





Cambridge Local Plan - Towards 2031

Statement of Consultation



CAMBRIDGE
CITY COUNCIL
Planning Services



CAMBRIDGE LOCAL PLAN - TOWARDS 2031 ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT: CONSULTATION STATEMENT

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Local Plan is used to guide decisions on matters ranging from the location of housing, schools, parks and open spaces to the design requirements of new buildings. Policies in the Local Plan are used when decisions on planning applications are made. The current Local Plan for Cambridge was adopted in 2006 and it is now being reviewed.
- 1.2 The timetable below shows the stages that are involved in the preparation of a new Local Plan. Stage 1, the preparation and completion of evidence base, has been completed and we are now on stage 2, the Issues and Options Consultation.

STAGE	DATES
1 - Preparation and completion of evidence base and preparation of the Issues and Options Report	March 2011 – May 2012
2 - Issues and Options consultation	15 June – 27 July 2012
3 - Consultation on site options for development	7 January – 18 February 2013
4 - Draft submission plan consultation	Summer 2013
5 - Submission	Winter 2013
6 - Examination	Winter 2013/2014
7 - Adoption	April 2014

Purpose of this report

- 1.3 This report sets out the consultation arrangements proposed by the Council in the development of the Cambridge Local Plan Towards 2031 Issues and Options Report. The Council recognise the importance of engaging the community from the outset of the Local Plan review process. To this end, in November 2011, the Council agreed a Consultation and Community Engagement Strategy for the Local Plan review, which can be viewed via the link below:
<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/democracy/documents/s6576/Cambridge%20Local%20Plan%20Appendix%20A%20Consultation%20and%20Engagement%20Strategy.pdf>

Preparation and completion of evidence base

- 1.4 As part of the early stage of developing a new plan, the Council has undertaken a significant amount of work in compiling its evidence base. This has involved the completion of a number of studies as well as working with key stakeholders, organisations and groups across the city. Details of the evidence base for the Local Plan can be found by visiting the background documents page of the Council's website:
<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/background-documents/>
- 1.5 A series of workshops were also held between December 2011 and February 2012, with Councillors, stakeholders, developers, agents and residents associations. The purpose of these workshops was to explain how the Local Plan will be prepared, to encourage people to get involved from an early stage and to discuss issues and concerns.

- 1.6 Written reports of these workshops and a summary document can be found by visiting www.cambridge.gov.uk/localplanreview
- 1.7 One to one meetings were also offered and a number were held with various organisations in order to help understand future needs and concerns. The issues identified as part of these workshops and one to one meetings, alongside evidence developed as part of background studies, were then incorporated into the development of the Cambridge Local Plan Towards 2031 - Issues and Options Report.

2 CONSULTATION ON THE ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT

- 2.1 The Cambridge Local Plan Towards 2031 – Issues and Options Report was made available for a six-week period of public consultation between 15 June to 27 July 2012. This consultation provided an opportunity for local residents and other key stakeholders to have sight of and discuss a range of issues and options that are relevant to the future planning and development of the city.
- 2.2 Consultation on the Issues and Options Report took place between the 15th June to 27th July 2012. During this time people were able to comment on both the Issues and Options Report and its associated Sustainability Appraisal. The planning regulations¹, establish minimum requirements for consultation and at the Issues and Options stage the Council is required to consult specific and general consultation bodies, as appropriate to the document. Appendix A includes the list of consultees.
- 2.3 In accordance with the Council’s Consultation and Community Engagement Strategy, consultation arrangements included:
- Consultation for 6 weeks between 15 June to 27 July 2012;
 - Letters and emails informing Consultees of consultation dates and how to view and respond to the consultation material (see Appendix A for list of consultees);
 - A public notice (see Appendix B);
 - All documents to be made available on the Council’s website and Customer Service Centre including a small exhibition;
 - Libraries to receive hard copies;
 - Article in the summer edition of Cambridge Matters which goes to every household in the city;
 - Publicise the consultation through the Council’s Facebook page and Twitter as well as developing a Local Plan news blog;
 - Leaflets promoting the Local Plan consultation will be handed out at key locations including Cambridge Station, Addenbrooke’s Hospital and Cambridge Science Park;
 - Opportunities will also be explored to engage with young people and other groups.
- 2.4 A series of exhibitions across the city were also held, to enable as wide an audience as possible to have their say on the Issues and Options Report, as outlined in the table below.

Event	Dates	Where
West Cambridge Exhibition	Tues 19 th June 3pm - 8 pm	West Cambridge Sports Pavillion, Wilberforce Road, CB3 0EQ

¹ The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

Event	Dates	Where
North Cambridge Exhibition	Sat 23 rd June 10am - 3pm	The Meadows Community Centre
East Cambridge Exhibition	Tues 26 th June 3pm - 8 pm	Barnwell Baptist Church
South West Cambridge Exhibition	Sat 30 th June 10am - 3pm	Trumpington Village Hall
South East Cambridge Exhibition	Tues 3 rd July 3.30pm - 8 pm	Cherry Hinton Village Centre
Central Cambridge Exhibition	Wed 4 th July 10am - 8 pm	Small Hall – Guildhall
Central Cambridge Exhibition (Stall with ChYPPS)	Sat 7 th July 10am - 3pm	The Big Weekend
North East Cambridge Exhibition	Tues 10 th July 3pm - 8 pm	Brownsfield Community Centre
Central Cambridge Exhibition	Mon 16 th July 10am - 8 pm	Small Hall – Guildhall
East Cambridge Exhibition	Sat 14 th July 1pm - 5pm	Ross St Community Centre

- 2.5 A public notice was placed in the Cambridge News, setting out the details of the consultation including where consultation documents can be viewed. A copy of this public notice can be found in Appendix B.
- 2.6 The Council set up an interactive website to assist access to the Issues and Options Report and to facilitate making responses online. Over 11,000 comments were received to the Issues and Options Report and its accompanying Sustainability Appraisal from 858 respondents.

Key Issues

- 2.7 Appendix C contains a summary of the key issues raised. An approach has been taken whereby representations with similar themes have been grouped together to enable a more effective approach to responding to representations and drafting the Draft Local Plan. The key issues that received the most interest and comment relate to:
- The need for a joint plan with South Cambridgeshire District Council in order to plan for housing an employment provision across the two areas;
 - Recognition of housing need but significant concern about the environmental impacts as well as the ability for appropriate infrastructure to be provided;
 - Mixed support for further development in the Green Belt. Many respondents made the point that the Green Belt should be protected;
 - The majority of the land within the broad locations are considered to be important to the setting and special character of the City;
 - Support for the continued redevelopment at the station and the fringe sites developments at the Southern Fringe and North West Cambridge;
 - Concern about the capacity in the City Centre, especially in relation to space and the quality of the public realm;
 - Support for employment led development at Northern Fringe East although other uses have been suggested;

- General support for the opportunity areas put forward along with suggestions for other opportunity areas such as Mitcham’s corner;
- Support for being ambitious in relation to climate change and water related policies although concern about viability and implementation;
- Support for options relating to design, historic environment, landscape and biodiversity;
- Mixed support for options relating to density, tall buildings, space standards and lifetime homes;
- Support for employment provision although concern about the lack of land for provision;
- Support for local, independent shops and diversity in centres;
- Support for a sub regional community stadium in principle although the majority of those in support live outside the city and are Cambridge United supporters. There was no overall support for a particular site;
- Support for an ice rink in Cambridge;
- Support for continued emphasis on non car modes;
- Support for a review of residential car parking standards to better reflect national guidelines; and
- Support for the option relating to timely provision of infrastructure.

2.8 Officers are in the process of assessing all of the representations received, using these to inform the preferred approach to be taken forward into the draft Local Plan. The Key Issues were considered at Development Plan Scrutiny Committee on the 16th October 2012. Further committee reports on the preferred approach to each section of the Plan are being considered by Development Strategy Scrutiny Committee between December 2012 and February 2013, and this consultation statement will be updated to show how the Issues and Options responses have informed the development of the draft Local Plan.

Sustainability Appraisal

Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report

2.9 It is a requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) for all planning policies documents to undergo a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) in order to determine their impact on social, economic and environmental objectives. The first stage in the process is to determine the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal and to set out the Sustainability Appraisal Framework, which will be used to assess the Local Plan.

2.10 The draft Scoping Report was made available for consultation between February and March 2012, in line with requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations, 2004. Consultation was carried out with the SEA Consultation Bodies (the Environment Agency, Natural England and English Heritage) and other key stakeholders. A number of changes were made to the Scoping Report as a result of this consultation, which provided further detail to the sustainability themes identified in the report. Further detail of these changes is provided in Annex II of the Scoping Report².

2.11 The next stage of the SA process was to appraise the options presented in the Issues and Options Report. To this end, the Issues and Options Report was appraised and an Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report produced by consultants URS (May 2012). This document was made available for consultation at the same time as the Issues and Options Report.

² URS (June 2012). Cambridge Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report.

- 2.12 A total of 300 representations were received to the SA, of which there were 174 representations in support and 122 objections. Many of these representations echoed comments made to sections of the Issues and Options Report, rather than having a focus on the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal itself. As the SA was carried out by independent consultants in order to inform the preparation of the new Local Plan, it was felt that no changes should be made to the SA as a result of this consultation. Officers will take account of the representations received to the SA when preparing the Draft Local Plan.

3 ISSUES AND OPTIONS 2 CONSULTATION

- 3.1 The next stage of consultation is the Issues and Options 2 consultation, which has been split into two parts. The Part 1 document is a joint consultation between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council on options for the development strategy for the wider Cambridge area and for site options for housing or employment development on the edge of Cambridge on land currently in the Green Belt. It also includes site options for a community stadium. It builds upon the Issues and Options consultations that both Councils undertook in summer 2012 and provides background information in relation to the housing and employment needs for the area as a whole, as well as outlining what that means for the future development strategy. The site options included in Part 1 have had regard to the comments submitted in response to the Issues and Options consultations on the ten broad locations in the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge, a summary of which can be found in Appendix D.
- 3.2 The Part 2 Site Options Within Cambridge consultation document considers both site allocations and designations. The site allocations focus on strategic sites that are considered central to the achievement of the development strategy for Cambridge, for example achievement of housing requirements or land for employment development. It also seeks peoples views on designations that will be included in the new Local Plan and its accompanying Proposals Map. These designations will include areas of protection, such as protected open space, and land-use designations such as local and district centres. In addition, the Part 2 document considers more detailed matters such as consultation on residential space standards and car and cycle parking standards.

Sustainability Appraisal

- 3.3 Alongside the Issues and Options 2 consultation documents, we are also consulting on Sustainability Appraisals for both the Part 1 and Part 2 documents. For the Part 1 document, a joint SA has been prepared, which considers the impact of the site options on the sustainability objectives identified in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Reports of both Councils. The Sustainability Appraisals are being made available for consultation at the same time as the Issues and Options 2 documents.

Consultation Arrangements

- 3.4 In accordance with the planning regulations and the Council's consultation and community engagement strategy, consultation arrangements include:
- Consultation for 6 weeks between 7 January to 18 February 2013;
 - Letters and emails informing consultees of consultation dates and how to view and respond to the consultation material, including consultees listed in Appendix A and all those who responded to the Issues and Options consultation;
 - A public notice will be placed in the Cambridge Evening News (see Appendix E);

- Posters to advertise local exhibitions;
- All documents to be made available on the Council’s website and the Customer Service Centre at Mandela House;
- Libraries to receive hard copies;
- Article in Cambridge Matters, which will include dates on exhibitions, including those being held jointly with South Cambridgeshire District Council;
- Use of the Council’s Facebook page and Twitter account to publicise consultation;
- Use of the Local Plan blog; and
- Use of site notices for each of the site options, with letters sent to adjacent neighbours to inform them of the consultation.

3.5 A series of exhibitions across Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire have also been planned. Some of these will be joint exhibitions, which will be advertised in each Council’s magazine and will be attended by officers of both Councils (shaded in the table below). Dates and venues are:

Date	Venue	Exhibition Time
Monday 7 th January	Grantchester – Village Hall	2.30pm – 7.30pm
Tuesday 8 th January	Castle Street Methodist Church	2.30pm – 7.30pm
Wednesday 9 th January	Fulbourn, The Swifts	2.30pm – 7.30pm
Thursday 10 th January	The Hub, Camborne – Main Hall	2.30pm – 7.30pm
Saturday 12 th January	Trumpington Village Hall – Jubilee Room	12– 4pm
Monday 14 th January	Guildhall – Small Hall	2.30pm – 7.30pm
Wednesday 16 th January	Great Shelford – Memorial Hall	2.30pm – 7.30pm
Friday 18 th January	Meadows Community Centre, Cambridge – Room 2	2.30pm – 7.30pm
Monday 21 st January	Guildhall – Small Hall	2.30pm – 7.30pm
Tuesday 22 nd January	Histon and Impington Recreation Ground	2.30pm – 7.30pm
Friday 25 th January	Cherry Hinton Village Centre – Large Meeting Room	2.30pm – 7.30pm
Saturday 26 th January	Netherhall School – Atrium Hall	12 – 4pm
Monday 28 th January	Newnham Croft Primary School	5pm – 8.30pm
Friday 1 st February	Brownfields Community Centre, Cambridge – Hall	2.30pm – 7.30pm
Thursday 14 th February	East Area Committee, Cambridge United Football Club – Dublin Suite	5pm – 7pm

3.6 The Council’s interactive website will be set up to enable people to view and respond to the Issues and Options 2 consultation online. This is the Council’s preferred means of receiving

representations. This website can be accessed via: <http://cambridge.jdi-consult.net/ldf>. For those who do not have access to a computer, paper response forms can also be completed and sent to the Council. Copies of the response form are available from the planning policy team, who can be contacted using one of the following methods:

- You can phone us on 01223 45700 (ask to speak to someone in the planning policy team);
- You can email us at policysurveys@cambridge.gov.uk

3.7 Please note that the deadline for responses is **5pm on 18th February 2012**. Unfortunately, responses received after the deadline can only be accepted in exceptional circumstances. If you have any queries as to how to submit a representation, please contact the planning policy team.

4.0 DUTY TO COOPERATE AND JOINT WORKING ARRANGEMENTS

4.1 Planning issues are not constrained to local authority boundaries. The National Planning Policy Framework states that public bodies have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those that relate to strategic priorities. Councils are required to work collaboratively to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual local plans.

4.2 The City Council has a long history of joint working and has worked closely with South Cambridgeshire District Council on a variety of planning matters over many years, reflecting the close functional relationship between the tightly drawn city boundary and its rural surroundings. This includes working together on key strategic and joint issues at both officer and Member level through the preparation of Structure Plans, input to Regional Plans, the preparation of existing development plans, joint Area Action Plans for major developments, the preparation of joint evidence base documents on a wide variety of topics, and other planning matters including various transport strategy documents.

4.3 The Councils have decided to prepare separate Local Plans for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, but are fully aware of the need to work effectively together and that they will need to demonstrate how they have cooperated effectively, both with each other and with other key public bodies, including the County Council, on the preparation of their respective new Local Plans. The Councils' ongoing approach to joint working is therefore now a specific legal requirement and it will be necessary to provide formal evidence of the cooperation as part of the plan making process.

4.4 Joint working arrangements have already been established. At a Member level, previous joint working groups have been replaced by two new Member groups: The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Strategic Planning and Transport Member Group, which is a County wide group, and the Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group, set up specifically to address issues affecting Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. Work is also ongoing at an officer level, steered by regular meetings of senior officers: Chief Planning Officers group for County wide issues and officers from the three Councils for more Cambridge-focussed issues. The Cambridgeshire Councils have already established and commissioned the Joint Strategic Planning Unit to prepare a strategic spatial framework for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, which will also help demonstrate the coordinated approach to planning for the long term needs of the wider area.

- 4.5 The Councils have been working together throughout the preparation of the Issues and Options consultations on the Cambridge Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, and also the parallel consultation on issues for a new Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. The Councils took the same approach to joint issues in the summer 2012 Issues and Options consultation. Each of the Issues and Options consultation documents took a common approach to the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge, the future planning of Cambridge East and the Northern Fringe East and sub-regional sporting, cultural and community facilities. Each document also highlighted the corresponding consultation by the other Council. A joint approach has also been taken for the Issues and Options 2 consultation, with the Part 1 consultation document being a joint consultation by the Councils.
- 4.6 The Councils have agreed to continue to work jointly as plan preparation continues. In terms of timetables, the Councils' Local Plan programmes have been very similar, although it did not prove possible to align them completely for the summer 2012 Issues and Options consultations.
- 4.7 In terms of working with statutory consultees, as part of evidence base preparation, a series of workshops were held between December 2011 and February 2012 with statutory consultees, as well as with Councillors, developers and agents and residents' associations. These allowed for early discussion of the key issues to be dealt with as part of the Local Plan Review. Statutory consultees also responded to the Issues and Options Report and will be engaged as part of the process of drafting of policies prior to consultation on the Submission Draft Plan.

5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

- 5.1 Once consultation on Issues and Options 2 has finished, we will consider all of the representations that have been received, using them to refine the allocations that will be included in the Local Plan. We will then draft the actual Local Plan, which will include draft policies, site allocations and designations. This will be subject to a further round of public consultation in the summer of 2013, prior to being submitted to the Secretary of State for examination. At this stage, an independent Government Inspector will consider the 'soundness of the Local Plan at a public examination. In other words, the Inspector will consider whether the plan has been positively prepared, and that its policies are justified, effective and are in conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework. Following this, the Inspector will produce a report of his or her findings, and then the Council will formally adopt the Local Plan, which is currently scheduled for April 2014.

APPENDIX A: LIST OF CONSULTEES FOR THE ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION

Below is a list of organisations that will be directly informed of the Issues and Options consultation via email (individuals are not listed). In addition to this list the public will be informed through an article in *Cambridge Matters*, various press releases, through the Council's web pages and a series of exhibitions to capture as many people across the city as possible.

SPECIFIC CONSULTATION BODIES³

- English Heritage
- Environment Agency
- Highways Agency
- Natural England
- Network Rail
- Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust
- EDF Energy
- National Grid Transco
- E.On Energy
- Npower Renewables
- Scottish Power
- Scottish & Southern Electric
- British Gas
- Cambridge Water Company
- Anglian Water
- Homes and Communities Agency
- South Cambridgeshire District Council
- Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways)
- Cambridgeshire County Council (Strategic Planning)
- Comberton Parish Council
- Coton Parish Council
- Cottenham Parish Council
- Fen Ditton Parish Council
- Fulbourn Parish Council
- Girton Parish Council
- Grantchester Parish Council
- Great Shelford Parish Council
- Hauxton Parish Council
- Histon & Impington Parish Councils
- Horningsea Parish Council
- Madingley Parish Council
- Milton Parish Council
- Teversham Parish Council
- Cambridgeshire Constabulary

- Cambridge Crown Court
- Cambridge University Hospital (Addenbrookes)

COUNCILLORS

- 42 x City Councillors
- All County Councillors (City Wards)

COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS

- Cambridge Federation of Residents' Associations
- Cambridge Citizens Advise Bureau
- Cambridgeshire Voluntary Sector Infrastructure Consortium (CVSIC)
- The GET Group
- Cambridge Ethnic Community Forum
- The COVER Group
- Work Advice Volunteering Education Training (WAVET)
- Cambridgeshire Older Peoples Enterprise (COPE)
- Cambridge Interfaith Group
- Encompass Network
- Disability Cambridgeshire
- National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
- The Church of England Ely Diocese
- The East Anglian Gypsy Council
- East of England Faiths Council
- Age Concern Cambridgeshire

ENVIRONMENTAL

- Conservators of the River Cam
- Cambridge Past, Present and Future
- The Wildlife Trust
- Transition Cambridge
- RSPB Eastern England Office
- The Wildlife Trust
- Cambridge Friends of the Earth
- Cam Valley Forum
- Cambridge Carbon Footprint
- Transitions Cambridge

³ Specific consultation bodies are required under the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

- Campaign to Protect Rural England
- Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum
- The National Trust

DEVELOPERS

- Estate Management and Building Service, University of Cambridge
- Januarys
- Savills
- Bidwells
- Carter Jonas
- Skanska UK Plc
- Countryside Properties
- Barratt Eastern Counties
- The Home Builders Federation
- Beacon Planning Ltd
- Grosvenor USS
- Liberty Property Trust
- Bovis Homes Ltd
- Home Builders Federation
- Countryside Properties
- Argyle Street Housing Cooperative
- Cheffins
- Bellway Homes
- Unex
- Artek Design House
- Barton Wilmore
- Brookgate
- Berkeley Homes
- The Howard Group of Companies
- DPP
- Chartered Institute of Architectural Technologist
- RPS

BUSINESSES

- Marshalls Airport
- Cambridgeshire Chambers of Commerce
- CRACA
- Cambridge Network
- Love Cambridge
- Cambridge Hoteliers Association
- Cambridge Energy Forum
- Cambridge Cleantech
- Future Business
- St John's Innovation Centre
- Ely Cathedral Business Group
- One Nucleus

- Creative Front
- Sub Groups of the LEP
- ARM Holdings
- Redgate
- Federation of Small Businesses
- The Institute of Directors

EDUCATION

- Anglia Ruskin University
- All Colleges of the University of Cambridge
- The Bursars Committee
- Sixth Form Colleges
- Private Schools
- Cambridge Regional College
- Secondary Schools
- Parkside Federation

OTHERS

- Mobile Operators Association
- Cambridge Cycling Campaign
- Local Enterprise Partnership
- Design Council/CABE
- Cambridgeshire Campaign for Better Transport
- Shape East
- Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service
- The Norfolk, Suffolk & Cambridgeshire Strategic Health Authority
- BT Open Reach Newsites
- Cable & Wireless UK
- Cambridge Federation of Tenants and Leaseholders
- Sport England
- Local Strategic Partnership
- Registered Social Landlords

ALL RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATIONS (INCLUDING):

- Accordia Community and Resident's Association (ACRA)
- Babraham Road Action Group
- Barton Close Residents' Association
- Bateman Street & Bateman Mews Residents Association
- BENERA (Bentley and Newton Road Residents' Association)
- Bishops Court Residents' Company Ltd

- Bradmore & Petersfield Residents Association
- Brooklands Avenue Area Residents' Association
- Brookside Residents Association
- Brunswick & North Kite Residents' Association
- Bulstrode Gardens Residents Association
- Cambanks Residents' Society Ltd
- Camboaters
- Castle Community Action Group
- Cherry Hinton & Rathmore Roads Residents' Association
- Cherry Hinton Residents' Association
- Christ's Pieces Residents Association
- Clerk Maxwell Road Residents' Association
- Corfe Close Residents Association (CCRA)
- Covent Garden Residents' Association
- CREW
- CRONC
- De Freville Avenue RA
- Devonshire Road Residents' Association
- East Chesterton Community Action Group
- EMRAG
- FECRA (Cambridge Federation of Residents' Associations)
- Fenners Lawn Residents Association Ltd
- Friends of Milton Road Library
- Gazeley Lane Area Residents' Association
- George Pateman Court Residents' Association
- Glisson Road/Tenison Road Area Residents' Association
- Gough Way Residents Association
- Greenlands' Residents Association
- Guest Road Residents' Association
- Hanover & Princess Court Residents' Association
- Hazelwood & Molewood Residents' Association
- Highsett Flats Resident's Association
- Highsett Houses Residents' Society
- Highsett Residents' Association
- Icen Homes (Hundred Houses) Tenants' Association
- Jesus Green Association
- King Street Neighbourhood Association
- Kings Hedges Neighbourhood Partnership
- Lichfield & Neville Residents' Action Group
- Mill Road Community Improvements Group
- Mill Road Society
- Millington Road & Millington Lane Residents Association
- Mitchams Corner Residents' & Traders' Association
- Mulberry Close Residents Society
- NAFRA 19 Acre Field Residents' Association
- New Pinehurst Residents Association
- Newnham Croft Conservation Group
- Newtown Residents' Association
- Norfolk Terrace & Blossom Street Residents' Association
- North Newnham Residents Association
- Norwich Street Residents' Association
- Old Chesterton Residents' Association & Friends of Stourbridge Common
- Old Pinehurst Residents Association
- Orchard Close Residents Association
- Oxford Road Residents' Association
- Park Resident's Association (PRSA)
- Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)
- Pinehurst South Resident's Association
- Protect Union Lane Group
- Ravensworth Gardens Residents Association Limited
- Residents Association of Old Newnham (RAON)
- Richmond Road Residents' Association
- Riverside Area Residents Association
- Romsey Action
- RTLG Residents Technical Liaison Group
- Rustat Neighbourhood Association
- Sandy Lane Residents' Association
- Shelly Gardens Leaseholder's Association
- SOLACHRA
- St Mark's Court Residents Association

- St Matthews Gardens Residents Association
- Storeys Way Residents' Association
- Tavistock Road & Stratfield Close Residents' Association
- The Eights Marina Management Board
- The Linchpin Project
- Three Trees Residents' Association
- Trumpington Residents Association
- University of the Third Age & Mill Road Society
- Victoria Park Residents Working Group
- VIE Residents' Association
- West Cambridge Preservation Society
- Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE)
- York Street Residents' Action Group

APPENDIX B: ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION PUBLIC NOTICE

Cambridge City Council Cambridge Local Plan Review

Notice of publication of the Cambridge Local Plan Towards 2031 - Issues and Options Report (June 2012) for public consultation



Cambridge City Council is in the process of preparing a new Local Plan, which will plan for and manage development in the City of Cambridge until 2031. The first stage is the identification of the issues the Council believes are facing Cambridge over the next 20 years and the options for dealing with these issues. The Council seeks your views in order to help shape the new Local Plan.

The six-week consultation period on the Issues and Options Report 2012 and its associated Interim Sustainability Appraisal is from **9am on 15th June 2012 until 5pm on 27th July 2012**

The Issues and Options Report, the Interim Sustainability Appraisal and other relevant supporting documents are available for inspection:

- Online on the City Council's website:
www.cambridge.gov.uk/localplanreview
- At Cambridge City Council's Customer Service Centre at Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY from 8am-6pm on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Fridays, and 9am-6pm on Thursdays.

You can also visit exhibitions and speak to representatives of the Council as follows:

- West Cambridge Exhibition, Tuesday 19th June 3pm - 8 pm, West Cambridge Sports Pavillion, Wilberforce Road, CB3 0EQ;
- North Cambridge Exhibition, Saturday 23rd June 10am - 3pm, The Meadows Community Centre;
- East Cambridge Exhibition, Tuesday 26th June 3pm - 8 pm, Barnwell Baptist Church;
- South West Cambridge Exhibition, Saturday 30th June 10am - 3pm, Trumpington Village Hall;
- South East Cambridge Exhibition, Tuesday 3rd July 3.30pm - 8 pm, Cherry Hinton Village Centre;
- Central Cambridge Exhibition, Wednesday 4th July 10am - 8 pm, Small Hall, The Guildhall;
- Central Cambridge Exhibition, Saturday 7th July 10am - 3pm The Big Weekend, Parkers Piece (Stall with ChYPPS);
- North East Cambridge Exhibition, Tuesday 10th July 3pm - 8 pm, Brownsfield Community Centre;
- Central Cambridge Exhibition, Monday 16th July 10am - 8 pm, Small Hall, The Guildhall; and

- East Cambridge Exhibition, Saturday 14th July 1pm - 5pm, Ross Street Community Centre

The Issues and Options Report and Sustainability Appraisal can also be purchased from the Customer Service Centre (Tel: 01223 457000).

Comments should be made using:

- The online response system available on the City Council website <http://cambridge.jdi-consult.net/ldf/>;
- Printed response forms are available from the Customer Service Centre (as above) or can be downloaded and filled in electronically by visiting www.cambridge.gov.uk/localplanreview

Completed response forms should be sent to:

- Local Plan Review Issues and Options Consultation, Planning Policy Team, Cambridge City Council, PO Box 700, Cambridge, CB1 0JH
- Or emailed to policysurveys@cambridge.gov.uk

Please submit your comments before **5.00pm on the 27th July 2012**.

Any representations submitted in relation to the Issues and Options Report may also be accompanied by a request to be notified of the submission of the draft Local Plan to the Secretary of State.

For further information, please contact the Planning Policy team as follows:

- Tel: 01223 457000
- Email: policysurveys@cambridge.gov.uk

Patsy Dell
Head of Planning
Cambridge City Council

Date of Notice: 15th June 2012

APPENDIX C: KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CAMBRIDGE LOCAL PLAN – TOWARDS 2031 – ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION	
SECTION OF ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT	KEY ISSUES
What is sustainable development for Cambridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New architecture that is embraced sympathetically with the historic buildings; • Protection of historic core; • Protection of Green Belt and green spaces; • More affordable homes for those working in Cambridge on lower incomes; • Retain its status as a world class centre of excellence.
Working with other authorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan needed but should be a joint plan with South Cambridgeshire District Council and the County Transport Strategy.
General consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document too long to include everyone.
What people like and think is special about Cambridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small and compact city; • Historical buildings; • Green spaces; • Cycling accessibility; • The University of Cambridge’s standing as a world renowned institution; • The river.

CHAPTER 2 – CAMBRIDGE 2031 VISION	
SECTION OF ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT	KEY ISSUES
Option 1: Cambridge 2031 Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considerable support for the Vision, even if only part (often most) of it; • Needs more mention of existing developments, not just new ones; • Needs to remain a compact ‘small town like’ city; • Cambridge should become a beacon for urban design and sustainable development; • Vision should address socio-economic inequalities; • Vision should explicitly mention protection of Green Belt; • No mention of diverse natural environment or wildlife in Vision; • Vision should reflect having healthy lifestyles as a priority; • Needs to better reflect housing needs, anticipated workforce

	<p>and job growth;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to tie into Vision for surrounding districts, particularly South Cambridgeshire; • More needs to be made of the exceptional heritage of the city and protecting historic buildings.
Strategic Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for the strategic objectives; • Still too much of a presumption that the Vision should be based on new development; • Not enough mention of the Green Belt; • More commentary on ‘what is sustainable’ – too ambiguous; • Protecting the ‘university town’ and green spaces should have higher priority; • Need to mention noise and light pollution; • Should be additional objective about minimising the need to travel through new communications and technology.

CHAPTER 3 – SPATIAL STRATEGY	
SECTION OF ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT	Key Issues
General issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan for Cambridge must be properly integrated with plans for South Cambridgeshire. Need to look holistically at the housing and economic market area rather than at the administrative area; • Predictions of growth are based on nothing more than speculated extensions that should not form the basis for a level of growth that would damage the special character of the city; • Development of brownfield sites should be maximised and the Green Belt must be preserved; • The new Local Plan should continue with the development strategy set out in the adopted Structure Plan – this remains the most sustainable approach; • Chesterton Fen needs to be developed properly with supporting infrastructure – consideration of the needs of residential boat dwellers must be included in the Local Plan (Conservators of the River Cam); • A core issue is whether we want Cambridge to remain a compact green city; • A radical overhaul of the transport system must go hand in hand with any further development; • Growth should be in excess of that presented in Option 5 (25,000) on the basis of technical work on housing need; • Employment sites should not be converted into housing; • Opportunities are being missed to provide more

	<p>employment on sites such as Clay Farm and NIAB;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look to improve the quality and density of existing residential areas; • Create areas for new housing and jobs using the connections formed by the Guided Busway; • Provide adequate and culturally sensitive sites for travelling communities – at least 1% of affordable housing should be earmarked for them.
<p>Option 2: 12,700 new homes to 2031 – urban growth</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong level of support for this option; • Infrastructure cannot cope with any further housing provision above this level; • Green Belt land must be protected and under this option no further Green Belt release would be required; • The city should give priority to employment, with some of the 2,060 new homes provided in selected villages in South Cambridgeshire; • Growth needs to be limited if the Vision for Cambridge is to be achieved. • Current levels of growth will enable a significant level of growth without destroying the quality of the city; • Additional housing growth should be evenly distributed across the region, taking advantage of an improved public transport system; • Need to experience the results of existing developments before we commit to more. <p>OBJECTIONS TO THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12,700 too high – keep to the 10,612 already agreed; • Insufficient to meet identified levels of housing need.
<p>Option 3: up to 14,000 new homes to 2031</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approach is consistent with enlarging the city whilst maintaining its key qualities; • This would help to meet some of the housing need of the city, particularly affordable housing; • This should be the absolute maximum level of growth that should be planned. <p>OBJECTIONS TO THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge cannot support this level of growth without harming the special character and setting of the city; • Infrastructure capacity cannot deal with this level of growth; • The Green Belt must be protected and any further release would set a dangerous precedent; • Insufficient to meet identified levels of housing need;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further land should be released from the Green Belt on the basis on forecasts for population and housing projections and jobs, as these are an unreliable source of evidence; • Growth should focus on existing urban area with any shortfalls delivered within a new sustainable village located outside of the Green Belt in South Cambridgeshire; • Would result in negative environmental impacts, including adverse effects on landscape, biodiversity and accessible green infrastructure.
<p>Option 4: up to 21,000 new homes to 2031</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option would help bring homes and jobs closer together making the city more sustainable. <p>OBJECTIONS TO THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge cannot support this level of growth without harming the special character and setting of the city. It would compromise the scale and identity of the city; • Infrastructure capacity cannot deal with this level of growth; • The Green Belt must be protected and any further release would set a dangerous precedent; • Development would undermine the purposes of the Green Belt; • Not compatible with the principles of sustainability; • Growth should focus on existing urban area with any shortfalls delivered within a new sustainable village located outside of the Green Belt in South Cambridgeshire; • Would result in negative environmental impacts, including adverse effects on landscape, biodiversity and accessible green infrastructure.
<p>Option 5: up to 25,000 new homes to 2031</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan should be ambitious concerning housing; • This option would help bring homes and jobs closer together making the city more sustainable. <p>OBJECTIONS TO THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge cannot support this level of growth without harming the special character and setting of the city. It would compromise the scale and identity of the city; • Infrastructure capacity cannot deal with this level of growth; • The Green Belt must be protected and any further release would set a dangerous precedent; • Development would undermine the purposes of the Green Belt;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not compatible with the principles of sustainability; • Growth should focus on existing urban area with any shortfalls delivered within a new sustainable village located outside of the Green Belt in South Cambridgeshire; • Would result in negative environmental impacts, including adverse effects on landscape, biodiversity and accessible green infrastructure; • Figure is unlikely to be achieved based on historic rates of development.
<p>Option 6: Plan for 10,000 new jobs to 2031</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the lowest number of jobs as infrastructure and the character of city cannot cope with higher levels of growth; • The state of the global economy and fall in public sector employment means higher forecasts are unrealistic; • Encourage jobs growth elsewhere, in areas where they are more needed and / or have less of an impact on commuting; • Support for the lowest number of jobs as more jobs means more homes; • Future employment may not recover to pre-2000 levels; • Empty units around Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire demonstrate a surplus of units. <p>OBJECTIONS TO THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for a lower number of jobs as infrastructure and the character of city cannot cope with even lowest level of growth; • The Council should adopt an aspirational target and fulfil Cambridge’s potential as a globally significant high tech cluster; • Use longer term employment trends as historic data unreliable.
<p>Option 7: Plan for 15,000 new jobs to 2031</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most realistic assessment of job creation; • A reasonable balance; • No more than 15,000 unless the infrastructure is improved; • The Council should identify space for these jobs; • Support for at least the same level of job growth as the past; • Supports existing economic plans for Cambridge. <p>OBJECTIONS TO THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure and the character of city cannot cope with higher levels of growth; • More jobs means more homes are needed;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would damage the character and environment of the city; • Encourage jobs growth elsewhere, in areas where they are more needed; • Too high, unrealistic; • Too many people; • The Council should adopt an aspirational target and fulfil Cambridge’s potential as a globally significant high tech cluster; • Future employment may not recover to pre-2000 levels; • The state of the global economy means these forecasts are unrealistic.
Option 8: Plan for 20,000 new jobs to 2031	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will proactively drive and support sustainable economic development; • The Council should adopt an aspirational target and fulfil Cambridge’s potential as a globally significant high tech cluster. <p>OBJECTIONS TO THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure and the character of city cannot cope with higher levels of growth; • More jobs means more homes are needed; • Would damage the character and environment of the city; • Encourage jobs growth elsewhere, in areas where they are more needed; • Impact on commuting and congestion; • Future employment may not recover to pre-2000 levels; • Does not go far enough to support the Cambridge economy; • The state of the global economy means higher forecasts are unrealistic; • Would require Green Belt changes.
Other general points relating to levels of employment provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth in Cambridge will exacerbate the north / south divide; • Small scale enterprise should not be discouraged; • Current employment sites should be safeguarded; • Land is limited; • Cambridge should be a low growth city; • Should be planned jointly in the Cambridge sub-region; • Changes associated with increased efficiency and homeworking mean the forecasts are unrealistic; • Lower levels of job growth mean less commuting which means lower carbon emissions; • Should be flexible and not make assumptions about future growth; • An element of job growth will need to be provided will

	<p>need to be provided in conjunction with new housing on the edge of the city;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No consideration of commuting to London; • Intensifying existing employment areas could help provide more jobs; • Growth in satellite villages / towns / business parks should be explored.
<p>General issues about broad locations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for additional housing and jobs provides the exceptional circumstances in Cambridge to justify the release of further land from the Green Belt; • If Green Belt land is to be released for housing, it should also be considered for Travellers' sites; • A traditional Green Belt policy is vital to the future of Cambridge. Once lost, it cannot be recovered; • Critical to maintain the 'green fingers' that penetrate Cambridge in order to preserve the setting and special character of the city; • Exceptional circumstances do not apply when adequate land for development is available in South Cambridgeshire; • The sequential approach to development in the current Local Plan must continue since it is the most sustainable approach to growth and has been endorsed by an Inspector. This will require a coordinated approach between the city and South Cambridgeshire District Council; • Very strong opposition from residents to further development of the Green Belt – need to analyse the impact of existing changes before any additional change is considered; • Need to avoid the loss of separation of surrounding villages; • Some feeling that only the airport represents a possible development site; • The environment of the city and its setting attracts businesses to Cambridge – this needs to be protected; • Release of further land from the Green Belt would contradict the Vision of a compact city; • Needs to be a better use of existing land, particularly within urban centres, e.g. building over surface car parks and intensifying land use through mixed use developments.
<p>Option 9: Development within Urban Area of Cambridge</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for this approach as it supports a higher density, sustainable city; • Prioritise new development towards brownfield sites in order to preserve the Green Belt; • Land for the 2,060 new homes should be allocated for new employment with new homes focussed towards SCDC; • Suggestion that the Council has over-estimated SHLAA

	<p>capacity within the existing built up area of the city and as such land will need to be released from Green Belt to meet housing need.</p>
<p>Option 10: Broad Location 1 – Land to the North and South of Barton Road</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The release of sensitive Green Belt land around Cambridge is not unprecedented e.g. North West Cambridge; • There is a clear need for additional housing and affordable housing in Cambridge, exacerbated by the lack of development at Cambridge East; • The site could be sensitively developed to address issues surrounding flood risk, visual impact and transport impact; • The location would encourage sustainable modes of transport; • Development would be accompanied by additional open space (including a wildlife reserve and country park) and recreation facilities, and community facilities and local shops. <p>OBJECTIONS TO THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial Green Belt release has only recently been sanctioned so further release should not be contemplated. There should be a settling in period of at least 10 years to allow for the impact of current developments on the edge of Cambridge to be assessed; • Parts of the site are in Flood Zone 3 and are at high risk of flooding. Development would exacerbate flood risk in an area already prone to flooding; • The land is in a highly sensitive area of the Green Belt, which is important to the setting of the city and adjacent conservation area and forms an important approach to the city. Forms a vital part of the Quarter to Six Quadrant; • Would lead to an unacceptable level of traffic on Barton Road, which is already heavily congested. Other transport infrastructure in the area would not be able to cope with the proposed levels of development; • Insufficient infrastructure in this area of the city to deal with proposed level of development, especially schools; • Loss of recreation facilities should be resisted and is contrary to the NPPF; • The site has already been rejected by a Planning Inspector as part of the 2006 Local Plan Examination; • Would destroy the last remaining vista of the historic core and the last remaining stretch of road into Cambridge not subject to urban sprawl; • The area is important for wildlife, including threatened species;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area should not be designated for housing but for playing fields and recreation; • The site contains the remnants of the West Field and almost certainly contains archaeological remains dating at least as far back as the Roman occupation.
<p>Option 11: Broad Location 2 – Playing fields off Grantchester Road</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant responses. <p>OBJECTIONS TO THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial Green Belt release has only recently been sanctioned so further release should not be contemplated. There should be a settling in period of at least 10 years to allow for the impact of current developments on the edge of Cambridge to be assessed; • The loss of playing fields should be resisted and is contrary to the NPPF; • Parts of the site are liable to flooding (functional floodplain) and development would exacerbate flooding to neighbouring properties; • The land is in a highly sensitive area of the Green Belt, which is important to the setting and character of the city. Forms a vital part of the Quarter to Six Quadrant; • Access to the site is poor, with Grantchester Road being too narrow and winding to accommodate the level of development proposed; • Would lead to an unacceptable level of traffic on Barton Road and Fen Causeway, which are already heavily congested. Other transport infrastructure in the area would not be able to cope with the proposed levels of development; • Insufficient infrastructure in this area of the city to deal with proposed level of development; • Would lead to the loss of a green finger running into the centre of Cambridge; • Could lead to the loss of the allotments, which represent an important facility for the community; • Would destroy the village feel of Newnham; • Would have a detrimental impact on the River Cam Corridor and Grantchester Meadows; • The area is important for wildlife, including threatened species. The site forms an important wildlife corridor linking to the Backs and Grantchester Meadows; • Development of this site has been rejected in the past, and the reasons for this remain unchanged.
<p>Option 12: Broad Location 3 – Land</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No support for this option.

<p>West of Trumpington Road</p>	<p>OBJECTIONS TO THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area forms a sensitive part of the Green Belt and should remain as such. It plays a very important part in the overall setting of the city and its rural edge is a vital characteristic of Cambridge that should be protected; • Development in this area would dominate the world renowned Grantchester Meadows, which forms an essential amenity for the city and its residents; • The loss of playing fields should be resisted and is contrary to the NPPF; • Trumpington Road would not be able to cope with the additional traffic generated by such a development; • The site forms an important part of the river valley wildlife corridor. The area is important for wildlife, including threatened species; • Development would lead to the loss of high quality agricultural land; • Development would have a negative impact on the Southacre Conservation Area; • The trees along Trumpington Road form part of a Woodland Wildlife Site; • Development of this site has been rejected in the past and nothing has changed to overturn this decision.
<p>Option 13: Broad Location 4: Land west of Hauxton Road</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good access; • Minimal landscape impact. <p>OBJECTIONS TO THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erodes value of Trumpington Meadows; • Impact on traffic; • South west approaches essential to distinctive character; • Loss of Green Belt and impact on setting of city; • Reserved for country park and agricultural open space; • Impact on local nature reserves; • Pressure on local services; • Noise from stadium; • Southern Fringe growing rapidly already; • Destruction of planned new urban edge; • Will attract people from south of city, not helping local employment and housing problems; • Motorway noise and pollution impact on new development; • New retail should be in city centre; • Allow new development to be completed and settled before more is contemplated;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flooding; and • Coalescence with Hauxton / Harston.
<p>Option 14: Broad Location 5: Land south of Addenbrooke's Road</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good transport network nearby; • Deliver new affordable homes; • The site is available and could be delivered in the plan period; • Will assist the delivery of high levels of employment growth in Cambridge; • Help meet housing needs; • A sustainable location high in the development sequence established in the 2003 Structure Plan; • Would not harm the purposes of the Green Belt; • Would allow for enhancement of approach to Cambridge; • Would allow for enhancement of nearby habitats and increased access to the countryside; • Good access to centre by public transport; • Help meet employment needs, provide jobs and contribute to the high tech cluster; • New community facilities and open space; and • Would reinforce ribbon development on Shelford Road. <p>OBJECTIONS TO THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Green Belt • Green Belt erosion in a place where loss is already planned; • Traffic impact; • Area already overdeveloped; • Coalescence with Great Shelford; • Flooding; • Nearby County Wildlife Site; • Noise and air quality measures needed; • Destruction of planned new urban edge; • Impact on setting of the city and surrounding landscape; • Allow new development to be completed and settled before more is contemplated; and • Planning inspectors have ruled Addenbrooke's Road is a sensible Green Belt boundary.
<p>Option 15: Broad Location 6: Land south of Addenbrooke's Road and between Babraham Road and Shelford Road</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can deliver high quality affordable homes close to Addenbrooke's and existing transport routes; and • Would deliver new infrastructure to help serve existing uses. <p>OBJECTIONS TO THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic impact; • Impact on biodiversity;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Green Belt; • Harm to purposes of Green Belt; • Coalescence with Great Shelford; • Impact on setting of city; • Impact on infrastructure; • Highly visible from the Gog Magog hills to the south; • Impact on Nine Wells Nature Reserve; • Undermine the new planned edge for the city; • New community isolated from existing; • Impact on open landscape; • Roads nearby are narrow and at or near capacity; • Could constrain the very long term development of the Biomedical Campus; • Site slopes upwards away from the city; and • Loss of quiet paths used by walkers etc.
<p>Option 16: Broad Location 7: Land between Babraham Road and Fulbourn Road</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower lying sections may have less impact; • Development could minimise the starkness of Addenbrooke’s; • Help meet need for dwellings and jobs growth; • Most capacity for development out of the broad locations; • Can provide significant open space and recreation areas; • Good access to all modes of transport and Addenbrooke’s; • Allow expansion of Peterhouse Technology Park and support the Cambridge economy; and • Sites within the broad location are deliverable within the plan period. <p>OBJECTIONS TO THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on Green Belt; • Impact on wildlife; • Impact on vistas of the Gog Magog hills; • Impact on views from the Gog Magog hills; • Impact on traffic; • Impact on Site of Special Scientific Interest; • Slope should be preserved; • Damage to green corridors; • Area has high/very high landscape value; and • Impact on tranquillity of the countryside.
<p>Option 17: Broad Location 8 – Land east of Gazelle Way</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Damage would be less here than on most of the other proposed sites; • Preferred option as development would not involve views of the historic core of the city; • Qualified support to sympathetic development of this

	<p>region;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area has had planning permission granted in the past and might not be such a loss to the Green Belt as other sites around the city; • Stronger possibility for development provided a clear corridor could be retained for Teversham village. The southern part north of Fulbourn Road could be integrated with Cherry Hinton & new development to form a worthwhile and well-served extension to the city. <p>OBJECTIONS TO THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not possible to assess capacity of this location without knowing how many dwellings could be accommodated in South Cambridgeshire; • Adverse effects on the setting & special character of Cambridge; • Development would have a significant impact on landscape; • Attractive rolling agricultural land giving good views of Cambridge. • Need Green Belt to preserve the boundaries of the city, for wildlife, for the visual restfulness from endless housing that it provides; • Development would encroach into countryside and adversely impact on the concept of Cambridge as a compact city contrary to Green Belt purposes; • Risk of sprawl to engulf Fulbourn and Teversham; • Impact on existing road network - Cherry Hinton Road, Newmarket Road and Coldham's Lane are some of the most congested in the city; • Inadequate public transport to support development.
<p>Option 18: Broad Location 9: Land at Fen Ditton</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is suggested that an area of search for development of c.25ha could be made available for 450-500 new homes (160-200 affordable homes), within close proximity to the village to facilitate integration but taking sufficient account of Fen Ditton's heritage assets. A Green Belt/ landscaped buffer could be retained between the development site/ village and the A14. To enhance travel by non-car modes, a foot/ cycle bridge across the Cam could be investigated providing a convenient cross and linkage between the site and the forthcoming Cambridge Science Park Station and extended link with the Cambridge Guided Busway. <p>OBJECTIONS TO THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not possible to assess capacity of location without knowing how many dwellings can go in South Cambridgeshire;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the most beautiful landscapes in Cambridge; • Proposed development would have negative impact on a Site of Special Scientific Interest and Fen Ditton Conservation Area, which contains Listed Buildings and Buildings of Local Interest; • Village of Fen Ditton is of value as an amenity asset for the city with its proximity to the river and green corridor adjacent; • Open and rural nature of land between Chesterton on the fringe of the city and Fen Ditton is highly prized as essential open space; • Land link formed by Stourbridge Common and Ditton Meadows is valued as essential open space for other intensively developed parts of the city; • This is low, flat agricultural land with the noise and visibility of the A14 as the predominant features. • Fulfils a number of Green Belt functions, not only in respect of the setting of the historic, compact city, but also in terms of maintaining the rural setting of Fen Ditton itself; • Landscape is of high and very high sensitivity in Green Belt terms; • Importance of Green Belt has been examined through South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Development Framework and through various planning applications, which have dismissed development as inappropriate. • Negative impact on East Cambridge road network, which is one of the most congested in the city; • Existing public transport links are minimal (2 buses a day) and unable to support an enlarged settlement travelling for employment; • The infrastructure could not support any further development. • Additional housing development in this area would effectively subsume Fen Ditton into the city; • Previous Local Plan Inspectors have concluded that the consolidation of existing ribbon development would be undesirable, and it is evident that the area plays an important role in preventing coalescence between Fen Ditton and Cambridge.
<p>Option 19 / Figure 3.15: Broad Location 10: Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This land coming forward for development is supported; • It would be less damaging, given the development that has already taken place, than on most of the other sites being considered; • Difficult to argue the case for leaving an increasingly isolated area of farmland bounded by some of the busiest

	<p>roads in the county undeveloped given the precedent of Orchard Park and NIAB2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the A14 so close, this areas has a much more urban feel than other Green Belt sites around the city; • The best of the proposed fringe sites with the guided bus. <p>OBJECTIONS TO THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not possible to assess capacity of this location without knowing how many dwellings could be accommodated in South Cambridgeshire; • Girton would also be at risk of being subsumed as a suburb of the conurbation; • Highly sensitive location whose contribution to the Cambridge Green Belt is well documented; • The NIAB development is going ahead so it is unnecessary to use up a piece of land of high importance to the Green Belt; • Very close to the A14 so it is not going to be a pleasant place to live.
--	---

CHAPTER 4 – STRATEGIC SPATIAL OPTIONS	
SECTION OF ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT	KEY ISSUES
Option 20: Green Belt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large proportion of comments state that the Green Belt and open spaces are special, should be protected and not built upon; • A policy for protection of the Green Belt is vital; • There should be a presumption against development within the Green Belt in the Local Plan.
Option 21: Setting of the city	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt and ‘5 green corridors’ are key to preserving the setting of the city; • Needs to be a clear distinction between green corridors, Green Belt and the ‘urban edge’; • Care needs to be taken with development on the edge of the city, to protect the Green Belt; • Some question the deliverability and whether it will work as intended.
Option 22: Green Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green infrastructure should include private and community gardens; • A sizable amount of general support for the policy; • Greater public access to green infrastructure needed.
Option 23: Comprehensive policy for the River	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally a very good level of support for the policy; • Support for a waterspace study; • The majority of the objections based on a concern about

Cam corridor	increased pressure on the river as a result of this policy.
Option 24: City Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City Centre capacity (or lack of) is a reoccurring theme – no space for development; • Must maintain the historic centre; • Difficult to advance the City Centre in terms of number of people and commercial interest etc. without impacting its beauty and historical importance; • Some support from Colleges for policy; • Many concerns about Park, Bridge and Magdalene Streets. • Some support for Market Square and Peas Hill suggestions. • Too many buses in City Centre – some responses suggest banning them altogether. • Less chain shops, more variety is cited as a desire by numerous respondents. • Any changes need considerable consultation with public.
Option 25: Maintain the current hierarchy of centres with new additions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many support need for hierarchy, and many call for review to widen the scope for the Local Plan to identify additional retail centres; • A couple of larger retailers do not see the need to revisit the hierarchy; • The general need for a policy is supported by most.
Option 26: Change the position of some local centres within the hierarchy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A couple of larger retailers do not see the need to revisit the hierarchy; • Objections tend to centre around fears that local and district centres / shops may lose protection; • The general need for a policy is supported by most.
Option 27: Residential communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very strong support for this option.
Option 28: Station Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally, the principle for development in this area is supported; • Care needs to be taken to ensure area does not become over developed; • Car parking highlighted as an issue for the area; • Pick up and drop off point required in the area; • Questions asked as to whether more office space is needed in this area; • More residential development needed; • More cycle parking is needed.
Option 29: Southern Fringe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some objections to any more expansion of Addenbrooke's; • Some support for the retention of land for the purpose of expansion of Addenbrooke's; • Mostly support for the option.
Option 30: Addenbrooke's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant numbers saying that the development of Addenbrooke's as a centre of excellence is vital;

Hospital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical to the economy; • Some query whether the site can handle much more expansion / footfall; • Staff car parking an issue raised; • A danger of ‘over-concentration’ of medical resources on the site; • Access by bicycle to the site is difficult.
Option 31: North West Cambridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some concerns about the impact this policy is having and will continue to have on this area of the city, particularly in transport terms; • Must be consistent with the North West Area Action Plan; • Generally the reps are supportive of having a policy; • Ample cycle infrastructure should be designed into any development on the site.
Option 32: West Cambridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater cycle access to the site desired; • Some saying employment would support more intense development; • Further university development also a reoccurring theme in support of the policy; • In general, a policy for the site is largely supported; • Better to densify this site than build elsewhere on Green Belt; • The surrounding Green Belt (either side of the site) should be protected.
General comments on the Northern Fringe East	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed use aspect is critical, requiring local retail, commercial and domestic elements; • Support for the new Cambridge Science Park Station; • Need for an exciting wider vision for the area to complement the delivery of the new station; • Water treatment works should be downsized and recreated as a practical demonstration of a modern high tech sewage works; • Need to consider increased use of energy from waste; • Need to include provision of a new relief road linking Cowley Road and Fen Road; • Support for the Chisholm Trail cycle route and cycle and pedestrian bridge; • There is scope at Northern Fringe East for higher density but there must be full consultation with the local community to ensure that it does not detract from the character of the wider area; • Proposals for the Northern Fringe East will need to consider impacts on local biodiversity and identify suitable mitigation and enhancement options; • Water treatment works should be moved to free up valuable development land;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order to meet the growth that is currently envisaged, Anglian Water has investment plans in place to expand and upgrade the wastewater treatment works at Cambridge. This work is currently at feasibility stage and could involve relocation of assets on the site. This does not necessarily mean that the footprint of the works will become smaller. In any event, Anglian Water cannot envisage any situation where housing development on or close to the Anglian Water site would be acceptable; • Need to understand the impact of the development on traffic problems in Fen Road; • CamToo will destroy Stourbridge Common and Ditton Meadows. Furthermore, the creation of a bridge link to Chesterton does not depend on a sporting facility; • Need to consider the impact of CamToo on biodiversity, landscape and visual amenity; • Land should not be safeguarded for a busway across Stourbridge Common and Ditton Meadows as it would impact on landscape quality and amenity; • Need to move the waste water treatment works; • Need for high quality cyclist and pedestrian facilities, including a high-quality cycle route to Waterbeach and completion of the Chisholm Trail; • Need to consider the wider impact on the level crossing on Fen Road and the need for alternative access arrangements; • Need for consideration of the mix of uses, particularly the desire and need for residential use and hotel development in the locality as a result of station development; • Route required to reduce pressure on Chesterton High Street; • Gentrification with improvements to landscape, sewerage, drainage and access.
<p>Option 33: Northern Fringe East</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The three authorities need to work closely together to produce site-specific detailed analysis of the land use, transport, urban design and environmental planning options for the area's future use; • Need for unified development of the area; • Priority should be given to employment; • Need to provide a new relief road to link Cowley Road to Fen Road; • Need to improve access for and safety of cyclists and pedestrians; • Support the delivery of development at Northern Fringe East, which should not involve any further land being

	<p>released from the Green Belt.</p> <p>OBJECTIONS TO THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to consider revising the Northern Fringe East to include the Fen Road area; • Need for flexibility to be built into any site specific policy for the area to ensure that redevelopment proposals can respond to market conditions operating at the time of delivery of development; • Need to clarify the boundaries of the site; • Need to clarify the approach to building heights in this location; • Need for detailed environmental assessment to ensure no adverse effects.
<p>What should the boundary be for this area?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The railway sidings and the land between the railway and Fen Road should be included leaving the river corridor between Fen Road and the river; • Bounded by the A1309, the line of the former railway line to the south of the Cambridge Business Park, the River Cam, taking in both sides of Fen Road, and the A14; • The railway line to the East should be the boundary, but the plan must allow for road access to Fen Road across the railway line; • The boundary should include Chesterton Fen, with a common interest in waste recycling and vehicle maintenance; • The boundary should include Chesterton Fen, there is scope for marina development independent of the CamToo project; • The boundary for commercial use should extend east of the railway up to Fen Road with an appropriate link road. To the east of Fen Road, it could be developed as a nature reserve; • The whole area on the map should be included; • No further than the city's northern boundary.
<p>What should be the vision for the future of this area?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possibility for a trans-shipment centre to enable lorries of unsuitable sizes to be kept out of the city centre; • Science Park reaching maturity. A demonstration of sustainable development and as a flagship for the city of the 21st century; • Well designed city district, with high density buildings and areas of greenery. A good mix of locally owned shops, businesses and leisure facilities. Transport geared towards bicycles and pedestrians, with provision of the Chisholm Trail; • Preservation of the village of Chesterton with a prosperous

	<p>community, incorporating industry, transport infrastructure, the commons, the river and leisure pursuits;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an area where more intensive development could provide real benefits and resolve adequate access to Chesterton Fen at the same time. It is also a site where taller buildings could be appropriate as long as they do not overpower Chesterton; • Planning of Northern Fringe East must take the Fen Road area into account, particularly in terms of transport infrastructure; • The operation of the waste water treatment works must not be prejudiced by any other development in the area; • The new station should meet the highest standards of design. Car parking should be multi-storey and partly underground. Space above the station should be used for shops and offices. The road layout should be planned strategically using minimum space. Separate road access to Chesterton Fen should be provided and pedestrian and cycle access points carefully considered to minimise the impact on existing residents and green spaces; • Area needs to be considered as a key transport interchange.
<p>What should the key land uses be within this area?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment-led, rather than provision of housing for commuters; • Provision of the community stadium at Northern Fringe East; • Sustainable industry with some on-site retail provision; • Residential, with supporting transport infrastructure; • Mixed use development incorporating employment, retail and residential uses; • Upgraded waste water treatment works, mixed use to maximise benefits of the station development and upgraded sewerage; • Upgraded transport infrastructure, particularly for Fen Road area; • Waste compatible development near to waste water treatment works and safeguarding of land for sustainable transport infrastructure.
<p>Do you think land in this area should be safeguarded for sustainable transport measures?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for safeguarding land for sustainable transport measures; • Support for provision of the new railway station as part of a key transport interchange; • Endorsement of the extension of the guided busway or similar dedicated link along the railway line to Cambridge Station; • Improved bus links;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monorail provision could be revisited; • Cycle route provision is essential; • Impact on on-street parking in wider area needs to be dealt with; • A new river crossing for pedestrians and cyclists is desirable; • New bridleways should also be included.
Are there any other reasonable alternatives that should be considered at this stage?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of a Community Stadium; • Provision of residential development, with supporting transport and other infrastructure.
Cambridge East – general comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The airport pollutes the city and is too near to built-up areas; • Designate the site in the plan as an airport; • Any future development should factor in the need for high quality provision for cycling in order to reduce impacts on the local transport infrastructure; • Retain the existing approach of 4 major growth areas, ensuring public transport connectivity; • Consider the need for provision for household recycling centre and a commercial waste management facility in the Cambridge East area.
Option 34: Cambridge East – Retain current allocation	<p>Arguments in support of this option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing is needed; • If this area is built out, consideration must be given to how people travel in to Cambridge as Newmarket Road is highly congested; • Marshall should be encouraged to relocate. <p>OBJECTIONS TO THE OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marshall confirms its intention to remain at Cambridge Airport for the foreseeable future; • We should not continue an approach predicated on Marshall moving away from Cambridge Airport, including the land North of Newmarket Road; • This option will have negative impacts on biodiversity according to the Sustainability Appraisal.
Option 35: Cambridge East – Safeguarded Land	<p>Arguments in support of this option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge and its sub-region have a history of buoyant growth over many years. Growth will continue. Designating Cambridge East as safeguarded land reflects its inherent qualities as a sustainable location and will give flexibility in the longer term; • Support the retention of the allocation in the interests of

	<p>safeguarding a direct cycleway between Cambridge East and Lode;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marshall should be encouraged to relocate. <p>OBJECTIONS TO THE OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delays decision-making with associated waste and costs incurred from business uncertainty; • Transport infrastructure is inadequate to deliver a sustainable development in this location; • This option will have negative impacts on biodiversity according to the Sustainability Appraisal.
<p>Option 36 – Cambridge East – return land back to the Green Belt</p>	<p>Arguments in support of this option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Marshall decides to leave, the land should be returned to Green Belt. Currently, Marshall provides a green lung and barrier between the city and Cherry Hinton, as most of the land is grass around a runway, not intensively developed; • The land was only taken out of the Green Belt because it was to be used for housing. As it is not to be used for housing (for the foreseeable future) it should be returned to Green Belt; • The airport should remain where it is; • Option 36 is likely to deliver significant benefits in addressing key sustainability issues relating to transport, water, flood risk, landscape and biodiversity as compared to protecting this area for future development. <p>OBJECTIONS TO THE OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing in sustainable locations is needed over Green Belt; • Successive studies have confirmed that land at Cambridge East does not fulfil any Green Belt function. The 2012 Green Belt Study by LDA Design confirms that. Green Belt boundaries are to endure and should only be altered in response to exceptional circumstances. None exists (Marshall); • Site is of little value ecologically in comparison to other Green Belt sites; • The Green Corridor opposite Teversham should be retained as Green Belt: the rest of the site should be Safeguarded Land outside Green Belt designation.
<p>Whilst in South Cambridgeshire District Council, what issues do you think there are for the city with development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land north of Newmarket Road remains an obvious site for development, providing public transport along Newmarket Road corridor can be improved; • There should be a much more serious look at potential for enhanced flood risk caused by building on green areas. Permission for new development should only be granted if consistent with Strategic Objective 2 (reduction of flood

<p>coming forward on land north of Newmarket Road?</p>	<p>risk);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good opportunity for development - probably housing, but also a site for a football stadium; • This development would put yet more pressure on traffic on Newmarket Road; which is badly designed, badly congested and the least attractive approach to the city. The whole area from Barnwell Bridge to Elizabeth Way roundabout needs remodelling, including the retail park which could be reduced in size, with a service road to reduce pressure on the main road. Some scope for housing development if the retail area was reduced; • Development north of Newmarket Road should safeguard the open spaces between Cambridge and Fen Ditton to preserve an extensive area of open land in this part of the city and South Cambridgeshire given the increasingly intensive developments that are likely in the immediately adjacent urban areas; • Sustainable transport infrastructure is key to the development of this area;
<p>Are there any other reasonable alternatives that should be considered at this stage?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain Cambridge Airport and add new option to protect and develop the airport further.

CHAPTER 5 – OPPORTUNITY AREAS

SECTION OF ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT	KEY ISSUES
<p>Option 37: Mill Road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong support for the option; • Mill Road has a distinctive character; • Need to preserve 'local retail' and prevent too many food and takeaway outlets; • Mill Rd is independent but not diverse; • Too many HMOs in area; • Restrict stores with significant (large) amounts of delivery required – as this blocks road for other users; • More regular road closures – such as is done for the Winter Fair – should be encouraged; • Support for controlling mix and size of units and types of uses strong; • Reduce street clutter in area; • Inadequate cycle parking in the area; • More family houses needed in the area;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chisholm Trail vital for Mill Road depot housing development; • Good support for housing on the depot site.
Option 38: Eastern Gate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally good support for the option although some uncertainty as to whether the plans will work (particularly in terms of traffic); • Currently the area is designed for cars, so attracts cars – consider making some parts public transport only?; • Call to extend area as far as Park and Ride site at Newmarket Road.
Option 39: Cambridge Railway Station to the City Centre and Hills Rd Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good support for this general; • Some concern about impact traffic from CB1 is already having, and will continue to have; • A lot of support for improving conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport; • An SPD for the area is needed; • Remove unnecessary street clutter in the area.
Option 40: South of Coldham's Lane	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good to use land, which is otherwise wasted, for community purposes; • Good support for not using the site for housing; • This area of Cambridge would benefit hugely from a relaxing area such as this – it doesn't have much by the way of green space; • Would be an excellent family location; • Would boost the local economy; • Site would be safer with public controlled access than it is at present, with no control; • Very few opportunities to enjoy natural water resources near Cambridge – would be a valuable resource; • Helps encourage exercise and sport; • Support for further industrial and employment uses of the site too. <p>OBJECTIONS TO THIS OPTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site's wildlife and biodiversity needs protecting; • Dangerous site – cliffs; • Contaminated land issues; • Development on land 'west of Rosemary Lane' will compromise the efficiency of airport; • Increased anti-social behaviour; • Increased traffic to area; • Impact on Spinney School; • Cycle, walking and public transport routes need improving.
Other Opportunity Areas to be	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Newtown; • East Road area;

considered:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitcham’s Corner; • Perse playing fields and telephone exchange.
-------------	---

CHAPTER 6 – SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT, CLIMATE CHANGE, WATER AND FLOODING

SECTION OF ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT	KEY ISSUES
Option 41: Innovative and sustainable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong support - Should be fundamental approach to all new development; • Cambridge should lead by example; • Recent unpredictable weather patterns confirm the need for extreme caution. New development should not make the situation (re: flooding) worse.
Option 42: Comprehensive sustainable development policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong support for development of this policy; • Learn from the best examples in Europe where this approach is much further advanced; • Policy needs to cover existing communities, infrastructure and buildings as well as new development; • A clear policy integral to the Local Plan will help assist with the design of development proposals; • Should place emphasis on smarter use of land, especially public realm; • Should include conservation and enhancement of the historic environment; • Promote local food production; • Need to consider behavioural change; • There is a need for a definition of sustainable development, which should then be fed through to all other policies.
Option 43: Sustainable Construction Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the policy – Cambridge should lead by example; • Standards should rise over time and higher standards should be sought from large scale development; • Concern surrounding how such an approach can be achieved where development incorporates historic buildings and redevelopment of existing buildings; • Need to give consideration to impact on viability and alignment with Building Regulations and zero carbon policy; • Consider alternatives to the Code and BREEAM.
Option 44: Detailed targets for on-site carbon reduction related to the levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes being sought	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for this approach; • Some feeling that this would not be ambitious enough.

<p>Option 45: Detailed targets for on-site carbon reduction in line with the findings of the Decarbonising Cambridge report.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for stronger level of policy intervention – Cambridge should lead by example; • Preferred on the grounds of long-term sustainability; • Support for approach for non-residential development being linked to Building Regulations.
<p>Option 46: Leave carbon reduction to Building Regulations and continue to operate a percentage renewable energy policy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for this approach; • Concerns over the impact of this approach on the viability of development; • On-site renewables are not always the most efficient option – policy should allow for off-site renewables to be taken into account; • Policy should focus on carbon reduction and not on-site renewables.
<p>Option 47: Establishment of a Cambridgeshire Community Energy Fund</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that this is a way of allowing developers to do something on the cheap. Focus should be on on-site carbon reduction; • Support for the development of a fund – projects for investment should include retrofit; • Support from some developers for the establishment of such a fund as a way of assisting them with meeting their zero carbon requirements; • More detail required on how such a fund would be governed and administered.
<p>Option 48: Renewable and low carbon energy generation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for development of a positive approach to renewable and low carbon energy; • Some concern from developers about the impact of connecting to district heating on the viability of development (although aspiration is supported); • Support for designation of strategic district heating areas – look to connect existing properties as well as new; • Consider opportunities to work with the local universities to deliver pilot renewable energy projects.
<p>Option 49: Climate change adaptation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong level of support for policy development; • Urban greening very important; • Need to consider long-term maintenance requirements for some adaptation measures (e.g. SuDs); • Further detail regarding setting tree canopy requirements needed; • Should be applied to existing communities as well as new development.
<p>Option 50: Consequential</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some support for the development of such a policy; • Concern over the cost implications for householders and

improvements policy	<p>landowners of such a policy;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for care when dealing with heritage assets; • Make reference to the Cambridge Retrofit project.
Option 51: Develop a comprehensive integrated water management policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very important policy to develop – strong level of support; • Concern that requirement to set aside 10-15% of development area for open space/multi-functional surface water management could impact on viability of development.
Option 52: Water efficiency – water neutrality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear need for a policy dealing with water conservation; • General support but with questions as to whether this policy would be achievable; • Need to consider approach to engaging the existing community in water reduction; • Concern from developers over impact on viability of new development; • Support Option 53 up to 2022 moving up to Option 52 after 2022.
Option 53: Water efficiency – 80 litres/head/day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear need for a policy dealing with water conservation; • Concern from some that this approach would not go far enough in dealing with issues of water shortage and its wider impact; • Support from those who see this as a more realistic option than option 52; • Need to consider approach to engaging the existing community in water reduction; • Concern from developers over impact on viability of new development; • Support Option 53 up to 2022 moving up to Option 52 after 2022.
Option 54: Water efficiency – 105 litres/head/day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear need for a policy dealing with water conservation; • Concern that this approach would not go far enough in dealing with issues of water shortage and its wider impacts; • Need to consider approach to engaging the existing community in water reduction; • Support from developers as less focussed on seeking enhanced measures.
Option 55: Water efficiency – non-domestic buildings – full credits for water efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support from those who feel that the highest possible standards should apply across all new development regardless of use; • Concern from developers around the impact on the viability of new non-residential development as well as refurbishment of existing buildings.
Option 56: Water efficiency – non domestic buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support from developers as this represents a lower cost option and is less likely to impact on viability; • Other stakeholders object to this approach on the grounds

– BREEAM	that it would not go far enough in dealing with issues of water shortage and its wider impacts.
Option 57: Develop a comprehensive flood risk reduction policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong level of support with policy development seen as vital; • Need for clarification as to how policy would be applied to extensions/refurbishments.
Option 58: Develop a water body quality policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong level of support for development of such a policy.
Option 59: Develop a green roof policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some support for this approach from residents and other stakeholders due to their multiple benefits; • There are some concerns surrounding the impact on the viability of new development, conflict with renewable energy provision and the long-term maintenance costs of green roofs; • The Local Plan should not be too prescriptive.

CHAPTER 7 – DELIVERING HIGH QUALITY PLACES

SECTION OF ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT	KEY ISSUES
Option 60: Delivering High Quality Places	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong support from most responses – seen as a vital policy; • Need to show significance of city townscape; • Extra policy needed to require pre-app preparation and consultation on development briefs for all major developments; • Policy needed to prevent demolition of buildings until development starts; • Hard to define high quality design; • Developers need to respect the current ‘style of the city’ and not impact upon this with design that is not akin to it.
Option 61: Criteria based responding to context policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally supportive of the policy; • Scale is critical; • Some of the terminology needs to be altered to make clearer (“grey infrastructure for example); • The policy doesn’t give enough scope for innovative development; • Ensure internal space requirements are adequate.
Option 62: Criteria based policy for delivering high quality places	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only include public art as an integral part of major new developments; • Needs to be made clear at what scale of development these policies are aimed at – criteria not relevant to all schemes;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge should develop a 'local identity' in design; • Add safe walking and cycling routes to the criteria.
Option 63: Criteria based policy for the design of buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is refurbishment covered here? Surely this should be covered in Option 66; • Many recent buildings not reached 'high quality' of design; • Contemporary and 'historical' designs can both be suitable for a new or old site if design is good.
Option 64: The design of the public realm, landscape and other external spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good support for the option in principle; • Shared space can cause issues between drivers, cyclists and pedestrians; • Need to avoid street clutter too; • Need to upgrade the public realm in context with the city and its historic nature; • Open space needs to be provided, not commuted sums.
Option 65: Requirement for the production of design codes in respect of growth areas for all outline planning applications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some concern that it could lead to another tier of design and access statements – this will cause delays and expense; • Only suitable for large scale development; • Would need greater public consultation and awareness; • Should encourage walking and cycling.
The importance of public art provision in new developments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considered desirable, not essential, so no need for specific, individual policy; • Should only be part of major new sites.
Option 66: Criteria based policy for alterations and extensions to existing buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing buildings need to respect their context; • There may be instances where large buildings are appropriate (i.e. to accommodate larger families). Should recognise this; • Should this section consider alterations for the purpose of improves sustainability / energy efficiency?

CHAPTER 8 – PROTECTING AND ENHANCING THE HISTORIC AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

SECTION OF ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT	Key Issues
Option 67: Protecting and enhancing the historic and natural environment (Strategic priority)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The city should have a heritage policy and a discrete environment policy; • Reference should be made to minimising light pollution; • Hazards to heritage assets should be clearly defined so that aims become meaningful; • Option 67 would not be adequate to form a strategic historic environment policy for the Cambridge Local Plan;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns at the loss of green spaces and the need for more trees.
General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks specific inclusion of college playing fields as part of Cambridge's distinctive historic environment; Victorian/Edwardian suburbs such as North Newtown should be given special consideration and mention in the Local Plan and their heritage assets protected; Support the clear distinction between the historic setting of Cambridge and rural area beyond and suggest it is a good reason to retain the Green Belt.
Option 68: Protection and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recent development of tall buildings has detracted from the skyline. High rise should not be a feature of Cambridge; Historic buildings, rivers and green spaces are essential to the character of Cambridge; Cambridge's historic environment is what makes it special, it is internationally important; This section tries to cover too much ground and should be split up. Too many issues to be covered by one policy; 'Views' which have been used extensively to argue against development in large areas of the city need to be carefully considered. There is no definition of 'local' or 'strategic' views; Support the protection of the wider setting of the city; There is also a need to maintain the usability of historic buildings, heating and insulation for example; Buildings may not just have architectural merit but also may be important in terms of local history; The 2006 Local Plan should be a template for any new policy; The policy should not be unnecessarily prescriptive or restrictive and should support 'sustainable development'; A policy on Article 4 directions; Enhance protection of conservation areas; Protection and enhancement should include 'in line with ecological needs'; Protection of views should include views that are created; The current policies on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas are fine and should be replicated together with a policy on archaeology; There is a need to retrofit energy efficient improvements to Cambridge's historic stock; There may be instances where 'wider public benefit' should be taken into account in relation to proposed development to historic buildings; Enhancement must include stringent approval of materials; A separate policy on the setting of designated heritage

	<p>assets would be useful</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need to recognise that Buildings of Local Interest are undesignated heritage assets. Consequentially the wider public benefit required to outweigh their loss will be less than for designated heritage assets; • More important to protect the historic environment where it is damaged e.g. Newmarket Road.
<p>Option 69: Protection of Buildings of Local Interest and Development of a Local List</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no requirements stated within the NPPF relating to local lists. A specific policy dealing with Buildings of Local Interest is out of step with the NPPF; • Colleges depend on being able to use and modify their buildings in order to achieve their educational purpose. Colleges are not simply curators of buildings decided by others to be of local interest at the expense of practicality; • There is no reason why, in a compact city such as Cambridge where over 1000 buildings are listed and almost ¼ of the city covered in Conservation Areas, Buildings of Local Interests should be considered so valuable to the city's heritage that they should be given a higher level of protection than that contained within the NPPF; • The Council's reason for designation of Buildings of Local Interest needs to be far more transparent and there should be a statement of what is significant about each Building of Local Interest.
<p>Option 70: Works to a heritage asset to address climate change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are occasions when maintaining the existing use may require a more substantial loss of significance to a heritage asset than a new use; • It is not clear what the third bullet point (in the case of change of use; ensuring the sympathetic reuse of the heritage asset) brings to the consideration of climate change and heritage assets; • Supplementary Planning Guidance on this issue might be sufficient, and would be beneficial in providing more detailed advice; • The option should be more weighted to protect the historic asset; • Conservation and renewal need to allow for embodied energy; • The age and importance of the building should not be used as an argument for no action or too little action to reduce carbon emissions of such buildings; • Adaptation to the works or the historic fabric should primarily use traditional materials; • Traditional methods/materials may not be the most appropriate or sustainable ways of enhancing the performance of historic buildings.

<p>Option 71: Shopfronts and signage policy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shopfronts and signage should be required to be sympathetic and positive in relation to the character of the building; • There still needs to be much work done with corporate brands; • Some shops require shutters or bollards to deter robbers; • A policy allied to a review of the Shopfront Design Guide would be appropriate; • There is no need for a Local Plan policy on shop fronts and guidance. Advice on these and other ‘advertisement’ issues could be provided in SPD guidance; • Commercial development in the historic city centre must be controlled in order to maintain a sense of place; • Support aligned to a policy supporting small units and diversity of use types; • Current policy seems to be sufficient; • There should be a presumption against chains using their house style and an effort made to harmonise shop fronts in the City Centre; • Remove shutters from premises that have them and don’t permit new ones; • The use of advertising billboards on busy pavements should be stopped.
<p>Option 72: Criteria based tall buildings policy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to emphasise the city’s heritage and approve only mid-height buildings; • The historic core is particularly unsuitable for tall buildings; • This could be used in conjunction with Option 73 (identifying specific areas suitable for tall buildings) to create individual, iconic and slightly taller buildings in some areas and groups of significantly taller buildings away from the city’s historic core; • Overall bulk of buildings must also be considered carefully; • Tall buildings do not fit with Cambridge and should only be allowed in exceptional cases; • The criteria must be much more demanding without being restrictive. High quality materials and craftsmanship should be included. Aesthetic values such as colour, texture, contrast, detail and massing need to be taken into account. Tall buildings should only be for extraordinary exceptions; • Support the development of the policy supported by guidance setting out design and locational criteria in order to assess the suitability of development proposals on a case by case basis; • Tall buildings can work well in the right place if proper thought is given to design; • It would be better to have a policy that precludes tall

	<p>buildings unless they can clearly demonstrate that they will not result in harm to the setting of historic buildings or the historic core, including more distant views of the city's skyline;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to know what the Council's definition of tall is.
Option 73: Policy identifying specific areas suitable for tall buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tall buildings can provide a positive contribution to the street scene, the Compass House site within the Eastern Gate would be an area suitable for tall buildings; • Specifying areas for tall buildings is unnecessary, development should respond to local character and distinctiveness.
Option 74: Limits on building heights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specifying a maximum height for buildings is unnecessary. An upper limit might encourage developers to build to just below it; • A policy which limits building heights is needed; • Need a policy like this to protect the historic core; • The limit should be 5 storeys; • Needs to be one height restriction over the historic core and a less onerous but proportionate one over the rest of the city; • A policy like this would limit innovative design and would reduce the opportunity to make the most efficient use of land which in turn would impact on development viability; • A criteria based approach that deals with tall buildings on a case by case basis would be better; • Height should relate to function and purpose so a rigid limit is not appropriate; • One of the attractions of Cambridge is its human scale. The gradual encroachment of tall buildings negatively impact on this; • Area wide restrictions on building heights would be unnecessarily prescriptive; • Need to safeguard the historic skyline; • It is essential that building height and density is in keeping with neighbouring areas, particularly where domestic buildings are concerned; • There should be guidelines on the height of buildings permitted; • Height should be measured in absolute terms and not by number of storeys as residential and commercial buildings have different floor heights; • Missing comment about rooftop visual garbage (air conditioning, lifts, aerials) that can be detrimental to views; • Preservation of views of open space needs to include the River Cam corridor.
Question 8.16: Do	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 storeys applied across the city centre and views into it;

<p>you have any suggestions as to the height limit that could be set across the city, should Option 74 be the policy approach adopted? Should a policy cover just the historic core, or should it cover the wider city?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy needs to apply across the whole city; • A maximum height above sea level should be proposed; • 4 storeys in the historic centre, 6 in the areas built up before WW2 and 12 – 14 further out, except where they would impinge on the beautiful skyline; • Maximum height in general – 20m. Exceptions might be allowed in the city centre where height can contribute positively in a visual scene. Tapering of buildings is preferred to vertical blocks; • Need a policy tailored to different areas of Cambridge. No tall buildings in the city centre and a height limit on all buildings in neighbouring heritage/conservation areas; • Centrally limits should be 6 storeys and 4 in suburban areas; • 5 storey maximum to the whole city; • The height limit policy should be restricted to the inner core. Outside the inner core the height limit should take its guidance from existing tall buildings e.g. Foster’s Mill. This would ensure there are suitable zones for office and residential buildings; • To not exceed current building heights.
<p>Option 75: Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone and Safeguarding Zones</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The air navigation orders must already deal adequately with this part of the city; • Government advice requires an appropriate policy regarding the public safety zone; • This policy is unnecessary, a number of buildings that exceed the safety zone restriction have been built in the city in recent years; • The policy is needed, there is a strong likelihood that air traffic at the airport will increase over the plan period.
<p>Option 76: Paving over Front Gardens</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simply require paved over gardens to have adequate soakaways for their drainage systems; • Ideally soft paving should always be used; • This will continue to increase our capacity to reduce flood risk; • All developments, not just front gardens should increase porosity by use of adequate materials and soakaways; • Support clear guidance on the factors that need to be considered when contemplating paving over front gardens, including the impact of the character of the area and surface water runoff; • Support for a policy because of the negative visual impact of paving over front gardens; • The removal of walls in conservation areas to facilitate extra parking is something that should be resisted; • Silly to go for green roofs if we are concreting front

	<p>gardens;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With stringent restrictions on parking in the city, there should not be any restrictions on people parking in front of their houses; • Given that this is often permitted development the policy is unnecessary. If it is a concern in conservation areas, it should be flagged up in Conservation Area Management Plans; • There needs to be clear control on this and potentially rear gardens as well.
Option 77: Protection of sites of nature conservation importance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were several general statements of support for this policy which is seen as important; • Object to the appropriate assessment of sites that are not covered by the Conservation Regulations 1994 (e.g. county or city wildlife sites). This requirement would be unnecessarily onerous and could impact on the viability of development; • Development proposals near such sites should not be 'assessed', they should be thrown out automatically. There should be no development on wildlife sites; • Policy/policies should ensure that development will only be supported where it can be adequately demonstrated that proposals will not have an adverse effect on biodiversity, where required suitable mitigation measures must be acceptable and deliverable; • The policy is needed and it needs to be enforced robustly; • Better protection is needed for green spaces and commons within the city; • Measures to enhance biodiversity should promote native species.
Option 78: Protection of priority species and habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several statements of support in favour of a policy for the protection of priority species and habitats; • When a case is made for protection of a species that are not on the Section 41 list it must also be considered; • No need for a Local Plan policy, detailed guidance should be provided in SPD guidance on Nature Conservation issues.
Option 79: Enhancement of biodiversity as part of all development proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should be amended to allow pooling of biodiversity gain in adjacent sites, nearby green spaces and adjacent corridors; • The requirement to minimise the impacts of development on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity is included in the NPPF. It is not necessary to repeat the policy in the Local Plan, it should be incorporated into Option 64 (Design) and the wording should reflect the wording in the NPPF;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance in this regard including opportunities to reduce costs through identifying and replicating successful approaches should be developed.
Option 80: Enhancement of Biodiversity as part of major developments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less desirable than Option 79 as it does not apply to all developments;
Option 81: Include reference to biodiversity within Option 64 (the design of the public realm, landscape and other external spaces)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less desirable than Option 79 as it does not apply to all developments; • It would be better if Option 79 was added to Option 64; • The requirement to minimise the impacts of development on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity is included in the NPPF. It is not necessary to repeat the policy in the Local Plan, it should be incorporated into Option 64 (Design) and the wording should reflect the wording in the NPPF; • So long as 'public realm' includes developments of less than 10 houses, a unified approach is welcome; • Several statements of support for a policy of this nature; • Some sites have not been designated despite their wildlife value e.g. Chesterton Sidings; • No need for a policy but detailed guidance should be provided in an SPD on Nature Conservation issues; • Support the inclusion of a biodiversity enhancement programme but suggest it should be wider than the options presented; • Worth noting the value of allotments.
Option 82: Support for strategic biodiversity enhancement proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option is essential to support the creation of a viable and functioning ecological network across the city to deliver the Green Infrastructure Objectives; • Large sites need to have this assessment; • The 2011 Green Infrastructure Strategy will provide a useful starting point for the identification of proposals.
Option 83: Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several statements in support of this policy option; • A replacement policy would be more sensible than preventing trees from being harmed; • The 'wherever possible' element could allow developers to wriggle out of their responsibility; • In favour of the retention of hedges and veteran trees; • A flexible approach should be promoted; • The criteria for judging whether a tree should be felled needs to be stronger; • The policy should recognise the role of trees in the setting and character of the city and its neighbourhoods, and in

	<p>providing visual amenity, environmental and social benefits;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When a large tree is removed a greater number of smaller trees should be planted, to ensure similar levels of habitat; • The Council’s proposed policy should incorporate the flexibility provided in the NPPF (Paragraph 118) where the loss of veteran trees might be outweighed by the benefits of new development; • Policy needs to account for the felling of trees in anticipation of development; • There should be ongoing maintenance of trees provided as part of large developments.
Option 84: General Pollution Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General statements in support of a policy option on pollution; • One overarching policy dealing with pollution is sufficient; • A preferred approach would be that a general policy on pollution be supported by SPD guidance on the individual issues of air quality, noise and contaminated land; • Light pollution is a growing menace; • Additional recent damage to the health of people living near major roads from extra development needs to be recognised; • ‘External lighting’ should include internal lighting that is visible externally.
Option 85: Air Quality Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A preferred approach would be that a general policy on pollution be supported by SPD guidance on the individual issues of air quality, noise and contaminated land; • Don’t build housing next to the M11/A14; • Pollution by contractors’ vehicles and plant also needs to be addressed; • This option needs to cover current air quality not just that for new development; • Additional recent damage to the health of people living near major roads from extra development needs to be recognised.
Option 86: Noise Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several general statements of support for a noise pollution policy; • Several mentions of noise pollution caused by the airport including that separate mention should be made of aviation noise; • Several mentions made of traffic generated noise including that noise reduction measures should include reduction measures for existing sources of noise (e.g. traffic from the M11); • Policy should look at existing industrial sources of noise; • Eliminate noise at the source (e.g. car alarms);

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound insulation needs to be improved in modern properties; • The A14 upgrade would surely have a detrimental effect on noise.
Option 87: Contaminated Land Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research into prior uses can identify potential hazards at an early stage and avoid the necessity of remedial work during construction; • A preferred approach would be to include a general policy on pollution matters with guidance on individual issues within SPD guidance; • There should be a presumption that all brownfield sites are contaminated and a detailed assessment should be required in each case. When remediation is required on phased developments it should be a condition that the whole site is remediated at the outset, not on a phased basis; • There should be more stringent control of radioactive waste around the city. Sites central to and around Cambridge still release radioactive waste.
Option 88: Light pollution policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirement for a need assessment, site survey and modelled levels of light spill should not be required for all types of development as this would be unnecessarily onerous and costly for small developments. The requirement should only apply to major development, development with floodlighting or in countryside locations; • Street lights should go off at 2am; • New lighting should be low energy; • All cycle routes in urban areas should be lit with normal street lighting; • The policy should give consideration to energy saving, impact on biodiversity but also public safety and crime prevention; • Particularly important in the western part of the city, because of the impact on observatories; • A preferred approach would be to include a general policy on pollution matters with guidance on individual issues within SPD guidance; • 'External lighting' should include internal lighting that is visible externally (stairwells); • There should be an additional requirement for an ecological assessment of the impact of any proposed lighting scheme; • Policy should take account of heritage street lighting and the lighting character of an area; • Missing mention of safety and designing out crime.
Option 89:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street clutter is a persistent problem;

Detailed visual pollution policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No need for a separate policy, other policies in the plan allow these matters to be addressed; • The design of buildings can involve visual pollution; • Require commercial premises use lower lighting when shut.
----------------------------------	--

CHAPTER 9 – DELIVERING HIGH QUALITY HOUSING	
SECTION OF ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT	Key Issues
General comments – Affordable Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Privately rented housing is not considered sufficiently in this chapter; • Forecasting of demographic trends is needed to underpin housing chapter; • Should recognise need of ageing population; • Housing cooperatives should be considered; • Commuted payments towards affordable housing should not be collected in lieu of delivery of affordable housing.
Option 90: 40% or more Affordable Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for this approach, which is well established; • Concern that insufficient affordable housing would be delivered; • Concern was expressed about the impact on viability.
Option 91: Proportion of Affordable Housing – 50% or more	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for a higher percentage than the existing 40% approach; • Concern that insufficient affordable housing would be delivered; • Concern was expressed about the impact on viability.
Option 92: Proportion of Affordable Housing – 30% or more	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern was expressed that 30% would be insufficient to meet local need.
Option 93: Lower qualifying threshold for Affordable Housing provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to reduce the threshold to deliver more affordable housing; • A threshold of 10 dwellings was suggested; • Concern was expressed about the impact on viability.
Option 94: Maintain current threshold for Affordable Housing threshold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to reduce the threshold to deliver more affordable housing; • Insufficient affordable housing has been delivered under the current approach;
Question 9.3: Should there be any other variants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smaller sites should be subject to a lower percentage of affordable housing, e.g. 20 – 30%; • A tiered approach dependent on the size of the site;

<p>to this, for example, where schemes have less than 15 dwellings, the proportion of affordable housing sought might be less than 40%?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More self-build or community building; • No, as this would diminish delivery of smaller sites; • 40% should be the norm, unless proven that the development is not viable.
<p>Question 9.4: Do you agree with the approach to clustering affordable housing, or do you feel an alternative approach would be more suitable?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing clustering would help community cohesion; • Clustering can have related management issues; • Clustering can affect the viability of developments.
<p>Option 95: Affordable Housing contribution for new student accommodation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would contribute to overall need; • This option does not recognise that for a proportion of students it is their permanent home whilst at Cambridge • Would it really lessen pressure on housing stock?; • It could impact on viability, slowing down development; • Would place additional pressure on the housing market and upon the colleges/universities; • The policy should be restricted to require delivery of affordable housing from speculative developers.
<p>Option 96: No Affordable Housing contribution from new Student Accommodation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would not place additional pressure on the housing market and upon the colleges/universities; • Students put pressure on the city's services and should contribute affordable housing.
<p>Option 97: Specified Tenure Mix</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The minimum of 75% of the 40% to be housing for rent should be retained; • This would place added constraints on the market.
<p>Option 98: Tenure mix specified through the SHMA and Affordable Housing SPD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tenure mix should not be set out in the Local Plan since flexibility is required to take account of changes in housing requirements and also other factors such as funding provision and Central Government specifications.
<p>Option 99: Employment related housing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 99 could help prevent new housing simply being taken by London commuters; • Encourages local working; • What happens when a person in employment related housing leaves the employer?; • Many people prefer to live away from their work;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to the creation of enclaves; • There is clearly a need for affordable housing provision, but there is a lack of evidence that locally specific circumstances exist to require employment related housing; • It is important to explore the possibility of specific institutions and employers providing housing specifically for their staff, particularly for the University and its colleges; • It would need to ensure that low paid employees were not excluded from this housing; • It should be secondary to enforcing the provision of affordable housing; • Disincentive to economic development and growth; • Need to specify key worker housing; • Should not negate need for affordable housing; • College employees should be included if housing is provided by University of Cambridge; • A % of affordable housing should be given over to key workers and University and College workers should be included on a list of key workers.
Option 100: Housing mix – General policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 100 is preferable to Option 101 as it would allow local circumstances, needs and the housing market to determine the appropriate mix on each site; • Support, but need to avoid high density and very tall buildings; • Strong vision for an area is needed, developed in close consultation with residents.
Option 101: Housing mix – specific levels policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support, but need to encourage 3 bed dwellings or more for families; • Support more provision suitable for the elderly; • Support, but need minimum unit sizes; • Support provision of housing cooperatives; • Support, but need to avoid high density and very tall buildings; • Option 100 is preferable to Option 101 as it would allow local circumstances, needs and the housing market to determine the appropriate mix on each site; • It would lead to poor design; • The detail in the policy is critical – the character of the site and area, the market and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment are vital; • General approach is supported, with the mix in developments determined at the point of planning permission, responding to the market, local need and viability; • Should ensure adequate unit sizes, including provision of

	<p>sufficient 3 bed + units;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The types of accommodation on sites depends on location. It would be preferable to retain flexibility; • The mix of housing must not lead to high density or high rise; • There is a need to understand who needs what size dwelling in Cambridge; • Mix is a key lever for affordable housing; • Properties should be based on size, not number of bedrooms; • Need for more family housing; • Need for housing for the elderly; • Occupancy levels are important; • Space standards are vital.
<p>General comments – Housing Density</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing density will impact on local transport infrastructure and services; • Cambridge is a compact city and any further efficient use of land should be supported through provision of high quality cycle provision. High levels of car parking should be resisted: • There is a clear and demonstrable need for this policy if new developments are considered; • The policy would need to suit local circumstances; • Cross-boundary approach is needed with South Cambridgeshire; • The population of Cambridge should not expand any further; • Setting density is in conflict with residential space standards; • There is a need for a policy, but one which sets maximum rather than minimum densities; • Setting densities should be avoided and each site density assessed on its own merits. Arbitrary thresholds could easily result in inappropriate developments in sensitive areas; • Any density policy must include safeguards to ensure that the new development fits in with the existing development context; • Setting density is in conflict with residential space standards; • An additional option is required which seeks generally higher densities in central areas, but stresses the importance of also safeguarding the historic core of the city, and lower densities on the fringes of the city to respect the adjoining Green Belt, to ensure that the compact nature of Cambridge is not harmed and the need for family

	<p>housing is also met;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher densities should only be possible in areas with good transport infrastructure.
Option 102: No specific density policy or requirements – design led approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option will provide more capacity to deal with growth; It would allow local context and the housing market to determine the appropriate density on each site. This would result in more contextually appropriate development than Options 103, 104 and 105, which lack flexibility; Density must be dependent on site and context. Tall buildings must be dealt with by separate policy; Density is vitally important to the well-being of the city's residents; Some sites where high densities have been achieved have given rise to problems with inadequate internal and external spaces and car parking; Need to avoid cramming development into sites whether following a design-led or dwellings per hectare approach; Need to specify a maximum density.
Option 103: Establish minimum threshold densities in the City Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Denser housing is needed; Option 102 would allow local context and the housing market to determine the appropriate density on each site. This would result in more contextually appropriate development than Options 103, 104 and 105, which lack flexibility; There should be an option to set maximum densities, rather than minimums; Densities should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.
Option 104: Establish a minimum threshold of average net density within 400 metres of district and local centres on high quality public transport routes and transport interchanges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50 dwellings per hectare is a realistic level in such areas; Option 102 would allow local context and the housing market to determine the appropriate density on each site. This would result in more contextually appropriate development than Options 103, 104 and 105, which lack flexibility; There should be an option to set maximum densities, rather than minimums; Densities should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.
Option 105: Minimum density of 30 dph for all development sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option was not supported by any respondents; Option 102 would allow local context and the housing market to determine the appropriate density on each site. This would result in more contextually appropriate development than Options 103, 104 and 105, which lack flexibility;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be an option to set maximum densities, rather than minimums; • Densities should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.
<p>General comments – Residential Space Standards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to ensure a wide mix of sizes of property with adequate internal and external spaces to be family-friendly; • Need to prevent developers from squeezing too much into a development to create unacceptable living standards; • A number of respondents considered that Options 106 and 108 would represent a good combination of policies, whilst others considered that Options 107 and 109 would represent a good combination; • Need for a policy on standards for shared outdoor space for blocks of flats; • Need to build consumer awareness; • The first bedroom should always be big enough for two people to accommodate changes in circumstances; • Properties need private outdoor space of a reasonable depth and width; • Need for a long-term view of the immeasurable value of private gardens.
<p>Option 106: Minimum standards based on the level of occupancy (bedspaces)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current developments do not provide sufficient space for ordinary living; • This option should be combined with Option 107 as there are good aspects in both options; • Minimum space standards for principal rooms are desirable but the areas counting towards meeting the standard should have minimum headroom of at least two metres, preferably 2.1. There might be some relaxation for under eaves space but this should be minimal. Gross area for such rooms without any regard to height is not acceptable. All designated bedrooms should be large enough to accommodate an adult, their storage and dressing space; • Option 106 is preferred to Option 107, which could produce properties that are difficult to adapt or sell in future. Spacious houses sell well and in general people are getting taller and proportionately larger; • Minimum space standard should be based on occupancy levels; • Space standards should be determined by the market. Those able to buy or rent in the open market can exercise choice in terms of the balance between standards, space, affordability and location; • Imposing minimum space standards could adversely affect viability and deliverability of constrained sites, and would reduce the total number of units delivered in the city and the ability to deliver affordable homes and community

	<p>facilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence from the Home Builders Federation shows that whilst dwelling sizes may be smaller in the UK, the average occupancy level of new housing within the UK is amongst the lowest in Europe; • Increasing the size of homes necessarily increases costs to purchasers; • This can be carried out through development control mechanisms for new development and does not need a specific policy. There is no need to repeat other legislation in the Local Plan.
<p>Option 107: Minimum space standards based on a range of dwelling types.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too many dwellings are far too small; • Ceiling heights and principal rooms need minimum height and sizes. There is also a need for cycle, outdoor amenity and garden space; • Developers will not voluntarily do this; • It is in the interests of residents and the non-overdevelopment of a site to do this; • This option should be combined with Option 107 as there are good aspects in both options; • Minimum space standards for principal rooms are desirable but the areas counting towards meeting the standard should have minimum headroom of at least two metres, preferably 2.1. There might be some relaxation for under eaves space but this should be minimal. Gross area for such rooms without any regard to height is not acceptable. All designated bedrooms should be large enough to accommodate an adult, their storage and dressing space; • Option 106 is preferred to Option 107, which could produce properties that are difficult to adapt or sell in future. Spacious houses sell well and in general people are getting taller and proportionately larger; • Space standards should be determined by the market. Those able to buy or rent in the open market can exercise choice in terms of the balance between standards, space, affordability and location; • Imposing minimum space standards could adversely affect viability and deliverability of constrained sites, and would reduce the total number of units delivered in the city and the ability to deliver affordable homes and community facilities; • Evidence from the Home Builders Federation shows that whilst dwelling sizes may be smaller in the UK, the average occupancy level of new housing within the UK is amongst the lowest in Europe; • Increasing the size of homes necessarily increases costs to

	<p>purchasers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This can be carried out through development control mechanisms for new development and does not need a specific policy. There is no need to repeat other legislation in the Local Plan.
<p>Option 108: Minimum space standards for private outdoor amenity space only</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should not be a minimum standard for private outdoor amenity space. This should be determined by the market; • There could be recommended standards for minimum private outdoor amenity space standards but with flexibility to tailor to specific circumstances, for example, it could be reduced if the site is constrained, or if there is a high proportion of public amenity space in close proximity; • To impose a specific minimum requirement will be to constrain development sites coming forward, and will diminish the delivery of housing on certain sites. Each application should simply continue to be considered on merit as at the present time; • The space provided should be appropriate to the development and its location. Gardens that are contiguous have greater amenity and ecological value than separate fragments of land. The overall open space requirement coupled with a common-sense approach on a case by case basis can produce better results; • Minimum space standards need to be set out for outdoor amenity space, though not to the exclusion of other space standards.
<p>Option 109: General provision of outdoor amenity space</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those able to buy or rent in the open market can exercise choice in terms of the balance between standards, space, affordability and location; • Imposing minimum space standards could adversely affect viability and deliverability of constrained sites, and the ability to deliver affordable homes and community facilities; • Evidence from the Home Builders Federation shows that whilst dwelling sizes may be smaller in the UK, the average occupancy level of new housing within the UK is amongst the lowest in Europe; • Increasing the size of homes necessarily increases costs to purchasers; • Whilst well-intentioned, this option may allow too many loopholes to be meaningful; • The space provided should be appropriate to the development and its location. Gardens that are contiguous have greater amenity and ecological value than separate fragments of land. The overall open space requirement

	<p>coupled with a common-sense approach on a case by case basis can produce better results.</p>
<p>Option 110: No space standards specified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those able to buy or rent in the open market can exercise choice in terms of the balance between standards, space, affordability and location; • Imposing minimum space standards could adversely affect viability and deliverability of constrained sites, and the ability to deliver affordable homes and community facilities; • Evidence from the Home Builders Federation shows that whilst dwelling sizes may be smaller in the UK, the average occupancy level of new housing within the UK is amongst the lowest in Europe; • Increasing the size of homes necessarily increases costs to purchasers; • Standards are critical, no action is not a good option; • The space provided should be appropriate to the development and its location. Gardens that are contiguous have greater amenity and ecological value than separate fragments of land. The overall open space requirement coupled with a common-sense approach on a case by case basis can produce better results;
<p>General comments – Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Housing Design Standard</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new homes should include the provisions of lifetime homes as the costs are modest and it will only have the effect of slightly increasing the area of the dwelling; • Support a combination of 112 and 113, say 10% wheelchair housing design standard and a further 15% to Lifetime Home standard. This would improve our performance on this issue (an important one given our ageing population and historical failure to anywhere near meet the needs of the disabled), while not imposing too high a standard for developers; • Support Option 112 if the proportion of new homes to meet Lifetime Homes Standards is increased from 15%; • Space needs are greater not only for physically disabled people but for people with other forms of disability e.g. learning disability, for example when they require a carer or carers all the time or for most of the time. Autistic people may not be able to go out very often because of the lack of adequate support and it has been known for some time that many disabled children (including autistic children) need extra room at home so that they can play; • It should be a mandatory assessment with a system of awards; • Fiscal incentives should be introduced to make attractive to many of those living in larger houses (e.g. single occupation

	of family homes) to downsize/smartsize, freeing up accommodation to those who have families.
Option 111: Lifetimes Homes standard applied to all development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new homes should be designed for safe and comfortable movement in and around them. If Cambridge were to adopt a Housing Design standard that required specific justification for raised thresholds, steps or narrow doorways, most of the Lifetime Homes criteria would become the norm, and people would not be excluded from parts of their own or their friends' houses by mobility problems; • Options 111 and 113 impose a requirement for 100% Lifetime Homes and a proportion of housing to meet Wheelchair Housing Design Standards, which would result in an unnecessarily adverse impact on the viability of the development, and would increase the challenge of successfully developing constrained sites. The requirement for Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Housing Design Standards should reflect local needs and the characteristics of a site; • Option 112 would be more appropriate, although additional flexibility should be incorporated to ensure that viability is not adversely affected, by including the wording "unless not viable";
Option 112: A proportion of new homes to meet Lifetime Homes standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 112 would be more appropriate than Option 111, although additional flexibility should be incorporated to ensure that viability is not adversely affected, by including the wording "unless not viable"; • With changing demographics and health needs and with the aim of helping people to continue to live independently, we should aspire to design homes that are as flexible as possible; • All new housing should be built to Lifetime Homes standard.
Option 113: A proportion of new homes that meet the Wheelchair Housing Design Standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are increasing numbers of disabled and elderly people; • Needs can change very swiftly, so housing should be adaptable to suit those changing needs; • Options 111 and 113 impose a requirement for 100% Lifetime Homes and a proportion of housing to meet Wheelchair Housing Design Standards, which would result in an unnecessarily adverse impact on the viability of the development, and would increase the challenge of successfully developing constrained sites. The requirement for Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Housing Design Standards should reflect local needs and the characteristics of a site; • Option 112 would be more appropriate, although additional

	flexibility should be incorporated to ensure that viability is not adversely affected, by including the wording "unless not viable".
Option 114: Criteria based policy for small scale residential development and infill development in the rear of gardens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measured policy option which does not preclude development where appropriate and design standards are high; • Option 114 is preferable to Option 115, which does not provide sufficient flexibility to consider local circumstances for infill development in rear gardens. Option 114 provides adequate criteria to ensure such development is appropriate; • The option helps provide additional housing with a variety of designs to enhance the city's landscape; • It reduces the pressure on Green Belt land; • Gardens are a precious commodity and a defining quality to areas; • Loss of amenity space coupled with problems posed by flooding make this option unwise; • Deterioration of quality of life.
Option 115: Policy to restrict infill development in rear gardens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection should be given to gardens with mature trees; • Gardens are vital for biodiversity; • Gardens are a precious commodity and a defining quality to areas; • Gardens are an important part of reducing flood risk; • Very specific local circumstances could support this approach; • There is a presumption against development of gardens; • Deterioration of quality of life; Whilst welcoming a tougher policy stance on infill development in rear gardens, this should not preclude redevelopment on derelict sites; • Option 114 is preferable to Option 115, which does not provide sufficient flexibility to consider local circumstances for infill development in rear gardens. Option 114 provides adequate criteria to ensure such development is appropriate; • This option does not result in a balanced approach; • The amount of green space in residential areas needs addressing; • Need to restrict infill in existing areas of high density development;
General comments – Housing in Multiple Occupation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The designation of three storeys seems out of date with so many houses having loft conversions; • Inhabitants of large HMOs are often transient and some landlords do not keep their properties in a good state of repair; • Want to avoid HMOs outnumbering local family homes so

	<p>support the proposed policy;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to see specific policy that deters the conversion of large family homes to HMOs; • The need for a policy was largely supported by respondents. Particular reference was made to the need for a cap on the number of HMOs in a given area. • Where respondents objected, it was based on the impact that restrictive criteria on HMOs could have on the Cambridge housing market; and upon the difficulty of enforcing such a policy. A number of Colleges and Anglia Ruskin University responded in objection due to the impact restrictions could have on students' access to housing; • There should be a requirement for all licensed HMOs to lodge contact details for their owners and managers with local police or on the City Council website, so neighbours can have immediate access in cases of anti-social behaviour or emergencies; • Restrictions on car ownership and parking permits should be considered; • The value of shared housing needs protecting rather than restricting; • Many small houses in Romsey don't count as HMOs due to being on two storeys, but are overcrowded and provide poor living conditions; • Housing stock should be used efficiently, rather than being restricted; • Largest properties need improved regulation, without limiting the contribution that flexible shared housing makes to local housing provision; • There should be a review and improvement plan for the private rented sector.
<p>Option 116: Criteria based policy for HMOs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car parking is often a vexed issue with HMOs, so it is welcome to see it covered in the criteria; • HMOs can be an active nuisance, particularly when occupied by students. Restrictive criteria are welcomed; • HMOs need to be of a reasonable quality to safeguard residents and reduce impacts on neighbours; • HMOs are an essential sector of the housing stock at the lower end of the housing market. A positive approach should be taken to provision. Para 9.67 states 20% of HMOS are occupied by students. Therefore HMO policy should link in to a supportive policy for the provision of new student accommodation as the demand for both types of housing increases; • HMOs are an important part of the housing market in Cambridge. Cost of housing prices many young people out

	<p>of the market. There is a shortage of affordable housing and 8,210 people on the Council's waiting list. HMOs play an important role in meeting housing needs and enabling workers who cannot afford to buy to live in the city close to where they work. Restrictions on HMOs will worsen affordability and push rents up;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a cap on HMOs; • There is the need to consider cumulative impact of HMOs in a given area, as they impact on availability of family housing and weaken the sense of community in a locality; • The threshold for converting small housing units to HMO should be lowered.
General comments – Specialist Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for large, high quality retirement homes; • Need for bungalows for the elderly; • Housing cooperatives should be given more consideration; • Need to separate specialist housing from affordable housing categories.
Option 117: Specialist Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the principle of the option; • Residents of specialist housing should have good access to safe and secure open space. It is important to health and well-being; • Whilst supporting the need for a policy, caution should be exercised in specifying amenity space requirements for accommodation for the elderly; • Specialist accommodation should be available within communities so that people can remain within their existing community even if they require more care; • Any policy relating to specialist housing must take into account the market's ability to deliver such provision and other site-specific demands; • Specialist housing should be close to a local centre.
General comments – Opportunities to provide new housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should always be the presumption particularly for buildings of historic interest and in conservation areas that any conversion returns the house or building to its original use; • Identify empty houses to be repaired and brought back into use (perhaps using council loans to be paid back once a house is let or sold); • Identify derelict sites on residential streets, which could be used for small amounts of housing (e.g. the old tapes shop on Gwydir Street); • Older buildings and those not in use should be renovated to address housing needs before there are schemes for large scale housing developments that lack community infrastructure.

<p>Option 118: Opportunities for providing new housing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option was supported by all respondents to this issue. Concern was raised that it should be designed to avoid short-term thinking and to ensure that opportunistic development does not result in a skewing of the overall housing mix in a given area; • Emphasis should be less on the need to create new units of accommodation and more on the need to retain the existing variety of stock suitable for different household sizes.
<p>General comments – provision for Gypsies and Travellers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that the Traveller population is being underestimated and that this will increase the level of unmet need for Traveller provision, including land, locally; • Gypsies and Travellers are the largest minority group comprising 1% of the population in our region, yet the Council suggests only 1 pitch is required between 2011-2031. The Cambridge Sub-Region Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTAA) 2011) seriously underestimates the need for permanent pitches in Cambridgeshire. The Assessment was carried out by the local authorities themselves as a technical exercise; • The gradient of inequalities may be steeper than reported here. The recent inequalities report from the DCLG includes the following statement in relation to life expectancy "...a recent study stated that the general population were living up to 50% longer than Gypsies and Travellers"; • Wording should be more careful on whether Gypsies and Travellers travel; • There is a need for Travellers to have better access to education; • This statement does not sufficiently recognise the extent to which Travellers have been forced into Council accommodation against their wishes and in a way which erodes their culture, and nor does it reflect the detrimental effects of being forced into council housing; • A significant part of the demand for new pitches is from Gypsies and Travellers moving from bricks and mortar into private sites. The numbers seriously underestimate the numbers involved; • Needs to be independent consultation with the Traveller community; • Consideration should be given to a transit site near Addenbrooke's; • Need to continue working with South Cambridgeshire to progress pitch provision.
<p>Option 119: Criteria based</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirement that 'There should not be an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents or the

<p>policy for the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites</p>	<p>appearance or character of the surrounding area.' allows for prejudice to determine objections by other residents;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The approach to Traveller sites should be as similar as possible to that for housing; • Protection of residential amenity is paramount; • Green Belt land should not be used for Traveller site provision.
<p>Sites for Gypsy and Traveller provision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific site allocations must be made; • Support planning permission for pitches at the existing Smithy Fen site in Cottenham; • Improve current sites and improve transport links to these sites; • Large sites should be possible to allow the Traveller community to thrive in large, mutually supportive, extended family groupings. Amenity blocks and provision for chalets as well as trailers and caravans are all necessary. Without permission for sufficient amenity blocks proper sanitation will not be possible leading to inhumane living circumstances; • The Council could substantially enhance the prospects for traveller development through a policy to connect the Fen to Cowley Road, providing more direct connection to the trunk road network for heavy vehicles. Given the presence of the railway sidings this is likely to be along the northern boundary of Network Rail's land; • Spend grant funding on provision of new permanent sites with proper amenities; • Provide sites on brownfield uncontaminated sites; • Take on ideas from other existing sites where there is high quality internal and external landscaping to improve amenity for both traveller and settled communities. • • Sites within the urban area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land off Coldham's Lane might be suitable for Traveller Site provision; • A transit site should be found near to Addenbrooke's; • • Sites within the Green Belt <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas on the edge of the city should be set aside for new provision; • A transit site should be found near to Addenbrooke's; • Need to consider the area adjacent to the new station at Northern Fringe East. The three authorities need to consider this jointly; • Provision should be made in South Cambridgeshire or elsewhere in the county;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beside Babraham Road Park and Ride site.
Question 9.51: Should land in the Green Belt be considered for Gypsy and Traveller provision?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was limited support for the provision of sites in the Green Belt. Concerns included: • The Green Belt should not be released for this purpose; • Sites should be provided in South Cambridgeshire beyond the Green Belt; • Any significant areas of Green Belt released for housing should also make provision for Gypsies and Travellers.
General comments – Residential Moorings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of respondents supported the need to identify areas for new moorings, with reference made to marina provision. Concern was raised that moorings should be provided within the city boundary with standards enforced, equivalent to those which would be required of land dwellings. For example, coal and diesel should not be burned emitting fumes at one to two metre height.
Option 120: Residential moorings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many respondents supported the need for residential moorings despite having concerns about the reality of their development and potential for knock-on impacts in a given area (as outlined in the arguments against this option); • New residential moorings should not be at the expense of short-stay tourist moorings; • New residential moorings should not be to the detriment of the riverscape; • Need to consider impact on parking in a locality; • Need to consider amenity of local residents; • Risk of air and water pollution.
Sites for residential moorings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fen Ditton; • Land to the west of the River Cam off Fen Road formerly designed as a Waste Transfer Station under the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan 2009. Low lying floodplain with limited excavation required and significant capacity for moorings; • Land to the south-east of Clayhithe Bridge, Waterbeach, owned by the Conservators of the River Cam and let for seasonal cattle grazing. Probably Green Belt; • North side of the River Cam, near Fen Road; • Further mooring on the south side of the river could be provided on Stourbridge Common, but a better path should be provided.

CHAPTER 10 – BUILDING A STRONG AND COMPETITIVE ECONOMY

SECTION OF ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT	Key Issues
Option 121:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essential that the Council continues to support the

<p>Building a strong and competitive economy</p>	<p>University of Cambridge which supports Cambridge's economy, social and cultural life and environment;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable development for homes and jobs close to Cambridge will help build a strong and competitive economy; • Should plan for growth outside Cambridge, close enough to benefit from links to the University; • Need for growth should not be assumed at this stage; • The report downplays Anglia Ruskin University's role; • Cambridge's economy too skewed towards public sector; • The number of people and jobs need to be balanced; • Emphasis on strong sectors will exacerbate city's imbalance; • Encourage affordable employment space; • Limited land means much employment growth will have to go in surrounding districts; • Need to support economy of Cambridge sub-region; • Good transport links between employment sites important.
<p>Vision - Employment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should concentrate on quality over quantity; • Important to translate vision into policies that deliver new homes and supports the economy; • Need to support creation of new high tech firms; • Lack of land is surely and argument against further growth; • Growth cannot go hand in hand with maintaining quality of life; • The Vision should reference green spaces that contribute to compactness and attractiveness of the city; • The role of education establishments should be strengthened, flexibility around their growth is important; • Growth should be encouraged elsewhere; • Should not become a dormitory town for London or a shopping centre for the east of England; • A more balanced economy creating jobs for those with lower level qualifications.
<p>Selective management of the economy – general comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should look at growth of professional, service and retail industries commensurate with high tech growth; • Amend policy to allow small scale companies involved in research, development and production to support commercialisation of research; • Existing policy isn't restrictive enough, growth should be encouraged in other areas of the country; • This policy has helped keep Cambridge a nice place to live; • High tech manufacturing and HQs require major investment in rail and road infrastructure to be competitive; • Manufacturing development is unlikely to be viable given high costs in Cambridge;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to preserve Cambridge’s special character; • Should support live-work units and studios for inner areas; • Building higher, where existing buildings are only one or two storey would help create capacity.
Option 122: Continue with selective management of the economy unamended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for employment uses which provide a service for the local population; • The current policy is working; • Focus on strengths and locate larger, land hungry, businesses outside Cambridge; • Reserve land for uses that support high tech industry; • Only relax if local economy is stalling; • Should apply only to new buildings, not conversions, or retrofitting existing buildings; • Unduly restrictive and restricts employment growth in the city; • Amend slightly to allow manufacturing and HQ development associated with the cluster; • Based on looking back and playing it safe.
Option 123: Amend selective management to include some additional uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High tech HQs should be encouraged, will encourage employment diversity and organic growth; • Support the wider economy; • Promote high end manufacturing; • Increased flexibility may help retain commercialisation of research; • HQ operations are important to grow large companies; • High tech HQs could just contain back office staff; • High tech HQs and manufacturing should be considered separately; • High tech manufacturing growth needs to be coordinated with surrounding districts, Alconbury is a potential location; • Existing policy allows for high tech HQs to locate to Cambridge; • High tech manufacturing growth will impact on traffic in Cambridge; • Will increase pressures on land supply, increasing prices and rents; • Should apply only to new buildings, not conversions, or retrofitting existing buildings; • Unduly restrictive and will continue to restrict employment growth in the city.
Option 124: Discontinue the policy of selective management of the economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Let the market decide; • Current policy discourages development of employment space that no longer meets modern standards, restricting supply of office space; • Current policy too restrictive; • Current policy contrary to the spirit of the Use Class Order;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current policy unfairly discriminates against non-local users; • Should maintain focus on high tech service sector; • Free for all would allow industrial sprawl; • Encourage businesses with real roots in Cambridge that will remain through the bad times as well as the good.
Protection of industrial and storage space – general comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without protection, no industrial site can fight off residential land values; • Plans should be able to rapidly respond to changing circumstances; • Policies should not seek to protect sites where there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for that purpose; • Increased flexibility, but not to change to offices, but for cultural activities or even housing; • Vital need for small workshops as initial homes for new businesses.
Option 125: Continue with protection of industrial and storage space unamended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effectiveness of its implementation should be enhanced; • Critical to success of Cambridge economy; • Traffic generated by these uses tend to be outside rush hours; • Once lost, potential is gone forever; • Cambridge’s strengths lie in service sector; • These uses that have significant transport impacts, should be relocated outside Cambridge; • Empty sites could have office uses on them; • Some protected industrial sites do not have much industry on them; • Fails to provide sufficient flexibility.
Option 126: Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space by deleting all protected sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend criteria to assess sites; • Increased flexibility where employment sites are surplus to requirements; • Cambridge’s strengths lie in service sector; • Will allow redevelopment to residential, adding to congestion, and reducing employment opportunities for low skilled workers; • Once sites are lost from employment use, they are lost forever.
Option 127: Amend the policy of protection of industrial and storage space to encourage other forms of employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should apply where there are persistent vacancies; • Improve job diversity; • Increased flexibility; • Counter productive to enforce unviable uses to remain on a site; • Loss of best industrial sites; • Important to sustainable live/work plans; • Cambridge’s strengths lie in the service sector;

development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Still not sufficiently flexible.
Protection of office space – general comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on supporting redevelopment/upgrading of existing stock; and • Increased offices in the historic core will impact congestion and the environment.
Option 128: Do not protect office space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not necessary, market forces can achieve a sustainable balance; • Increased flexibility for owners; • Many existing empty offices, and new offices going up near station; no need to protect offices.
Option 129: Protection of office space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to sustainable live/work plans; • Not necessary, market forces can achieve a sustainable balance; • Reduced flexibility for owners, impacting on Cambridge economy; • Many existing empty offices, and new offices going up near station; no need to protect offices.
Promotion of cluster development – general comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discontinue policy as of no apparent value; • Strong support for cluster development, especially knowledge-driven, creative or high tech industries; • The new station will help the cluster expand; • Clusters assist networking; • Promoting clusters is in line with the NPPF; • Provision of incubator units can help some entrepreneurs; • Provides a positive statement of the type of development the Council wishes to see; and • Needs to mention growth of SMEs.
Option 130: Continue to promote cluster development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides reassurance to potential occupiers that sites will be occupied by related uses; • Justifies the principle of development on some sites; and • Carry forward existing policy; • Cluster should grow naturally.
Option 131: Do not promote cluster development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should look at what businesses are actually doing; • Carry forward existing policy.
Promotion of shared spaces – general comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a matter for Local Plan policy; • Not necessary or desirable; • Lack of facilities on commercial developments leads to extra journeys during the day; • Gardens for communal lunches; • Only realistic on larger employment sites; • Occupiers may have to subsidise; and • Increased costs to developers will increase rents.
Option 132: Promote shared	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot be left to market forces, will only be of interest to

social spaces	<p>developers with a long term interest;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires a long term commitment to them; • Community is important in workplaces; • Support for residential over commercial premises to enliven areas after hours; • No arguments against the option.
Option 133: Do not promote shared social spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No arguments against the option; • Requires a long term commitment to them; • Support for residential over commercial premises to enliven areas after hours.
Densification of employment areas – general comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should be planned in coordination with the transport strategy; • Densification should be complemented by fast connecting transport links, particularly at peripheral locations; • Smarter use of land; • Densification should not undermine value of open spaces and social areas, should be considered on a case by case basis, not a blanket policy; • Higher densities promote walking and cycling; • Densification where good public transport exists or can be provided; • Care must be taken of the historic environment in Cambridge; • Brownfield development is better than Greenfield; • Increased traffic from denser developments; • Criteria based policy may be effective.
Option 134: Densify existing employment areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support with adequate weight given to possible detrimental effects (traffic, noise, visual intrusion); • Will reinforce transportation, density and sustainability goals; • Preferable to erosion of green spaces and Green Belt; • Makes best use of employment land supply. • No arguments against the option.
Option 135: Do not densify existing employment areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional pressure to erode green spaces and Green Belt.
Retail development sites	<p>No specific sites were suggested, but the following suggestions were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redevelop Newmarket Road retail warehousing to use land more efficiently; • Distributed local shopping centres should be actively encouraged to reduce carbon emissions and ease congestion in the city. Suggestions within the city include Chesterton and Trumpington;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trumpington near new housing developments, around Business Parks or near new Chesterton Station; • Concentrated in City Centre through infill. Suggest Hobson Street to complement planned improvements as part of the Better Bus Area Initiative. Existing shops would benefit from improved street frontage and greater footfall; • Redevelopment at Mitcham’s Corner; • Waitrose should be in the Trumpington centre and this should be re-classified as a District Centre; • Classify Beehive Centre as a District Centre; • City Centre should be the focus for new comparison floorspace in line with NPPF and the sequential approach; • Retail provision in the new housing areas with access by all forms of transport.
<p>Option 136: General shopping policy that applies to all centres</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of objections to Option 136 which proposes a general policy for all centres. Preference for Option 137, which separates criteria for different types of centre, as different centres perform different roles and functions in the retail hierarchy; • Objection to larger retail developments providing smaller units. This would be an unnecessary restriction on development. Not in line with NPPF; • The growth of internet shopping is likely to reduce use of retail outlets in the city and reduce the need for increasing retail jobs; • There should be no loss of shops without justification; There is a need for economic vitality in all parts of the city, not just the City Centre; • The city requires more and smaller local shops outside the City Centre; • Economic downturn means that there does not seem to be any sort of justification for additional floorspace; • Object to control of floorspace by percentage of A1 use; During an economic climate where there should be a drive for town centre vitality and viability, such policies are considered too restrictive.
<p>Option 137: Separate policy options for different types of centre</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lots of support for this option which proposes a specific policy for each of the different types of centre and recognises the role and function of each type of centre would be different.
<p>Option 138: Neighbourhood shops</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed views on this option; • Support for retail facilities in the community; • Neighbourhood shops are fundamental and currently get little attention; • Neighbourhood shops make a huge contribution to the

	<p>quality of life, but conditions are hard for them. Any encouragement for them is to be supported;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual properties outside of town centres need to have flexibility to react to changing economic demands and thereby prevent properties standing empty where there is an alternative viable use; • Should not support unsustainable businesses, anti-competitive.
Option 139: No policy on neighbourhood shops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed views on this option; • Support for local shops which serve the community and to prevent loss of pubs / restaurants. These are community assets; • Shouldn't support economically unviable shops; • Market forces should determine viability; • Need a flexible policy – market forces will ultimately determine the issue; • Needs to be realism in the approach to whether a shop continues to be viable or not.
Option 140: New foodstore in North West Cambridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally supported but some objection – do not believe that a policy is needed in this respect; • Support as this would formalise the Informal Planning Policy Guidance; • The foodstore if approved should have a filling station; • Scope for a bus connecting to out of centre stores; • 2,000 square metre maximum requirement is too low and contrary to the findings of the Council's evidence base and the requirements for the NIAB site; • A policy on this could also apply to the University site.
Option 141: Convenience shopping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little support for such a policy; • Any policy should accord with an up to date evidence base and the NPPF; • Don't believe a policy is needed in this respect; • Let the market decide; • No need for a policy as it lacks flexibility and would discourage economic growth and competition. New convenience development should be considered against the requirements of the sequential and impact tests in NPPF; • Some support - agree that only small scale development of floorspace is desirable.
Option 142: Retail warehousing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lots of views that bulky goods should be sold outside the City Centre, and that there may be a need for a further retail warehouse park, but away from Newmarket Road due to the congestion, noise, pollution, road safety; • Suggestions for new locations – in South Cambridge(shire), site North of Marshall's, somewhere near guided busway, park and ride sites as they already have parking;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ruling out the delivery of further retail parks is shortsighted, given the expansion of the city. Are all of the city's residents expected to fit down Newmarket Road? • Absence of retail warehouse parks will probably simply increase electronic shopping; • It is not realistic or appropriate to plan for the 'relocation' of the Beehive Centre; • Some objection to retail warehousing generally as it leads to car use, pollution etc; • Support policy in principal but could be strengthened to categorically disallow provision of non bulky goods retail outside of allocated centres. The cumulative impact of out of centre retailing is a major concern and must be prohibited beyond genuine bulky goods, in order to prevent future harm to the City Centre; • Should not be wasting such a large amount of space on car parking. Have shops close to City Centre and collection or delivery of purchases can be arranged e.g. John Lewis at Trumpington; • Car parking on Newmarket Road is a waste of space – could be served by a multi-storey to release land for business use or small industrial units. Residential use appears to be ruled out by soil contamination.
<p>Option 143: Continued development of University of Cambridge's Faculty Sites</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essential that the Council continues to support the University of Cambridge which supports Cambridge's economy, social and cultural life and environment; • Support further faculty development provided the option is monitored; • North West Cambridge will prove to be very sustainable for students; • Strongly support but add Madingley Rise to list of faculty sites; • Support but should also support other Higher and Further Education colleges such as Westminster College and Abbey College; • Mill Lane is a prime site for more student accommodation as part of mixed use; • The University of Cambridge should downsize as it has outgrown the nest; • The Colleges equally contribute to economy as they have their own governance, property and staff; • Addenbrooke's has grown enough; • North West Cambridge and West Cambridge developments do not meet the needs of the Colleges in the city centre.
<p>Option 144: University Of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong support for the option but it is not an alternative to Option 145;

Cambridge staff and student housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate housing for the University and Colleges is fundamental to their continuing success; • Support provided open character of colleges maintained; • Should acknowledge role of small HMOs; • Change of Use Class C3 gives no protection to family housing; • Need to consider the needs of Higher and Further Education Sector as a whole not just the two Universities.
Option 145: Expand existing Colleges rather than plan for new Colleges at North West Cambridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The University supports growth in both locations in order to provide for student needs; • North West Cambridge is too remote from existing colleges. New colleges won't help existing colleges with their shortfall in student accommodation; • Some uncertainty whether new colleges would emerge at North West Cambridge
Option 146: Anglia Ruskin Faculty Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARU needs to expand its postgraduate provision and wants to stay on East Road and Young Street site and is unlikely to relocate; • The Master Plan for East Road should be allowed to evolve; • ARU have a satellite site in South Cambridgeshire District at Whitehouse Lane which is in the Green Belt; • Any satellite should be as close as possible; • Relocate student residences from East Road to create more space rather than developing a second campus; • ARU should be expanded in Chelmsford and find a third site in Norfolk or Suffolk; • ARU is important to local economy but has lost a lot of green space at East Road. They should look to Fulbourn and further afield if they want to expand further; • Petersfield should not become ARU's campus; • There should be no more ARU campuses in the city.
Option 148: Anglia Ruskin - Support for student hostel provision but remove affordable housing exemption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the policy but it should not be confined to Cambridge University and Anglia Ruskin University; • Policy 7/9 has been successful; • Its time to reverse policy and push for more affordable housing; • Support but could allow a reduced affordable housing percentage on sites with hostels rather than no affordable housing provision; • Affordable housing is vital in Cambridge and should take priority over Anglia Ruskin University; • Removing the exemption will put more pressure on students to find accommodation in shared houses; • Some students like to live in shared houses as they feel more integrated within the community than is the case with hostels.

<p>Option 149: Speculative student hostel accommodation limited to ARU and Cambridge University</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is inequitable to discriminate against non University Colleges; • Language Schools should not be excluded.
<p>Option 150: Speculative student hostel accommodation widened to include other established educational institutions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support, so additional student accommodation can be provided for other types of institution like Abbey College; • Support, other than the criteria for external amenity space which is difficult on brownfield sites; • Change needed as current policy inequitable; • It applies equally to specialist schools such as language schools; • Policy should include student and staff housing for these institutions.
<p>Option 151: Specialist colleges such as secretarial and tutorial colleges</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support introduction of new policy to enable specialist schools to provide financial and cultural benefits; • Language schools make an important contribution to the economy; • All specialist schools should be treated the same way.
<p>Option 152: Language Schools</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 152 preferred provided large residential houses are not lost. Keep controls to prevent too many specialist schools opening; • Both types of school should provide adequate hostels; • Retain a policy on language schools but widen to include other types of school. Restrict as far as legally possible opening of other new schools; • It is inappropriate to refer to behaviour when considering whether a policy towards expansion is appropriate.
<p>Option 153: Additional hotel provision based on a high growth scenario of around 2,000 new bedrooms</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support provision of higher growth in hotel rooms but it shouldn't be used as a cap; • Strongly support option, as there is a huge demand for more rooms for business and the University. The deficit is far greater than that for residential; • Support the policy for at least 2,000 additional bedrooms but add some flexibility for the location within Addenbrooke's; • Support the policy provided it is managed and monitored. Need more staying visitors not day-trippers; • Support option and it might allow less successful hotel sites to be released for residential or care homes if the high forecast is not achieved; • Our door should be open but we should not be actively seeking hotels; • Go for lower number of bedrooms as it would encourage

	<p>less traffic;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Petersfield has been targeted for budget hotels which will cause gridlock on Newmarket Road; • The City Centre cannot accommodate much more growth and this will add to parking issues. Develop new hotels on the edge of the city where guests can use Park and Ride.
Option 154: Additional hotel provision based on a medium growth scenario of around 1,500 new bedrooms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A policy is not required for this matter as market forces should decide.
Option 155: Location of new hotels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small boutique hotel at Mill Lane; • Suitability of one at the airport is supported; • NPPF at paragraph 23 calls for vitality in town centres. Cambridge suffers from overcrowding rather than lack of vitality. NPPF advises look to edge of city when City Centre sites unavailable; • Mill Lane isn't a viable location for a 5 star hotel.
Option 156: Support the development of existing City Centre hotels and conversion of suitable City Centre properties to hotels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose the view that large houses with 5+ bedrooms are unsuited to family accommodation; • City centre redevelopment will hit conservation issues; • Possible sites include Bingo Hall on Hobson Street, Llandaff Chambers over Mandela House, Sainsbury's in Sidney Street if they moved, GA building on Hills Road /Station Road corner, 32-38 Station Road.
Option 157: Treat serviced apartments as hotel uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These are not part of the housing market and should be recognised as hotel uses.
Option 158: Prevent the change of use of newly built permanent residential accommodation to a use for short term letting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support as it makes the process transparent; • Depends how you define short term. Letting for less than 6 months would be ok.
Option 159: Use licensing to control serviced apartments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looks to be best if local authority has the powers; • Depends how you define short term. Letting for less than 6 months would be ok; • Use of serviced apartments provides flexibility in housing

	market if they can't sell or do a long let.
Option 160: Retention of hotels in the City Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support if there is flexibility to exit the market; • Support retention of hotels in the centre, which needs to be defined.
Option 161: Do not include a policy to retain hotels in the City Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likely to get a better hotel offer by freeing up the market rather than adding constraints to it.
Option 162: Visitor Attractions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support particularly the development of Kettle's Yard area as secondary tourist destination for people staying in the city; • Cycle parking standards must be applied to attractions; • Not appropriate in city - develop sports and leisure attractions in hotels beyond city e.g. as at Bar Hill.

CHAPTER 11 – PROMOTING SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITIES

SECTION OF ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT	Key Issues
Option 163: A green and pleasant city with vibrant and culturally diverse neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for this option however <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Neighbourhoods should also be relaxing; ○ Green spaces should be multi-functional and support the objectives of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy; • The areas should include proper management of the natural environment and 'wildlife corridors'; • Community facilities should be protected and enhanced but not preclude the possibility of change of use, multi use or relocation based upon a strategic assessment in Cambridge. The policy itself should be sufficiently flexible to meet changing circumstances.
Protection of open space - general comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make protection and enhancement (including better management) a priority; • Support the ongoing protection of open spaces; • Support the maintenance of a green network of open space linking areas of Cambridge together along the Cam; • No intrusive developments along the Cam; • Development that can be seen from the River Cam and as such would spoil the character of the Cam should be resisted; • Relationship between the city and its open spaces is a defining aspect of Cambridge; • Recognise important transport function of paths alongside the Cam; • Support for Local Green Space designations and the need for

	<p>guidance on green areas;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of existing areas becoming overused if new provision is not made available; • Provide new spaces and not allow developers to pay contributions; • Allotments are essential and should be provided for along with design requirements.
Option 164: Protection of open space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for much tighter criteria regarding the satisfactory replacement of existing areas (including direct and indirect benefits); • Resist loss of open space; • Open spaces form part of the historic character of Cambridge and should be protected accordingly; • Much stronger policy is needed to prevent loss of open spaces under current Local Plan; • Need to continue with current policy protection and protect green lungs within the city and the urban edge (e.g. playing fields); • Overly restrictive policy that prevents development which respects environmental quality; • Potential of expansion of local schools provides an opportunity to enhance the quantity of provision; • Remove reference to Green Belt as this is not open to the public and is already protected as a separate designation; • Policy fails to weigh up the public benefit against the loss of public open space; • Lack of up-to-date evidence supporting existing open space policy; • Allowing protected open space for recreational reasons only to be replaced elsewhere should not be permitted. Where is elsewhere?
Option 165: Update the standards in line with the Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support principle for allotment provision for all residential developments; • Maxima not minima provision should be sought; • Allotment provision: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unviable or not desirable and would provide long-term issues to do with servicing and maintenance; ○ Unrealistic in built-up area; • New open spaces provided should be adopted and maintained by public organisations to ensure public access
Option 166: Maintain the current standards for open space and recreation provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge has many open spaces and recreational areas; • Allotment provision unviable or not desirable and would provide long-term issues to do with servicing and maintenance; • Inadequate in light of growth plans including allotment provision.

Option 167: On-site provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support is conditional on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Having clear reasons for not providing an onsite contribution; ○ Presumption in favour of onsite provision; ○ Off-site provision only in exceptional conditions; ○ Very clear guidance; ○ Onsite provision is completed before occupation; ○ No planning permission unless onsite provision is provided • Green spaces should be multi-functional and support the objectives of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy; • Dislike for off-site contributions; onsite provision should be provided wherever possible and weighted according to ward deficit; • Need to consider leisure facilities which provide play and sports facilities; • Accessibility of open space needs to be considered.
Protection of existing leisure facilities – general comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to consider wider social and recreational needs of a community with consideration of accessibility; • Policy criteria should consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stringent tests and consultation of existing and potential users of leisure facilities; ○ Facility use and reasons behind current performance; • Need to provide new leisure facilities in existing built-up areas; • No recognition that alternative uses outweigh retention of existing leisure facility; • Include sites on Community Asset Registers; • Growth must be accompanied with new leisure facilities; • Local need should not be defined by landowners and developers. Local opinions should take priority; • Contributions to support the new facilities are essential; • Increase access of sporting facilities owned by University, colleges and schools to the public.
Option 168: Protection of existing leisure facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for the policy option; • Policy needs further clarification particularly in relation to the terms used.
New leisure facilities – general comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for securing community use of sports facilities built on educational sites; • Need to clarify definition of leisure facilities; • Include sites on Community Asset Registers; • Assessment of the long-term viability of leisure facilities.
Option 169: New leisure facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for the policy option with some suggesting clarification;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy needs further clarification and clarification of the terms used; • Local people should be involved with the design and management of new facilities.
Community facilities – general comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy needed to provide the planning criteria to assess proposals for new public houses and separate from Option 176 New Community Facilities; • More emphasis on venues for use by various age groups for community activities; • Support for community interaction; • Many different views on what should and should not be included in the definition of community facilities; • Definition should include community kitchens, swap shops, free shops, tool libraries, charity cafés, local shops and pubs, private huts and places of worship, affordable community dance halls, boat clubs; • Inclusion of educational facilities dependent on local needs; • Highways and private places made open to the public.
Option 170: Protection of existing community facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for protecting community facilities; • Policy needs to enable new provision: • Include sites on Community Asset Registers with reference in Local Plan; • Need to take account of a balance between densification and local community needs; • Consider extending the marketing period to 18 or 24 months; • The means of access to new facilities remains the same as the previous facility.
Public Houses – general comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public houses are vital to the vitality of the high street. The change of use for pubs needs to be stopped; • Support for and against protecting public houses; • Need to protect public house gardens; • Failure to reflect community and historical value of pubs regarding their replacement; • More positive approach should be adopted; • Facilitate restaurant in former pubs becoming pubs against instead of alternative uses.
Option 171 - Public Houses: Market led approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With this option, there would be no clear means by which developers could establish that the premises were not viable as a pub business; • If business was truly viable then it would not be up for closure – protection of some public houses would be futile; • Pubs represent important community facilities and must be protected; • Pubs need to be given a chance to be viable – market forces can be variable.
Option 172 -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With this option, there would be no clear means by which

Protection for all Public Houses	<p>developers could establish that the premises were not viable as a pub business;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option would not be a true reflection of current market trends and would lead to an increase in disused pubs which may never reopen; • This approach may not offer complete protection of public houses as they could simply become a restaurant before changing into an alternative use; • Support for this approach – loss of public houses could lead to isolation of communities.
Option 173 - Safeguarding Public Houses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for this approach as it would provide a clear means by which a developer can objectively establish viability; • This option would provide a much needed safeguard against unwelcome closures and unsuitable conversions; • Independent assessment of a pub's viability is very important; • Concern that the policy could become overly restrictive – needs to be flexible to reflect economic realities and the values and benefits of alternative uses; • Presumption in favour of maintenance is a very good idea.
Option 174 – Extend safeguarding of public houses to former public houses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This approach should be adopted; • To try and bring properties back into pub use when they have been out of this use for a considerable time is a disproportionate policy response.
Option 175 – Allow flexible re-use of public houses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Former public houses identified as such and in use as a community facility should be able to revert back to this use without the need for a planning application.
New community facilities – general comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of attention paid to existing deficits in community facilities; • Needs an option with more emphasis on making good shortfall in existing communities; • No reference to applications for entirely new public houses.
Option 176: New community facilities Option 177: The provision of community facilities through new development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 176 and 177 are complimentary; • Relocation of hospice to Southern Fringe; • Shared facilities are not always possible due to conflicting demands and needs; • A new sixth form college needed in North West Cambridge; • Shortfall in the provision for climbing in Cambridge; • Support for a policy.
Faith Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for carrying out a survey; • Council should adopt a policy supporting the provision of faith facilities; • No specific policy required.
Arts and cultural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theatres should not be included in a description of leisure

<p>activities – general comments</p>	<p>facilities but in cultural facilities. Viability may apply to leisure facilities but not with the same weight for cultural facilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option should be link to transport strategy; • Facilities need to be protected and enhanced as the sub-region expands; • Proven need is crucial; • Opportunity for a legacy building; • Designate Cultural Quarters; • Need an innovative arts and archive centre.
<p>Option 178: Support for arts and cultural activities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for this option but further clarification is required and real demand for venue exists; • Consider former public houses identified for redevelopment to be converted into arts and culture centres;
<p>Provision for sub-regional sporting, cultural and community facilities – general comments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for general purpose halls and rooms that are sufficiently flexible to be used for a variety of activities; • Shortfall in the provision for climbing in Cambridge; • Developing Canoe Trails and access provision for canoeists; • Need for a multi-lane rowing facility; • The PMP 2006 report for Cambridge Horizons identified a gap in the sports provision within the Cambridge sub-region ; • Support for an 8-10,000 capacity stadium; • No need for Cambridge to provide facilities for the area which should be provided elsewhere; • Affordable ice rink needed.
<p>Option 179: A new Sub-regional stadium</p> <p>*It should be noted that these figures do not include responses made on the Community Stadium to the South Cambridge Local Plan – Issues and Options consultation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 119 out of 139 respondents to this question supported a new sub-regional stadium. Of the 119 supporters, 30% were Cambridge residents, with the remainder living outside the city. Many of the supporters appeared to be supporters of Cambridge United FC. The 20 objectors came from the following areas: 5 each from Trumpington & Grantchester; 7 from Cambridge & the remainder from Coton, Hauxton & Haslingfield. • Those supporting the proposed new sub-regional stadium also suggested a number of other sites for the delivery of the stadium , for example Cambridge East and NIAB. • Community Stadium would benefit the area; • Clear need for a Community Stadium ‘live entertainment’ facility with indoor training pitch and ancillary commercial space; • Shortfall in provision and support for a climbing wall; • Develop canoe trails and provision for canoeists; • Support for full size boating lake; • Many people supporting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Support the proposed 8-10,000 capacity stadium; ○ Support the venue to be suitable for other sports as well e.g. rugby and hockey.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many people responding indicated that Abbey Stadium should not be retained citing reasons such as the lack of training facilities and poor transportation links. Site could provide much need housing. • Responses indicated that the development of Abbey Stadium for housing was conditional on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not causing further transport issues; ○ The area being enhanced; ○ Replacement sports facilities are provided and improved upon and with suitable affordable housing; ○ Replacement sports facilities are first provided; • Other responses to indicated that the development of Abbey Stadium should not include a supermarket or offices; • No need for Cambridge to provide regional facilities; • Location of stadium at Trumpington Meadows is unsuitable mainly due to transport issues; • Stadium would alter the village character of Trumpington; • Location of stadium South of Cambridge unsuitable; • Abbey Stadium was supposed to provide a Community Stadium in 1999; • Community Stadium is unviable; • Loss of Green Belt; • Many people objecting suggested an alternate location including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ North of Marshalls; ○ Abbey Stadium; ○ Newnham; ○ Southern Fringe • Support the venue to be suitable for other sports as well e.g. rugby and hockey; • Abbey Stadium should be retained as a Community Stadium or as a community facility rather than high-density housing. CUFC should not move from the Abbey Stadium. Relocation may not overcome issues of congestion and parking in a residential area; • Developing Abbey Stadium for housing was not acceptable but retained/improved or it should be for another type of sports facility; • The proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Conflicts with the definition given the commercial background of the project; ○ Lack sufficient parking; ○ Fail to take account of local communities and Trumpington's village setting; ○ Should be more inclusive e.g. facilities should permit amateur and recreational sport activities with less focus
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ on football and open to other sections of the community; ○ Raises concern about the additional retail and housing; ○ Need to increase access for Cambridgeshire schools; ● Grosvenor's proposals are unacceptable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increased traffic and parking congestion in the surrounding area and additional burden on Park and Ride; ○ Increased burden on schools (new school at Trumpington Meadows cannot meet the additional need); ○ Significant additional erosion of the Green Belt; ○ Encroachment on the nature reserve at Byron's Pool; ○ Significant impact on the sustainability of neighbouring sports and social venues; ○ Significant additional strain on Parish of Haslingfield; ○ Reduction in quality of life of local residents caused by noise, light, traffic and litter from the venue. ● Alternative locations included Northstowe and Waterbeach, NIAB, Cambridge East, Cambridge Airport, University Site at Madingley Road, Newnham, Cowley Road
Option 180: Ice Rink	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● An ice rink would support sustainable communities; ● Need for an Ice Rink is economically viable and will improve Cambridge's sports facilities; ● Financial support available; ● No reasonable alternative to an ice rink; ● Proposal should form part of a general sports complex with good transport links, education and research facilities; ● Funding available, only a site is needed; ● Possible Locations: Not in the city, not Abbey Stadium, not North West Cambridge, cycling distance of the City Centre, West Cambridge, Science Park, near railway station, Abbey Stadium site, suburb / outskirts location with good transport links. ● Doubts over viability and therefore needs to be proven. : Ice rinks elsewhere have closed. Needs to be financially neutral; for Cambridge City Council and Council Tax payers; ● Ice rinks are environmentally unfriendly; ● Loss of Green Belt, congestion in and around Trumpington Park and Ride and Addenbrooke's.
Option 181: Concert Hall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lack of large scale concert venue in Cambridge; ● Concert hall would be supported locally; ● Proposals should include a conference hall and multi-purpose venue; ● Should be large enough to cater for big London and international orchestras, touring opera and ballet companies, as well as high end artists and acts; ● Multi-purpose venue would be more viable;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other existing venues could be better used; • Concert hall should be provided in collaboration with the University; • Replace Corn Exchange with concert hall; • Must be easily accessible/close to good transport links; • The Council must collaborate with neighbouring authorities to develop best solution for future and existing population. Community stadium, ice rink and concert hall proposals should not be considered in isolation; • Possible locations: Clay Farm, Station area, close to schools. Mill Road – the old Picture House, outside city boundaries; suburbs/outskirts location with good transport links; • Concert hall alone requires need/justification; • Multi-purpose venue to include conferencing and leisure more viable and will support Cambridge’s tourism and conferencing reputation; • Difficult to justify – other venues are available and there is insufficient demand to justify a purpose-built venue; • No need – Cambridge is already well served with suitable conference venues; • Loss of Green Belt, congestion in and around Trumpington Park and Ride and Addenbrooke’s.
--	---

CHAPTER 12 – PROMOTING AND DELIVERING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE	
SECTION OF ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT	Key Issues
Option 182: Timely provision of infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lots of support for the principle of the policy – getting infrastructure into development early is key; • Feeling that the policy hasn’t always been successful / implemented strongly enough in the past and caused congestion issues.
Option 183: Promote non-car modes of travel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong agreement from many; • This needs to be applied to existing areas as well as new developments; • Needs of motorists should not be ignored; • Sustainable links to surrounding villages important; • Chisholm Trail is given as example by many as a key to achieving this.
Option 184: Appropriate infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support from many respondents; • Getting the infrastructure in ‘before use’ is outlined by a number of respondents as vital; • Viability of getting the infrastructure in place prior to development being in use brought up as a potential issue (by developers).

Option 185: Low emission vehicle infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some concern about low emission vehicle infrastructure being provided for “all development” – viability could be an issue in smaller sites. Take up of electric cars is slow; • The market should decide when low emission and electric cars should be provided for, not this plan; • Good support for car clubs and car club spaces; • Car club spaces should have cycle parking next to them.
Option 186: Maintain the current level of provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some support for the current level of provision; • Existing policy can be improved; • Provide for car ownership but not usage.
Option 187: New residential car parking standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car parking spaces are needed, even if the cars are only used occasionally; • Provide for car ownership but not usage. Car ownership cannot be controlled; • Higher levels of car parking could conflict other policies aimed at sustainable travel.
Option 188: Completely new standards for all development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some support for this option; • Local circumstances need to be taken into account; • Higher levels of car parking could conflict other policies aimed at sustainable travel.
Option 189 : Car free development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unrealistic option; • Will push parking problems elsewhere; • Cambridge doesn’t offer enough alternatives, yet; • Some support for pursuing / investigating the possibility.
Option 190: Incorporate car free development into existing policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the whole, less opposition to this option than to 189 – seen as more flexible and viable.
Option 191: Location, design and quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shortage of cycle parking around the city – especially City Centre; • Lack of visitor cycle parking at new developments; • Strong support for the policy; • Standards should be stronger and enforced more; • Cycle parking needs to be more convenient; • Some over provision in terms of student and university provision.
Option 192: Update the cycle parking standards in the 2006 Local Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the policy; • Vital for making cycling attractive as a mode of transport; • Adopt tougher standards – using best examples from elsewhere (such as Netherlands) to guide; • Some overprovision in terms of student and university provision.
Option 193: Development only where the impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflect paragraph 32 of the NPPF more closely in this option – only permit development where “residual cumulative impacts of development are not severe”;

on the network is able to be mitigated against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally strong support for the need for the policy. • Don't just aim to mitigate, as things can be improved in some instances; • Development that results in increased "trips" by sustainable modes should not be seen as negative.
Option 194: Modal split targets for new development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be ambitious; • Might be too inflexible to create a citywide target.
Option 195: Do not set city wide modal split target for new development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites in Cambridge differ too much for one target – it seems more logical to base targets on local considerations (i.e. ease of public transport access);
Option 196: Set a Travel Plan threshold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong support; • 10 units is a sensible threshold for this; • Reduces uncertainty for developers.
Option 197: Do not set a Travel Plan threshold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each development, no matter the size, should be required to provide a travel plan, unless it can demonstrated that it is not required / appropriate.
Option 198: Cambridge Airport - Aviation Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A policy supportive of employment and aviation will help enhance the economic growth of the Cambridge area. Access by air is important to global companies in Cambridge and will help attract further similar investment. Marshalls is an important employer; • Support policy not to expand because of concerns about increased air traffic and impact on residential amenity and climate change and an increase in noise pollution; • Likely to help minimise the impact on environment and biodiversity. • Development of the airport should be welcomed not restricted; • We must consider the economic benefits of a thriving local airport; • Specific reference could be made to pollution – noise and air; • Residents living under the flight path suffer negative impacts; • Increase in air traffic would be detrimental; • We need to support such an established employer; • Aerobatics causes more disturbance than commercial flights; • Noise caused by aviation activity is a blight.
Option 199: Telecommunications criteria based policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree that consultation should take place before installation near a school or college; • Should prevent masts/sites within an agreed distance (say 50m) of any residential property;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a policy that limits electromagnetic field intensities; • Has the impact of existing masts been assessed locally? • It is insufficient to state that ‘significant interference’ should be used as a test, a tighter definition should be used. The requirement to consult should not be limited to immediate neighbours of the site; • The provision of telecommunications infrastructure can have a major impact on transport network requirements; • The Council needs to encourage the installation of fibre optics across the city; • It is insufficient to state that ‘significant interference’ should be used as a test, a tighter definition should be used. The requirement to consult should not be limited to immediate neighbours of the site; • Works should include the highway authority where appropriate, and also the SuDs approval body.
<p>Option 200: Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lord’s Bridge – Consultation Areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is an important site of international importance and should be protected; • Add the proposal to re-open the Oxford-Cambridge rail link, it used to run through this site. • It could rule out important sites.
<p>Option 201 – Provision of Infrastructure and Services</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Infrastructure and open spaces provision could enhance biodiversity and it is therefore welcomed; • Improvements and provision for infrastructure would need to be proportionate and related to the scale of development proposed taking account of the developments own impact on local infrastructure whilst not providing infrastructure to make up existing deficiencies; • All new developments need infrastructure and services • Developers should be required to support the provision of infrastructure; • It is important to ensure policies are robust so that they cannot be challenged by developers; • Support and note that the list in Option 201 is ‘not exhaustive’; • Planning obligations/CIL are one of a number of essential sources to deliver the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy and the 2006 Nature Conservation Strategy; • New developments usually generate traffic and other problems, which create costs to existing users; it is not acceptable for a developer to offload these externalities onto the taxpayer, and so the CIL/S106 payments ensure that these costs are properly accounted for; • Infrastructure must be in place before any development is

	<p>occupied.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major developments should meet their own infrastructure needs and this provision should be completed before the overall scheme is complete; • The policy should ensure developer contributions to non-vehicular infrastructure should be encouraged; • The Plan should provide a realistic and deliverable strategy which identifies the key infrastructure constraints and highlights how any constraints will be overcome. It is essential that the development strategy can be delivered and implemented with reasonable confidence; • Any policy should ensure that contributions from developers should only be sought where necessary to make a scheme acceptable in planning terms and should be fair and reasonable in both scale and kind. The level of contributions sought should strike a balance between the need for funding and the impact on the viability of development; • There is no statement about how the policy will be monitored and enforced; • There is a lack of transparency and a democratic deficiency with regard to how S.106 monies are collected and spent.
--	--

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL	
SECTION OF ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT	KEY ISSUES
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SA has been undertaken at too high a level. • Strong support for Option 2 in the SA; • Using pre 2008 growth figures is unsound due to the changes in the economic climate since then; • Each individual Broad Location has received mixed responses in the SA.

APPENDIX D: SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND OPTIONS 2012 COMMENTS ON BROAD LOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT

Map of broad locations



**Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council
Issue and Options Consultation on Broad Locations in the Green Belt**

Question / options no.	SUMMARY OF REPS
<p>1. Land to the North and South of Barton Road (including land in both districts)</p> <p>City: Support: 4 Object: 91</p> <p>SCDC: Support:5 Object: 53 Comment: 6</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The release of sensitive Green Belt land around Cambridge is not unprecedented e.g. North West Cambridge; • Suitable site for residential development with employment, shops, schools, services and open space provision (including a wildlife reserve and country park); • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge area including for affordable housing, such need has been exacerbated by the lack of development at Cambridge East; • Close to West Cambridge, housing development here would complement its employment floorspace; • The location would encourage sustainable modes of transport; • Low density, well landscaped, sensitive and high quality development acceptable. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • Substantial Green Belt release has only recently been sanctioned so further release should not be contemplated. There should be a settling in period of at least 10 years to allow for the impact of current developments on the edge of Cambridge to be assessed; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); • The land is in a highly sensitive area of the Green Belt, which is important to the setting of the city and adjacent conservation area and forms an important approach to the city. Forms a vital part of the Quarter to Six Quadrant; • Forms part of the wider setting of the historic core of Cambridge and the large number of highly graded listed buildings within the core; • The site contains the remnants of the West Field

	<p>and almost certainly contains archaeological remains dating at least as far back as the Roman occupation. New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would destroy the last remaining vista of the historic core and the last remaining stretch of road into Cambridge not subject to urban sprawl; • The area is important for wildlife, including threatened species; • The area should not be designated for housing but for playing fields and recreation; • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful • Part of setting for Grantchester Meadows and Coton Country Park • Loss of a green lung for Cambridge which is easy to access on foot; • Loss of recreation facilities contrary to NPPF; • Would bring development closer to necklace villages; • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity, Barton Road already heavily congested; • Development would make it harder to commute into Cambridge by car along Barton Road • Would bring more traffic through Grantchester • Impact on local services and facilities; • Land close to Bin Brook is subject to flooding and development could increase flood risk downstream; • Noise and air quality concerns close to M11; • Inadequate water supply to support development; • Site rejected in the past and nothing has changed to reduce the importance of the area; • Inadequate local infrastructure including schools. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The QTSC should be preserved and enhanced; • A limited area may be possible to develop if well landscaped.
<p>2. Playing Fields off Grantchester Road, Newnham (includes land in both districts)</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge; • Low density, well landscaped, sensitive and high quality development acceptable.

<p>City: Support: 1 Object: 69</p> <p>SCDC: Support:2 Object: 47 Comment: 4</p>	<p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • Substantial Green Belt release has only recently been sanctioned so further release should not be contemplated. There should be a settling in period of at least 10 years to allow for the impact of current developments on the edge of Cambridge to be assessed; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages) • New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful; • The land is in a highly sensitive area of the Green Belt, which is important to the setting of the city and adjacent conservation area and forms an important approach to the city. Forms a vital part of the Quarter to Six Quadrant; • Would bring development closer to Grantchester • Harmful to tourism; • Impact on Grantchester Meadows; • Would lead to the loss of a green finger running into the centre of Cambridge; • Impact on local services and amenities; • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity, Grantchester Road inadequate; • Would bring more traffic through Grantchester; • Could lead to the loss of the allotments, which represent an important facility for the community; • Would destroy the village feel of Newnham; • Would lead to unacceptable levels of traffic on Barton Road and Fen Causeway which are already heavily congested; • Development would make it harder to commute into Cambridge by car along Barton Road; • Flood risk to rugby club land, development could exacerbate flooding to neighbouring properties; • Inadequate water supply to support development;
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could increase flood risk downstream; • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity; • Loss of playing fields should be resisted and is contrary to the NPPF; • The area is important for wildlife, including threatened species. The site forms an important wildlife corridor linking to the Backs and Grantchester Meadows; • Development of this site has been rejected in the past, and the reasons for this remain unchanged. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The QTSC should be preserved and enhanced; • Perhaps a small development away from the River would be acceptable.
<p>3. Land West of Trumpington Road (includes land in Cambridge only)</p> <p>City: Support: 1 Object: 64</p> <p>SCDC: Support:3 Object: 43 Comment: 3</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge; • Well landscaped, sensitive and high quality development acceptable if away from river. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • The area forms a sensitive part of the Green Belt and should remain as such. It plays a very important part in the overall setting of the city and its rural edge is a vital characteristic of Cambridge that should be protected; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); and have a negative impact on the Southacre Conservation Area; • New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge; • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful; • Would impinge on a Green Corridor and add to urban sprawl; • Site assessed previously and rejected, nothing has changed since then to alter that conclusion; • Impact on Grantchester Meadows, important green lung for residents and visitors;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of the setting to Grantchester, and Grantchester Meadows; • Loss of playing fields should be resisted and is contrary to the NPPF; • Loss of green separation between Cambridge and Trumpington; • The site forms an important part of the river valley wildlife corridor. The area is important for wildlife, including threatened species; • Development would lead to the loss of high quality agricultural land; • Additional road junctions required by development would damage appearance of tree lined approach to City; • The trees along Trumpington Road form part of a Woodland Wildlife Site; • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity, Trumpington Road could not cope with the additional traffic generated by the development; • Inadequate water supply to support development; • Could increase flood risk downstream. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The QTSC should be preserved and enhanced
<p>4. Land West of Hauxton Road (includes land in both districts)</p> <p>City: Support: 4 Object: 41</p> <p>SCDC: Support:7 Object: 50 Comment: 4</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are exceptional circumstances; • Would be a sustainable development with 10.49 Ha of outdoor sports pitches, 8.65 hectare extension to Trumpington Meadows Country park a community stadium with a capacity of c8,000, indoor sports provision; • Logical extension to City without compromising neighbouring necklace villages. M11 forms a natural Southern boundary; • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge; • Land already compromised by development; • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable; • Good access; • Minimal landscape impact. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); • New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge; • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful; • Development would conflict with the aim of having a "quality edge" on the southern approach to Cambridge; • Loss of landscaped foreground to the new city edge; • Highly visible site on rising ground; • Coalescence with Hauxton / Harston; • Development would adversely impact on the setting of the adjacent new country park, including Byrons Pool and the river; • Community Stadium not appropriate in this sensitive gateway location; • Involves loss of open space needed to form a positive southern boundary to the city, and buffer Trumpington Meadows from the motorway; • Would erode the amenity value of the Trumpington Meadows country park; • Inadequate water supply to support development; • Could increase flood risk downstream; • Would worsen traffic and make it harder to commute to work; • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity; • Noise and air quality concerns close to M11; • Noise from the stadium, • Impact on local services and amenities including schools (Primary school at Trumpington Meadows incapable of extension); • New retail should be in city centre; • Allow new development to be completed and settled before more is contemplated. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor development acceptable; • Broad Location 4 should include the WWTW at Bayer Cropscience; • The QTSC should be preserved & enhanced.
--	---

<p>5. Land South of Addenbrooke's Road (includes land in both districts)</p> <p>City: Support: 7 Object: 30</p> <p>SCDC: Support:9 Object: 43 Comment: 5</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logical extension to City without compromising neighbouring necklace villages. M11 forms a natural Southern boundary; • Would provide a employment-led, mixed-use neighbourhood in a sustainable location with 45 hectares of office/research and employment development (science park), 1,250 market, affordable and key worker dwellings, local shops and community facilities, a primary school, public open space, strategic landscaping, highways and other supporting infrastructure; • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge; • Would assist the delivery of high levels of employment growth in Cambridge; • Sustainable location high in development sequence established by 2003 Structure Plan; • Good transport network nearby; • Site is available and can be delivered in plan period; • Land already compromised by development, would not harm Green Belt purposes; • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable; • Would allow for enhancement of nearby habitats and increased access to the countryside; • Yes, provided views maintained and clear separation between development and Great Shelford; • Potential for major growth which has little impact on character / townscape and landscape setting of city. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); • Allow new development to be completed and settled before more is contemplated, area is already overdeveloped; • Planning inspectors have ruled Addenbrooke's Road is a sensible Green Belt boundary;
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge; • Would compromise planned Green Belt edge on Glebe Road; • Development south of Glebe Road rejected in earlier plans and nothing has changed since then; • Would lead to ribbon development; • Would lead to coalescence with Great Shelford; • Harmful impact on views of Cambridge from the Gogs; • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity; • Inadequate local school places, services and facilities; • Would worsen traffic and slow ambulances going to Addenbrooke’s Hospital; • Noise and air quality concerns close to M11; • Loss of amenity, open spaces and land for walking; • Could increase flood risk downstream. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not as intrusive as other options • Minor development on non-elevated land would be acceptable • Not too bad, plenty of new housing going on nearby and decent roads • The southern limit of this site would need to be defined with care. If extended too far to the south it could swamp Great Shelford. • This is the better of the options, as it continues on from existing developments. However, it could cause congestion and the transport infrastructure would need to be improved to cope
<p>6. Land South of Addenbrooke’s Road between Babraham Road and Shelford Road (includes land in both districts)</p> <p>City: Support: 4 Object: 35</p> <p>SCDC: Support:6 Object: 37 Comment: 3</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logical extension to City without compromising neighbouring necklace villages; • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge including affordable homes; • Would deliver new infrastructure to help serve existing uses; • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable; • Yes, provided views maintained and clear separation between development and Great Shelford. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); • New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge; • Would lead to coalescence with Great Shelford; • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful; • No development south of the Addenbrooke's Access Road which is a clear Green belt boundary; • Undermine the new planned edge for the city; • Would create an isolated new community; • Used for recreation, important to preserve the unspoiled view of White Hill; • Harmful to views from the Gogs and Wandlebury; • Development should not encroach upon Nine Wells and to the land on either side of Granhams Road, which has landscape value; • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity; • Would worsen traffic and slow ambulances going to Addenbrooke's Hospital; • Could constrain long term growth of the Biomedical Campus; • Would lead to ribbon development distant from existing communities; • Inadequate local school places, services and facilities; • Inadequate local school places, services and facilities; • Damage to biodiversity and Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not as intrusive as other options; • Minor development on non-elevated land would be acceptable; • Area between Shelford Road and Babraham Road is of high value landscape. Some small areas to the rear of Shelford Road could be developed with a tree belt edge continuing the boundary of the Clay Farm 'green wedge'.
--	---

7. Land between Babraham Road and Fulbourn Road (includes land in both districts)

City:

Support: 5

Object: 38

SCDC:

Support:6

Object: 69

Comment: 3

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

- Logical extension to City without compromising neighbouring necklace villages;
- Could help meet housing and employment development needs of Cambridge;
- Deliverable in plan period;
- Could provide for up to 4,000 new homes in a sustainable location close to the jobs at the Addenbrooke's Hospital, Marshalls and ARM;
- Would allow for expansion of Peterhouse Technology Park;
- Can provide significant open space and recreation areas;
- Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable;
- Already compromised;
- Could minimise the starkness of Addenbrooke's;
- Low lying land development would have less impact.

OBJECTIONS:

- No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development;
- No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages);
- Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful;
- New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge;
- Very important to the special character and setting of Cambridge as elevated with important views;
- Majority of land is elevated with important views - development could not easily be screened from other vantage points;
- Worts' Causeway and minor road over hill towards Fulbourn provide a well-used route for leisure access to countryside and development along this corridor would have a significant negative impact;
- Harmful to setting and character of Fulbourn;
- Contrary to the conclusions of earlier Green Belt studies and to those of the Inspector when

	<p>considering proposals for housing at Netherhall Farm in 2006;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important for amenity and recreation; • Impact on tranquillity of the countryside; • Impact on traffic; • Harmful to views from the Gogs and Wandlebury and of high landscape value; • Damage to biodiversity and Nature Reserves. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The part of the area either side of Worts' Causeway which is on level ground would seem to be the most unobtrusive of all the sites. • Minor development on non-elevated land would be acceptable if the done with sensitivity to preserve the best of the landscape.
<p>8. Land East of Gazelle Way (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only)</p> <p>City: Support: 7 Object: 15</p> <p>SCDC: Support: 7 Object: 64 Comment: 6</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable; • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge; • Little impact on character / townscape and landscape setting of city subject to landscape and woodland buffers; • Strong possibility provided a clear (green) corridor retained for Teversham village; • Would not involve views of the historic city; • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful; • Loss of countryside, adverse impact on concept of a compact city; • Loss of rolling agricultural land with good views of Cambridge; • Would reduce the separation of Fulbourn from

	<p>Cambridge which is already compromised by the Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospital sites, and Tesco, making retention of open land to the north more important;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing this land would turn Teversham into a suburb of Cambridge and destroy the character of the village; • Impacts of road network, local roads already congested; • Inadequate public transport to support development. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to comment without knowing potential dwelling numbers; • Minimal impact on the setting of the city and good transport links. This would indicate Broad Location 8 as the least worst of the options; • Development would lead to merger with Fulbourn which should be avoided, however Teversham could be expanded north and eastwards considerably: there is little landscape value in that area.
<p>9. Land at Fen Ditton (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only)</p> <p>City: Support: 4 Object: 22</p> <p>SCDC: Support:9 Object: 43 Comment: 6</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable location to provide much needed homes and/or employment for the Cambridge area; • Could provide a foot/cycle bridge over the river Cam to link to the Science Park and the new rail station; • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge including affordable housing; • Development would retain a strategic green edge along A14, thereby preserving openness of immediate area and wider landscaped setting of Cambridge; • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable; • Little impact on character / townscape and landscape setting of city subject to landscape and woodland buffers. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • No need for development here, development can

	<p>be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fen Ditton is a historic settlement, most of which has been designated a Conservation Area. Additional housing development of any size in this area would subsume Fen Ditton into the city; • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in (other) Green Belt villages would be less harmful; • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of maintaining rural setting of Fen Ditton; • Importance of Green Belt has been examined through South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Development Framework and through various planning applications, which have dismissed development as inappropriate. • Negative impact on East Cambridge road network, which is one of the most congested in the city; • Existing public transport links are minimal (2 buses a day) and unable to support an enlarged settlement travelling for employment; • The infrastructure could not support any further development. • Would lead to urban sprawl, Cambridge could accommodate more by building taller; • Inadequate roads and other transport links; • Would lead to congestion, existing traffic bottleneck at the bottom of Ditton Lane at peak times, and bus services are likely to be reduced in near future; • Unsustainable location, the only bus is about to be withdrawn, there is no village shop, the sewage system is overburdened and inadequate, and the B1047 already carries a heavy vehicular load; • Commons on the river corridor are essential open space for the city; • Noise from the A14; • Open and rural nature of land between Chesterton and Fen Ditton is highly prized and has been identified by local and city people as essential open space.
--	---

	<p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to comment without knowing potential dwelling numbers; • Development might be possible if Fen Ditton village can be adequately protected and significant improvements are made to the transport system • There must be a 'buffer zone' between development and the edge of the River to preserve rural character of the Green Corridor.
<p>10. Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only)</p> <p>City: Support: 8 Object: 14</p> <p>SCDC: Support: 7 Object: 32 Comment: 5</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable location for housing and employment development including strategic open space, transport, noise and air quality issues can be mitigated; • Best of the 10 Broad Locations, least effect on the landscape; • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge; • This land is not easily accessed for recreation and too close to the A14 to be really worth keeping as Green Belt; • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable; • Little impact on character / townscape and landscape setting of city subject to landscape and woodland buffers. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); • This land forms a buffer between the village of Girton and the City, without it Girton could be subsumed as a suburb to the city; • Development would have negative impacts on Girton; • Close to A14 so will not be a pleasant place to live; • Flood risk downstream, site could be used for a reservoir to serve the North-West developments • NIAB and NIAB2 have failed to provide

	<p>strategic green infrastructure and allocation of this area for development would only compound the short-sighted decisions of the Councils regarding this area;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Loss of green corridor for wildlife. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hard to comment without knowing potential dwelling numbers;• This should be kept mostly as open space with some low density development;
--	---

APPENDIX E: ISSUES AND OPTIONS 2 CONSULTATION PUBLIC NOTICE

Cambridge City Council Cambridge Local Plan Review

Notice of publication of the Cambridge Local Plan Towards 2031 - Issues and Options Report 2 (January 2013) for public consultation



Cambridge City Council is in the process of preparing a new Local Plan, which will plan for and manage development in the City of Cambridge until 2031. The Issues and Options 2 consultation follows on from the Issues and Options Consultation held in June/July 2012.

The document is split into two parts. Produced in partnership with South Cambridgeshire District Council, Part One includes sites on the edge of Cambridge, which could be allocated for residential and employment development in the Local Plan. It also sets out site options for a community stadium.

Part Two of the consultation document includes: sites options within the urban area for a range of uses, new residential car parking standards, cycle parking standards, residential space standards, and site designations which we would also like your views on.

The six-week consultation period on the Issues and Options 2 documents and their associated Interim Sustainability Appraisals is from **9am on 7th January 2013 until 5pm on 18th February 2013.**

The Issues and Options 2 documents and their Interim Sustainability Appraisals and other relevant supporting documents are available for inspection:

- Online on the City Council's website:
www.cambridge.gov.uk/options2
- At Cambridge City Council's Customer Service Centre at Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY from 8am-6pm on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Fridays, and 9am-6pm on Thursdays.

You can also visit exhibitions and speak to representatives of the Council as follows:

- 7 January - Grantchester Village Hall, High Street, Grantchester - 2.30pm to 7.30pm
- 8 January - Castle Street Methodist Church, Castle Street, Cambridge - 2.30pm to 7.30pm

- 9 January - The Swifts, Haggis Gap, Fulbourn - 2.30pm to 7.30pm
- 10 January – The Hub, Cambourne - 2.30pm to 7.30pm
- 12 January - Jubilee Room, Trumpington Village Hall, High Street, Trumpington - Midday to 4pm
- 14 January - Small Hall, Guildhall, Market Square, Cambridge - 2.30pm to 7.30pm
- 16 January - Memorial Hall, Woollards Lane, Great Shelford - 2.30pm to 7.30pm
- 18 January - Room 2, Meadows Community Centre, 1 St Catharine's Road, Cambridge - 2.30pm to 7.30pm
- 21 January - Small Hall, Guildhall, Market Square, Cambridge - 2.30pm to 7.30pm
- 22 January - Histon and Impington Recreation Ground, New Road, Impington - 2.30pm to 7.30pm
- 25 January - Large Meeting Room, Cherry Hinton Village Centre, Colville Road, Cambridge - 2.30pm to 7.30pm
- 26 January - Atrium Hall, The Netherhall School and Sixth Form College, Queen Edith's Way, Cambridge - Midday to 4pm
- 28 January - Newnham Croft Primary School, Chedworth Street, Cambridge - 2.30pm to 7.30pm
- 1 February - Brown's Field Youth and Community Centre, 31a Green End Road, Cambridge - 2.30pm to 7.30pm

The Issues and Options 2 documents and Sustainability Appraisals can also be purchased from the Customer Service Centre (Tel: 01223 457000).

Comments should be made using:

- The online response system available on the City Council's website <http://cambridge.jdi-consult.net/ldf/>;
- Printed response forms are available from the Customer Service Centre (as above) or can be downloaded and filled in electronically by visiting www.cambridge.gov.uk/options2

Completed response forms should be sent to:

- Local Plan Review Issues and Options 2 Consultation, Planning Policy Team, Cambridge City Council, PO Box 700, Cambridge, CB1 0JH
- Or emailed to policysurveys@cambridge.gov.uk

Please submit your comments before **5.00pm on 18th February 2013**

Any representations submitted in relation to the Issues and Options 2 consultation may also be accompanied by a request to be notified of the submission of the draft Local Plan to the Secretary of State.

For further information, please contact the Planning Policy team as follows:

- Tel: 01223 457000
- Email: policysurveys@cambridge.gov.uk

Patsy Dell
Head of Planning
Cambridge City Council

Date of Notice: 7th January 2013