of the garages are owned on long leases and are not likely to be sold back.</p> <p>If the site of the garages is needed they should be reprovided/ relocated within the new development at no additional cost to leaseholders.</p> <p>Trees on the Hooper St frontage are safeguarded by the Conservation area designation.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to providing more open space in the area.</p> | <p>The SHLAA is a technical document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision.</p> <p>Should sites be progressed through the Local Plan Review and subsequent planning applications are made, negotiations would have to be undertaken with any prospective developer on how best to provide / replace car parking spaces and garage provision.</p> <p>Site access issues would also need to be overcome.</p> <p>The site is within the Central Conservation Area and this means all the trees onsite are protected from development. Any development proposal would also need to respond to local context. This could include opportunities to provide additional open space onsite.</p> <p>The Council recognises there are deficiencies in terms of open space provision in this Ward.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|---|---|---------------|
| 6222 | Object | <p>Petersfield already densely populated with lack of open space.</p> <p>My concerns include: Loss of jobs Loss of cultural facility Loss of local business Loss of garages and general impact on residential parking Impact on air quality Impact on existing congestion and road safety issues Demolition of Grade-2-listed building The difficulty of integrating new development with existing community. Impact of noise and inconvenience of demolition and rebuilding. Waste disposal capacity including sewage. Unless height restricted to 2 storeys, new development would overlook existing housing.</p> <p>Potential for any new development to ameliorate existing issues by offering affordable housing, parking solutions, Mill Road traffic management solutions, enhanced recycling opportunities and additional open space for existing community.</p> | <p>The SHLAA is a technical document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision.</p> <p>Should sites be progressed through the Local Plan Review and subsequent planning applications are made, negotiations would have to be undertaken with any prospective developer on how best to: contribute to community facilities; promote local employment opportunities and local housing needs; overcome transport and access issues; provide / replace car parking spaces and garage provision.</p> <p>Any development proposal would also need to respond to local context, in particular how any new development overlooks neighbouring streets / properties. This could include opportunities to provide additional open space onsite. The Council recognises there are deficiencies in terms of open space provision in this Ward. The listed building would need to be retained within any redevelopment. The site is within the Central Conservation Area and therefore all the trees onsite are protected from development.</p> | |
| 6075 | Object | <p>My major objection is the scale and quality of any development; most recent residential development in this part of Cambridge (railway station, junction of Hills Road & Cherry Hinton Road) are grossly out of proportion with the existing buildings and of very low architectural merit - how does fit with the proposed site being in, and overlooking, conservation areas?</p> <p>Another significant issue is that of the site's very poor access.</p> | <p>The SHLAA is a technical document to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision. Should sites be progressed through the Local Plan Review and subsequent planning applications are made, negotiations would have to be undertaken with any prospective developer on how best to overcome transport and access issues.</p> <p>The site is within the Central Conservation Area and any development proposal would need to respond to local context, including how any new development overlooks neighbouring streets / properties.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---|---------------|---|---|---------------|
| 6235 | Support | Support, but with reservations about relocation of the depot and how it could create extra traffic in Mill Rd, even if moved further away. Any housing development would need to be 'low car ownership' but with service vehicle access, not all from Mill Rd itself. The site must be divided for access from Hooper St with provision for garaging & parking for neighbouring streets, which will benefit from a one-way traffic flow. Open space must be provided & should be used to protect Kingston/Hooper St from noise and shadow. | Comments noted. Should sites be progressed through the Local Plan Review and subsequent planning applications are made, negotiations would have to be undertaken with any prospective developer on how best to: overcome transport and access issues; provide / replace car parking spaces and garage provision. Any development proposal would also need to respond to local context, in particular how any new development overlooks neighbouring streets / properties. This could include opportunities to provide additional open space onsite. The Council recognises there are deficiencies in terms of open space provision in this Ward. | |
| 6168 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology Previous activities on site include an iron foundry, coprolite mill and timber yard. The site may have significance for the 19th century industrial archaeology of Cambridge. It should also be noted that there is a Grade II listed building on the site, which would need to be retained as part of any redevelopment. | Comments noted. | |
| 6285 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | support subject to: if serious consideration for site to be redevelopment as housing then substantial open space should be provided also considering the lack of green space in this ward | Comments noted. The Council recognises there are deficiencies in terms of open space provision in this Ward. Opportunities to provide additional open space onsite provision should be explored. | |
| 6258 | Support | 1)Any development needs to be sensitive to the impact on surrounding streets 2)Contamination issues must be thoroughly dealt with as-well-as the potential impact on surrounding streets 3)Road access is a major issue. The stated advice that Mill Road is not suitable is a concern. Whilst accepting that Mill Road is already busy and narrow, the option of Hooper Street seems even more problematic. might also have considerable adverse impact on Kingston Street and Gwidyr Street. 4)The necessary requirements of parking, shopping, schools, community facilities, etc need to be planned from the start and, where necessary, implemented, at an early stage. | Noted. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|--|---|--|
| <i>Site 196: 31 Queen Edith's Way (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6022 | Object | Mill Road is already over-congested. Any development will have a negative impact on the area's infrastructure and civic amenity. The area would be far better served as a public park - Petersfield and Romsey are in dire need of green space. | This representation appears to have been submitted against the wrong site. The Council is aware of the shortages of open space in Petersfield and Romsey and will be seeking to redress this on SHLAA sites in this area. | |
| 6052 | Object | Your suitability assessment says that a more intense form of development is likely to prove visually intrusive... I agree with this and submit that a redevelopment of the site would need to be sensitive to these dangers. In particular, any new building should not be higher than the adjoining Mulgrave Court. Further, it should be sited a suitable distance from Mulgrave Court to avoid any problems of overshadowing or loss of light to Mulgrave Court. Note also that a 1922 conveyance imposes restrictions on what can be done with the site. | Comments noted. The role of the SHLAA is to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the City's future housing provision. Should sites be progressed through the Local Plan Review and any subsequent applications are submitted decisions will have to be made on how best to promote good design, height, overshadowing and loss of light considerations. These are not issues for the SHLAA as it is a technical exercise. | Investigate the 1922 conveyance restrictions and add to assessment as appropriate. |
| 6121 | Object | Quantity should not take priority over quality. Queen Edith's Way is becoming overdeveloped on a relatively small area on our doorstep and we now know from experience that this comprises privacy, security and safety. | Comments noted. The role of the SHLAA is to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the Districts future housing provision. Should sites be progressed through the Local Plan Review decisions will have to be made on how best to promote good design privacy, security and safety. These are not issues for the SHLAA as it is a technical exercise. | |
| 6286 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | agree with assessment conclusion and criteria set | Noted. | |
| 6169 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology Evidence for Iron Age activity is known to the north west (HER 15272) and south west (HER 04800). | Noted. Archaeology officers at the County Council have been consulted as part of the SHLAA assessment process. | Add additional comments to SHLAA Assessment |
| 6065 | Support | I feel it is extremely important to maintain the 'spacious quality' and 'visual identity' of the area. I would be happy for the site to be developed as long the design continued to be in keeping with the area. | Noted. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---|---------------|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <i>Site 196 Map</i> | | | | |
| 6080 | Object | There are already several large developments on 27, 29, 30 and a monstrous one on 21/21a Queen Edith's Way. Enough is enough it is ruining what used to be a nice neighbourhood. | Noted. The role of the SHLAA is merely to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the Districts future housing provision. Should sites be progressed through the Local Plan Review decisions will have to be made on how best to promote good design. These are not issues for the SHLAA as it is a technical exercise. | |
| <i>Site 068: Railway depot adjacent to 125a Cavendish Road (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 5983 | Object | Cavendish Road is already busy with a great deal of pressure on parking due to multiple occupancy. There are many families with young children. It is also now part of the conservation area. If the site is developed we would ask that this is done in conjunction with the Rigeons site so that vehicular access can be from Cromwell Road. | Noted. The landowner has decided however that they wish to retain the current use for the period covered by the Local Plan Review. | Remove the site from the SHLAA |
| 6170 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology It is not anticipated that significant archaeological remains would survive in this area. | Noted. Archaeology officers at the County Council have been consulted as part of the SHLAA assessment process. The landowner has decided that they wish to retain the current use for the period covered by the Local Plan Review. | Delete the site from the SHLAA. |
| 6287 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | support subject to: agree with conclusion but subject to consideration of adding significant public open space to Romsey Ward as well as other community provision. Note: Romsey is the worst ward with lowest (and well below average) provision of publicly accessible open space in Cambridge City. | Noted. The landowner however has decided to withdraw the site from the SHLAA. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---|---------------|--|---|--|
| <i>Site 070: 213-217 Mill Road (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6137 | Object | A large part of this site is a local DIY store which we view as a community asset. It provides an attractive alternative to the big national chains like B7Q and Homebase and is justifiably popular with local residents. We consider it most important that local residents continue to have immediate access to a diverse range of local shops and that such sites are retained as commercial, not converted into yet more housing in an area which is already very heavily residential. It will detract from local amenity to lose such sites and facilities | Noted. The redevelopment of the site for residential use should include the retention of an element of the retail floorspace on the Mill Road frontage. It is just located within the Local Centre. | Amend the assesment to require the retention of an element of the retail use on the Mill Road frontage in any redevelopment. |
| 6032 | Support | In principle, I support any development proposal for this site. At the moment, it is an ugly area and does not contribute to the character of Romsey. Any new development HAS to take into consideration the urban design of the area. This is paramount. | Noted. | |
| 6171 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology Remains associated with the mid to late 19th century development of Cambridge and possibly pre 19th century development may survive in the area. | Noted. Archaeology officers at the County Council have been consulted as part of the SHLAA assessment process. | Add additional comments to SHLAA Assessment |
| 5976 | Support | At present it is an untidy, poorly developed site; it could provide mixed housing and also car parking for 1. the new housing 2. residents in 2-16 Ross Street who could be invited to purchase access rights to the rear of their properties 3. local shoppers: part of the site is already in use in this way on an ad hoc basis. Having people residing on this corner (even if above car parking areas - this obviously is part of a later planning process - would improve the visual impact and increase general security and civic awareness in this part of Mill Road. | Noted. The matter of access rights is however ultimately an issue for the landowner. | |
| 6288 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | support subject to: agree with conclusion but subject to consideration of retention of commercial/ retail premise at ground level to serve the local community n this area (ref loss of other light retail space in recent years). | Noted. The site is just within the local centre so it would be appropriate under existing Local Plan policies to retain some retail floorspace. | Amend the assesment to require the retention of an element of the retail use on the Mill Road frontage in any redevelopment. |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|---|---------------|---|---|---|
| <i>Site 620: Ridgeons, Cromwell Road (Assessment)</i> | | | | |
| 6244 - Januarys Consultant Surveyors | Object | I have no comment on the principle of development on this site and do not seek to represent any views here, however I wanted to draw to your attention that the boundaries you have shown in the SHLAA document for the Ridgeons site are incorrect both at the southern and northern ends of the site. I have sent you a plan showing the correct site boundaries. | Noted. Site boundary has been amended. | |
| 6017 6033 6058 | Object | Ridgeons is a valued retail facility the area cannot cope with another highly condensed development of flats, for reasons of increased traffic and lack facilities & school places. | The County Council as highway authority have been consulted as part of the SHLAA. They have not raised any adverse issues on the access. The Council will continue to work closely with colleagues in County Education and Community Services on this and other sites to ensure the timely provision of key services. | |
| 6172 - Cambridgeshire County Council | Support | Archaeology Although little is known of this area, there is evidence of Roman activity in the vicinity (HER 04626). | Noted. Archaeology officers at the County Council have been consulted as part of the SHLAA assessment process. | Add additional comments to SHLAA Assessment |
| 6260 | Support | Area seems ideally suited to residential development, however buildings need to be made visually attractive, unlike the flats that have recently gone up on Cromwell Rd. My particular concern is that my garden should not be overlooked by a tower block, as it'd be a loss of privacy and amenity. My worry is that few of my neighbours are likely to be able to respond to your consultation: many are elderly and not at all computer literate. Ideally people should be canvased at home. | Noted. The role of the SHLAA is to identify potentially suitable sites to accommodate the Districts future housing provision. Should sites be progressed through the Local Plan Review decisions will have to be made on how best to promote good design, any overlooking and privacy issues. These are not issues for the SHLAA as it is a technical exercise. | |
| 6289 - Cambridge Past, Present and Future | Support | support subject to: agree with assessment conclusion and criteria set but also wish to highlight the significant underprovision of publicly accessible open space in the Romsey ward (recently adopted Open Space and Recreation Study) and new green spaces should be established with public access | Noted. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------|
| 6020 | Support | In line with current residential developments. Should cut down on traffic such as very large lorries manoeuvring in Cromwell Road. Business and retail areas nearby so no over- concentration of residential use. Have some concerns over increase in littering and cars joining Cromwell Road which is already a hazard from Green's, Winstanley Court and Ridgeon's. | Noted. | |
| <i>Site 620 Map</i> | | | | |
| 6317 - Januarys Consultant Surveyors | Object | Plan submitted showing revised boundary of land in companies control, as original assessment was incorrect. | Noted. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|--|---------------|---|---|---------------|
| <i>Technical Appendix: Undevelopable Sites - Summary of Reasons for Refusal</i> | | | | |
| <i>Row 8</i> | | | | |
| 6035 | Object | This area of Abbey would benefit from widespread development and offers a valuable opportunity for regeneration. Don't let a car park stand in the way of regeneration - the Technopark can easily be relocated. | The landowner does not wish to pursue residential development on this site. Government guidance on SHLAA's requires the Council to take their views into account. | |
| <i>Row 9</i> | | | | |
| 6036 | Object | This area of Abbey would benefit from widespread development and offers a valuable opportunity for regeneration. Don't let a car park stand in the way of regeneration - the Technopark can easily be relocated. | The landowner does not wish to pursue residential development on this site. Government guidance on SHLAA's requires the Council to take their views into account. | |
| <i>Row 20</i> | | | | |
| 6037 | Object | The entirety of the industrial site - not only the car park, but ALSO Staples and Comet, should be redeveloped and turned into residential housing. ALL out-of-town shopping centres and warehouses should be discouraged and turned over to better use. | The SHLAA has to take into account the availability of land for development. This usually involves a developer expressing an intention to develop or a landowner expressing an intention to sell the land. Neither Comet nor Staples have expressed any intention to discontinue their use of the site. | |
| <i>Row 22</i> | | | | |
| 6038 | Object | The entirety of this - not only the car park, but ALSO the Tesco superstore - should be redeveloped and turned into residential housing. ALL out-of-town shopping centres and warehouses should be discouraged and turned over to better use. The council needs to get its priority right, and turn anonymous space into characterful places. | The SHLAA has to take into account the availability of land for development. This usually involves a developer expressing an intention to develop or a landowner expressing an intention to sell the land. Tesco have not expressed any intention to discontinue their use of the site. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|----------------------------------|---------------|---|---|---|
| <i>Row 24</i> | | | | |
| 6039 | Object | This is laughable. Cambridge's status as a 'regional shopping entity' is not at risk at all - indeed, it is far too popular! In addition, many of the shops here have closed down and it is a sad place to be these days. The entirety of this site should be redeveloped and turned into residential housing. ALL out-of-town shopping centres and warehouses should be discouraged and turned over to better use. The council needs to get its priority right, and turn anonymous space into characterful places. | Comments noted. Residential development would however not be suitable on this site as it has longstanding underground contamination issues as a former household recycling site. | |
| <i>Row 62</i> | | | | |
| 6040 | Object | The so-called 'leisure' centre is a shocking aberration to the city of Cambridge, and actions must be taken to improve its character. Redeveloping the car park would be a start - make it a truly sustainable, car-free centre. ALL out-of-town shopping centres and warehouses should be discouraged and turned over to better use. The council needs to get its priority right, and turn anonymous space into characterful places. | The landowner does not wish to pursue residential development on this site. Government guidance on SHLAA's requires the Council to take their views into account. | |
| <i>Row 67</i> | | | | |
| 6229 - DB Schenker Rail (UK) Ltd | Object | It should be noted that for Site 854; Railway Sidings West of Rustat Road, the Employment Land Review (July 2008) concluded that the site has potential for '10,700 sq m B1 (a) Office scheme with residential.....' and the SHLAA is therefore factually incorrect in the conclusions made in respect of this site and in its assessment that the site is not suitable for residential development on the basis of the Employment Land Review. | Noted. This is a factual error. The landowner Network Rail have confirmed their continued interest in pursuing mixed residential and employment use in the longer term. As this site was rejected primarily because of the Employment Land Review status it should be reassessed. | Reassess site 854 in the SHLAA on basis of it being developed for mixed use B1(a) office use and residential development. |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|--|--|---------------|
| <i>Row 85</i> | | | | |
| 6041 | Object | Again, this is ridiculous. Cambridge has a severe problem with traffic - and this is largely because of out-of-town inhabitants who refuse to use the park and ride and simply drive into town. The congestion of Cambridge is far more of an hindrance to economic progress than parking spaces. Focus on sustainable and shared modes of transport. Why can't our council be brave? | The County Council are producing a Transport Strategy for Cambridge, which will shortly be the subject of public consultation. | |
| <i>Row 86</i> | | | | |
| 6042 | Object | No! Please see my earlier comment relating to Lion Yard. Cambridge has a big problem relating to congestion and too many cars. Car parks, such as this one, only add to the problem - they encourage congestion, and as such, are an economic hindrance. Far better to remove the multi-storey parking, and turn it into housing. A really well-designed residential block would also be much more attractive when viewed from Parker's Piece - a really important civic area. Look at it this way - if the car park was proposed today, it would never get permission. Why not? | The County Council are producing a Transport Strategy for Cambridge, which will shortly be the subject of public consultation. | |
| <i>Row 87</i> | | | | |
| 6043 | Object | No! Everyone knows the Grafton Centre was a horrendous mistake, and everyone knows the streets it replaced were much, much nicer than this monstrosity. The time is right to knock down both car parks and the Centre itself, and develop a more sustainable, more characterful, more appropriate residential and shopping development. | The County Council are producing a Transport Strategy for Cambridge, which will shortly be the subject of public consultation. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|--|--|---------------|
| <i>Row 88</i> | | | | |
| 6044 | Object | No! Everyone knows the Grafton Centre was a horrendous mistake, and everyone knows the streets it replaced were much, much nicer than this monstrosity. The time is right to knock down both car parks and the Centre itself, and develop a more sustainable, more characterful, more appropriate residential and shopping development. | The County Council are producing a Transport Strategy for Cambridge, which will shortly be the subject of public consultation. | |
| <i>Row 100</i> | | | | |
| 6045 | Object | I would actually support the redevelopment of this car park. Anything that encourages the removal of cars from our over-congested city centre can only be a good thing. The winds are changing; the age of the car is approaching its end. The city council needs to be much more proactive in advocating a more sustainable approach to transport. Car parks are not the answer. The city of Cambridge, and its economy, would be much better served by a residential development on this site. | The County Council are producing a Transport Strategy for Cambridge, which will shortly be the subject of public consultation. | |
| <i>Row 102</i> | | | | |
| 6049 | Support | Absolutely. They are a very important civic amenity. In fact, I would say the potential of this site has not yet been awakened. Can the car park not be turned over to employment uses? Why not a covered market? | Noted. | |
| <i>Row 104</i> | | | | |
| 6046 | Object | No! The Beehive Centre is an awful, embarrassing aberration in our beautiful city. Out-of-town shopping centres are not the answer. The city of Cambridge, and its economy, would be much better served by a mixed-use residential AND shopping development on this site. Anything that encourages the removal of cars from our over-congested city centre can only be a good thing. | The SHLAA has to take into account the availability of land for development. This usually involves a developer expressing an intention to develop or a landowner expressing an intention to sell the land. The landowner has not expressed any intention to discontinue the use of the site. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Row 105</i> | | | | |
| 6047 | Support | Absolutely. Highsett is a beautiful place; let's keep it that way. | Noted. | |
| <i>Row 106</i> | | | | |
| 6048 | Support | Absolutely. They are an important amenity. | Noted. | |