

CC2/CCC



Examination into the Soundness of the Cambridge
Local Plan

**Matter CC2 – City Centre and Areas of Major
Change**

Matter Statement by Cambridge City Council

May 2016

Introduction

1. This statement sets out the Council's response in relation to the Inspector's Matter CC2 in relation to the City Centre and Areas of Major Change.
2. The documents referred to in this statement are listed in Appendix 1. Examination document reference numbers are used throughout for convenience.

Matters CC2A and CC2B: City Centre and Hierarchy of centres and retail capacity

Overview

3. The Framework¹ requires local planning authorities to be positive, promote competitive town centre environments and set out policies for the management and growth of centres over the plan period².
4. In 2008, Cambridge City Council together with South Cambridgeshire District Council endorsed the Cambridge Sub-Region Retail Study³ to inform the new Local Plans. In 2013, Cambridge City Council endorsed the Cambridge Retail and Leisure Study Update 2013⁴ in order to update the evidence base relating to retail.
5. The study identified no capacity to support additional convenience floorspace in Cambridge to 2031 as existing commitments absorb all forecast capacity. The City Centre performs a top up role, and almost all the district and local centres provide at least one convenience store to meet day to day needs. Outside the network of centres, large foodstores provide a key role in meeting the shopping needs of residents.
6. The study found that Cambridge City Centre continues to be the most dominant comparison shopping destination in the area. The opening of the Grand Arcade in 2008 attracted a number of high end operators and has proved a success, while the Grafton/Fitzroy/Burleigh Street area continues to perform a complementary role alongside the Historic Core, providing a more mainstream offer. The study did find that while the City Centre continues to perform well, there had been a slight decline in performance and market share since 2008. The study goes on to recommend that the Council should focus on meeting the identified need in comparison floorspace to 2022 (i.e. 14,141 sq m net) and continue to closely monitor the situation with regard comparison floorspace.
7. Given the limited capacity of the City Centre, Cambridge City Council commissioned the City Centre Capacity Study⁵ to examine the capacity of Cambridge City Centre to meet the needs of the district and the wider sub-region in the period to 2031. This study identified the Grafton/Fitzroy/Burleigh Street area as having capacity to almost entirely meet the identified need for comparison floorspace to 2022.

¹ RD/NP/010

² RD/NP/010, paragraph 23

³ RD/E/080

⁴ RD/E/130

⁵ RD/E/120

Matter CC2A: City Centre

2A.1: Policy 9 – The City Centre

- i. **Should the policy include a further requirement to ensure that residential amenity is not prejudiced by development associated with the night time economy?**
8. Cambridge City Centre is a successful and vibrant centre, that has weathered the downturn in the economy well; it has a strong comparison shopping offer, supplemented by a good range of complimentary facilities; a more limited convenience offer, reflecting the constrained historic nature of the centre; good transport links; a high quality shopping environment (although with some scope for improvements); and a low vacancy rate⁶.
9. Policy 9 sets out how the City Centre’s role is expected to develop over the plan period. It will be the primary focus for retail, leisure and cultural developments that attract a large number of people and any new development will add to the vitality and viability and the environmental quality of the centre. Furthermore, the policy sets out that a City Centre Public Realm Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will be developed to set out how development can contribute to the capacity and quality of the public realm throughout the City Centre.
10. Paragraph 123 of the Framework requires policies to⁷, among other things, aim to:
- “avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development”*
- “recognise that development will often create some noise and existing businesses wanting to develop in continuance of their business should not have unreasonable restrictions put on them because of changes in nearby land uses since they were established”*
11. The Plan does seek to ensure that the adverse impacts of noise on health and quality of life are not acceptable, and where they occur, appropriate mitigation will be put in place. Policy 35 deals with the impact of noise resulting from development and its appropriate mitigation. Development that leads to significant adverse effects on health or amenity will not be permitted. This policy approach is appropriate and consistent with the Framework.
12. In terms of whether Policy 9 should include a further requirement to ensure that residential amenity is not prejudiced by development associated with the night time economy, the Council does not consider this to be necessary. The Plan should be read as a whole, and it is not considered necessary to repeat the Policy here.
13. Furthermore, the relationship between the night time economy and residential amenity is a two way association. The Council should, and will, seek to ensure that the night time economy is not prejudiced by new residential development (or other land uses), in line with paragraph 123 of the Framework. Policy 35 is again the appropriate mechanism to ensure this.

⁶ RD/E/130, page 34-35

⁷ RD/NP/010, paragraph 123

2A.2: Policy 10 – City Centre Primary Shopping Area

- i. **Should the policy be more flexible in terms of changes of use from A1 to another centre use, particularly in respect of primary and secondary frontages?**
14. Policy 10 sets out how applications for development in the City Centre Primary Shopping Area will be dealt with by the Council. The Council will maintain a primacy of A1 shopping uses, particularly on primary frontages, so as to sustain the vitality and viability of the City Centre. Developments in the Primary Shopping Area will have an active frontage and will not have a detrimental effect on the character or amenity of the area. Larger developments will have to contribute to the diversity of the city centre, by providing a range of smaller units to cater to the demands of smaller independent and local traders.
15. The Framework's Glossary⁸ defines primary and secondary shopping frontages as follows:
- “Primary frontages are likely to include a high proportion of retail uses which may include food, drinks, clothing and household goods. Secondary frontages provide greater opportunities for a diversity of uses such as restaurants, cinemas and businesses.”*
16. It is clear from this definition that primary shopping frontages are expected to have a high proportion of A1 retail uses, while secondary frontages provide a more varied mix of uses.
17. Policy 6/6 in the existing Local Plan⁹, requires A1 uses on secondary frontages to be above 60% (apart from two specific frontages) and requires no loss of A1 units on primary frontages where the proposal would harm the contribution the frontage makes to the vitality and viability of the centre. This policy has contributed to the ongoing success of the City Centre.
18. The Cambridge Retail and Leisure Update 2013 recommends that the policy should protect all A class uses and allow for increased flexibility to respond to different circumstances¹⁰.
19. At the time of the last shopping survey¹¹, in 2012, the majority of existing and proposed primary shopping frontages had over 70% of A1 uses¹², with many at around 90% A1 uses.
20. The new policy builds on the existing policy and is consistent with the definition in the Framework, with detailed elements adjusted to reflect changes coming through from the evidence base. The percentages selected for A1 threshold in primary and secondary frontages are configured to be consistent with the current percentage of A1 uses on those frontages. The policy requires A1 uses on primary frontages to remain over 70% and on secondary frontages to remain over 50%, unless it can be shown that a change would be beneficial to the vitality and viability of the frontage. Without a good percentage of A1 uses on primary and secondary shopping frontages, this could affect the retail function of the shopping frontage.
21. The main aim of introducing a specific percentage of A1 units in primary frontages was to set out a clear position, providing certainty to applicants. This certainty will speed up the planning

⁸ RD/NP/010

⁹ RD/AD/300, page 62, Policy 6/6 Change of Use in the City Centre

¹⁰ RD/E/130, page 108-109, paragraphs 9.41-9.44

¹¹ RD/E/110

¹² RD/Sub/C/080, page 129

**Matter CC2 – City Centre and Areas of Major Change
Statement by Cambridge City Council**

May 2016

application process. The percentage of 70% was chosen as an appropriate percentage, as most primary frontages were already above this threshold (many significantly so), and those that were below it were close to the percentage.

22. The policy is sufficiently flexible to deal with changing circumstances as it allows for the percentage of A1 uses to fall below 70% where it can be shown that such a change would be beneficial to the vitality and viability of the frontage. This could include development in units that are constrained or do not meet the requirements of modern retailers. For example, a unit that has been vacant for a long time or if there is an area of complementary uses and a development would be beneficial to the vitality and viability of the frontage. The policy is flexible enough to deal with these circumstances.
23. In secondary frontages, a more diverse range of uses is expected¹³ and the evidence base suggested that a more flexible approach should be adopted¹⁴. At the time of the last shopping survey (2012), only half of the secondary frontages had over 50% A1 uses¹⁵. Although, of those frontages with less than 50% A1 uses, two of them are only just below 50%.
24. Paragraph 3.7 of the Plan recognises the concentration of uses in some secondary frontages that provide a distinct character to these frontages, but notes that where retail uses have fallen below 50%, there should be no further loss of retail. On reflection, this final sentence of paragraph 3.7 implies a level of inflexibility that is not intended in the policy, which clearly says "...unless it can be shown that this would add to the vitality or viability of the street frontage". This final sentence of paragraph 3.7 appears to contradict criterion (e) of the policy, and introduce a level of inflexibility once secondary frontages fall below 50% A1 uses, that is not intended by the policy. The Council proposes that this final sentence to paragraph 3.7 is deleted in its entirety.
25. This proposed minor modification is set out in Appendix 2 to this statement.
- ii. Is the cap on the proportion of non-Class A1 within the primary shopping frontage too prescriptive thereby restricting the range of prospective occupiers? Should the cap be lowered from 70% to 50%?**
26. The response to question CC2A.2 (i) of this statement sets out why 70% was chosen as an appropriate proportion and also why the policy is flexible enough to deal with changing circumstances. The Council considers that the approach is consistent with the Framework and the evidence base.
- iii. Should the requirements for new retail or leisure developments in excess of 2,500sqm be more flexible so as to take account of viability considerations?**
27. The policy requires larger retail or leisure developments to provide a mix of unit sizes to cater for national retail occupiers and smaller independent and local traders. This requirement is consistent with the findings of the evidence base.

¹³ RD/NP/010, glossary

¹⁴ RD/E/130, page 109, paragraph 9.43

¹⁵ RD/Sub/C/080, page 130

Matter CC2 – City Centre and Areas of Major Change
Statement by Cambridge City Council

May 2016

28. The requirement for new retail or leisure developments above 2,500 sq m to provide a mix of small and large retail units to cater for national retail occupiers and the demands of smaller independent traders has been proposed following evidence that there is a higher than average proportion of multiple retailers in the city¹⁶. Providing a range of units, including smaller units, will be more likely to meet the needs of independent retailers¹⁷.
29. The Council recognises that viability is an important consideration to applicants seeking to develop a site and the Framework requires local authorities to take this into account in plan-making and decision-taking¹⁸. The Council will negotiate with applicants to get the best outcomes for development on the merits of each case. Discussions with the Local Planning Authority will allow applicants to work through viability concerns with the Council and meet the policy requirements with certainty as to the acceptability of their proposals.
- iv. Should the range of suitable uses on upper floors within the primary shopping area be widened to include the potential, in principle, for the full range of main town centre uses as defined in Annex 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework?**

30. The Framework defines the Primary Shopping Area as:

“Defined area where retail development is concentrated (generally comprising the primary and those secondary frontages which are adjoining and closely related to the primary shopping frontage).”

31. The table at the end of Policy 10 lists “centre uses” as being suitable at ground floor level and “non-centre uses” as not being suitable at ground floor level. It is intended that the policy would indicate that “centre uses” are appropriate in centres at both ground floor and on upper floors. A minor modification is proposed for clarity in Appendix 2.

2A.3: Policy 11 – Fitzroy / Burleigh Street / Grafton Area of Major Change

- i. Notwithstanding the Council’s comments on pages 3, 4 and 5 of reference document RD/GEN/081 which relates to supplementary planning documents, has any progress been made in respect of the preparation of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)? Should the policy contain a timeframe for the preparation of the SPD and indicate that no planning application will be submitted until the SPD has been adopted by the Council?**
32. The Councils’ Matter M4 statement outlines the approach taken to the Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton area of major change¹⁹. This statement provides an update and further detail as far as it relates to the questions in this hearing session.
33. Policy 9 sets out how the City Centre’s role is expected to develop over the plan period. Policy 11 builds on this guiding how the development of the Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area of Major Change will take place. The area will meet the majority of the Council’s retail needs to

¹⁶ RD/Sub/C/080, page 130, paragraph 32

¹⁷ London Small Shops Study 2010, page ii, paragraph 10 (Appendix 3)

¹⁸ RD/NP/010, paragraphs 173-177

¹⁹ M4/CCC&SCDC, paragraphs 44-46

Matter CC2 – City Centre and Areas of Major Change
Statement by Cambridge City Council

May 2016

2022. Development will be of a high quality and sensitive to surrounding residential uses; it will improve the public realm as well as looking at how people access this area, including links to the Historic Core.

34. The Cambridge Retail and Leisure Study Update 2013 identified that there may be scope for the Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton area to accommodate some of the identified capacity for comparison floorspace to 2022. The Study suggests that the Council should further assess the feasibility of bringing forward development in the Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton area²⁰.
35. The Cambridge City Centre Capacity Study considers the Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton area in more detail. It refers to a long-term opportunity to plan for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Grafton Shopping Centre and potentially Fitzroy and Burleigh Street, although recognising that this may be difficult given the multiple ownerships. The Study does suggest that redevelopment of the Grafton could provide additional retail capacity of up to 12,000 sq m, along with residential or student accommodation above, but any capacity should be tested against a detailed design assessment and masterplan²¹.
36. The Study also makes suggestions in relation to streetscape, highway and public realm improvements along East Road and Fitzroy/Burleigh Street, and linkages to the Historic Core.
37. The Cambridge City Centre Capacity Study also identifies that much of the City Centre does not offer any further opportunities to meet this need other than limited infill and redevelopment opportunities²². Consequently, the Council allocated the Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton area as the primary focus for providing additional comparison retail in the City Centre.
38. In 2012, an application²³ was submitted to the Council to reconfigure the former Eden Hall and adjacent areas (near the Burleigh Street entrance to the Grafton), this was approved. This development is a substantial reconfiguration of the western end of the Grafton which will improve the quality of the shopping experience within this part of the City Centre, and also enhance the vitality and viability of this part of the City Centre. Work on this development is due to start this year (2016).
39. The Council considers that it is important to look at the Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area of Major Change comprehensively and that a masterplan-led SPD is an appropriate mechanism to deliver the policy aspirations in line with the evidence base. If development proposals were to come forward on a piecemeal basis and before the preparation and adoption of the SPD, the coordination of development would not be possible. Without this comprehensive approach, the Area of Major Change would remain fragmented and the potential range of townscape and public realm improvements would not be achieved.
40. The Council does not consider this approach to be overly restrictive, and it is consistent with the approach taken to bringing forward other key sites in the Plan. The Council considers that the SPD will be a positive tool ensuring comprehensive and coordinated development of the area and it should not prevent development from coming forward. However, providing they do not conflict with the broad aims and objectives to be set out in the policy, the Council considers that

²⁰ RD/E/130, page 106, paragraphs 9.27-9.28

²¹ RD/E/120, page 76

²² RD/E/120, page 51

²³ 12/0187/EXP

Matter CC2 – City Centre and Areas of Major Change
Statement by Cambridge City Council

May 2016

less substantive applications can be submitted and determined. On this basis, the Council is proposing a minor modification to Policy 11 in order to clarify the position. This can be found in Appendix 2.

41. The Council has worked with the owners of the Grafton and discussions have evolved since the Plan was submitted in March 2014. In October 2014, the Council signed a statement of common ground with M&G Real Estate, the then owners of the Grafton²⁴. This set out the areas of common and uncommon ground and how the parties would work together to achieve the aims of the policy. Furthermore, in their statement to Matter M4, M&G Real Estate recognised that a masterplan approach to the area's development was appropriate, but should not prevent all development prior to its adoption²⁵.
 42. In order to take the masterplan forward, the Council is committed to working proactively with landowners, developers and relevant stakeholders. A minor modification to the policy is proposed in Appendix 2 to reflect the fact that the Council will lead on the coordination of the SPD rather than the scheme promoter.
 43. The Council does not consider it appropriate to include a timetable for the SPD in the Plan and it would not be consistent with other references to the preparation of SPDs in the Plan. A timetable for the preparation of the SPD will be agreed later in 2016, with a commitment to prepare the SPD in a timely manner as has been the case with the preparation of other site related SPDs.
 44. In 2015, the ownership of the Grafton changed, with Legal and General Property taking ownership of the shopping centre. Legal and General Property have appointed Wrenbridge to act on their behalf with respect of this property. Initial discussions between the Council and the new owners' representatives have stated that they wish to concentrate on the redevelopment associated with existing planning permission²⁶ in the foreseeable future.
 45. The Council considers that the policy is compliant with the Framework's core principles of encouraging the effective reuse of land, actively managing patterns of growth and encouraging multiple benefits from the use of land. Furthermore, the Council considers that achievement of the policy's objectives is consistent with paragraphs 7 and 15 of the Framework in delivering the three dimensions of sustainable development.
- ii. Should the policy seek to ensure that development proposals for the Grafton Centre take full account of the potential retail impacts on the vitality and viability of the Historic Core?**
46. The Cambridge Retail and Leisure Study Update 2013²⁷ identifies baseline capacity to support approximately 3,820 sq m net additional comparison floorspace in Cambridge by 2017. By the virtue of growth in the baseline population and available expenditure, this will increase to 14,141sq m net by 2022, to 31,226 by 2027 and to 39,976sq m net by 2031. The study recommends that these forecasts are treated as an upper limit, reflecting uncertainties over the effect of wider developments on capacity and the level of growth in special forms of trading,

²⁴ RD/SCG/020

²⁵ M4-5212, paragraph 39

²⁶ 12/0187/EXP

²⁷ RD/E/130, paragraphs 9.14-9.18 and 9.23-9.25

Matter CC2 – City Centre and Areas of Major Change
Statement by Cambridge City Council

May 2016

particularly online spending. Given the City Centre's physical constraints, there is potential for retailers to maximise efficiencies with the effect of reducing overall need. The study also recommends that the Council should focus on meeting the identified need in comparison floorspace to 2022 (i.e. 14,141sq m net) and closely monitor comparison floorspace.

47. As explained above in the response to Question 2A.3 (i), there is limited scope to meet this capacity in the Historic Core, and the only major opportunity in the City Centre is at the Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton area.
48. The Cambridge City Centre Capacity Study suggests that redevelopment of the Grafton could provide additional retail capacity of up to 12,000 sq m, along with residential or student accommodation above, but any capacity should be tested against a detailed design assessment and masterplan²⁸.
49. The study also makes suggestions in relation to streetscape, highway and public realm improvements along East Road and Fitzroy/Burleigh Street, and linkages to the Historic Core.
50. The Cambridge City Centre Capacity Study also identifies that much of the city centre does not offer any further opportunities to meet this need other than limited infill and redevelopment opportunities²⁹. Consequently, the Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton area has been allocated as the primary focus for providing additional comparison retail in the City Centre.
51. The Historic Core is vibrant, resilient and a successful part of the City Centre, with low vacancy rates and a strong retail offer³⁰. Development at the Fitzroy / Burleigh Street / Grafton area will not undermine the vibrancy of the Historic Core. The Framework requires the Council to meet the identified retail needs, which we are seeking to do, mainly through the redevelopment at the Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton area, detailed in Policy 11. The development will not be appropriating retail demand from elsewhere as it will be looking to meet the forecast increase in demand identified in the Cambridge Retail and Leisure Update 2013³¹, hence any negative impact on retail elsewhere (including the Historic Core), will be minimal. Indeed, as development here will be helping to meet the identified needs of Cambridge, it should enhance retail offer of the City Centre as a whole.
52. The Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton area provides a different retail offer from the Historic Core. It is seen as providing "everyday" shopping facilities for local residents on a range of budgets, including a number of popular high street brands³². Development at the Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton area will complement the retail offer of the Historic Core, and enhance the vitality and viability of the City Centre as a whole.
53. The masterplan will look to promote linkages to the Historic Core, in line with criterion f of the policy. It is also proposed in Appendix 2 to modify criterion b of the policy to ensure any development is sensitive to the character and setting of the Historic Core.

²⁸ RD/E/120, page 76

²⁹ RD/E/120, page 51

³⁰ RD/E/130, pages 34-35, summary points

³¹ RD/E/130, page 105, paragraphs 9.23-9.25

³² M4-5212

Matter CC2B: Hierarchy of centres and retail capacity

2B.1: Policy 6 – Hierarchy of Centres and Retail Capacity

i. Should the locally set retail impact assessment threshold for proposals outside of the City Centre indicated in the policy be lowered in order to protect its vitality and viability?

54. Policy 6 set out the hierarchy of centres within Cambridge, the retail needs that are being planned for, and where they will be developed, as well as the approach to the sequential test and impact assessment. The retail needs are drawn from the Cambridge Retail and Leisure Study Update 2013³³, which identifies a need for 14,141 sq m of additional comparison retail floorspace to 2022 (and 39,976 sq m by 2031)³⁴.

55. Paragraph 26 of the Framework states:

“When assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres, which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m).”

56. Paragraphs 9.49 and 9.50 of the Cambridge Retail and Leisure Study Update 2013³⁵ set out the policy recommendations of the study as they relate to consideration of a locally set threshold for an impact assessment. They are reproduced below:

“Given the strength of the city centre, we do not consider there sufficient justification to support a blanket locally-set threshold different to that set out within the NPPF (i.e. 2,500 sqm gross). However, recognising that the role and function of the district and local centres is more reliant on convenience goods shopping and given the limited capacity to support additional convenience goods floorspace over the plan period, there may be justification to adopt a lower threshold specifically for convenience goods.

In order to maintain a degree of control over comparison goods, the Council could adopt a policy which acknowledges that, in normal circumstances, retail development below the NPPF threshold would not normally require an impact assessment but that, subject to the Council’s discretion, an assessment may be required in certain circumstances, particularly where there may be concerns over i) cumulative impact; and/or ii) the role/health of nearby centres within the catchment of the proposal. Applicants should be encouraged to engage with the Council at an early stage to establish whether an impact assessment may be required.”

57. The Council considered these recommendations, and has taken them forward in the requirement for an impact assessment within Policy 6. Policy 6 requires an impact assessment for developments over 2,500 sq m that are out of centre, and notes that an impact assessment could be required for both convenience and comparison retail developments under 2,500 sq m,

³³ RD/E/130

³⁴ RD/E/130, page 103, paragraph 103

³⁵ RD/E/130, page 110

Matter CC2 – City Centre and Areas of Major Change
Statement by Cambridge City Council

May 2016

if the proposal could have a cumulative impact or an impact on the role or health of nearby centres within the catchment proposal. Paragraph 2.67 of the Local Plan goes onto say that developers should discuss this with the Council as soon as possible, at a pre-application stage.

58. Both the policy³⁶ and the supporting text³⁷ makes clear under what circumstances there is the potential for an impact assessment to be required for developments under 2,500 sq m, providing certainty to applicants, while also addressing the points arising from the evidence base.
59. The Council considers that this approach is entirely in line with the policy recommendations contained in the evidence base and will appropriately protect retail uses in centres. The Councils' Matter M4 statement also covers this issue³⁸.
- ii. Does the level of comparison retail floorspace capacity indicated in the policy for 2011 to 2022 as identified in the Cambridge Retail and Leisure Study Update (May 2013) still reflect the current need?**
60. The Councils' Matter M4 statement³⁹ and the Joint Retail Topic paper⁴⁰ set out the evidence for the retail capacity in the policy.
61. In 2013, Cambridge City Council commissioned the Cambridge Retail and Leisure Study Update 2013⁴¹ in order to provide an up to date evidence base on which to plan for retail needs in the future.
62. The Cambridge Retail and Leisure Study Update 2013⁴² contains the most up to date evidence on retail need within Cambridge. The study found that Cambridge continues to be a key centre for comparison shopping in the area. In terms of forecasting, the study identifies baseline capacity to support approximately 3,820 sq m net additional comparison floorspace by 2017. By the virtue of growth in the baseline population and available expenditure, this will increase to 14,141 sq m net by 2022, to 31,226 by 2027 and to 39,976 sq m net by 2031. The study recommends that these forecasts are treated as an upper limit, reflecting uncertainties over the effect of wider developments on capacity and the level of growth in special forms of trading, particularly online spending. The study also recommends that the Council should focus on meeting the identified need in comparison floorspace to 2022 (i.e. 14,141 sq m net) and closely monitor the situation.
63. The Council considers that the approach proposed in the plan is a pragmatic and appropriate approach to the evidence base. There has been no change to this evidence in the intervening time and there have been no alternative evidence submitted to the Council on retail forecasting or on how these needs will be met.

³⁶ Policy 6, criterion b, second paragraph

³⁷ Paragraph 2.67

³⁸ M4/CCC&SCDC, page 15, paragraph 47

³⁹ M4/CCC&SCDC, question 4d

⁴⁰ RD/Top/040, pages 2-3, paragraphs 2.5-3.2

⁴¹ RD/E/130

⁴² RD/E/130

iii. Should the Beehive Centre be re-designated as a District Centre?

64. The matter of whether the Beehive Centre should be a District Centre or not was discussed at the hearing session into Matter M4, under 4 (d).

65. A District Centre is defined as⁴³:

“A group of shops, separate from the town centre, usually containing at least one food supermarket or superstore, and non-retail services such as banks, building societies and restaurants”

66. The Beehive Centre does have a supermarket and cafés, but it does not have non-retail services such as banks and building societies and restaurants.

67. The area is recognised in the Cambridge Retail and Leisure Study Update 2013 as an area of retail warehousing⁴⁴. It is an area of retail warehousing with significant levels of parking, indicating it's greater than local appeal and draw from a wider area. It is discrete from, and not integrated into, surrounding neighbourhoods. While some shops provide for people's day-to-day needs, it has a significant number of shops selling bulky goods and comparison goods, not aimed at meeting people's day to day needs.

68. The Council does not consider that the Beehive Centre meets the definition of a District Centre and that it performs the destination retail function of retail warehousing.

69. The Council maintains that the Beehive and Cambridge Retail Park are out of centre, in order to better manage retail in these locations and protect the retail in the City Centre and network of smaller centres. The Cambridge Retail and Leisure Study Update 2013 shows that since the previous study in 2008, the market share of the City Centre has gone down slightly and that of the retail parks has gone up⁴⁵, this provides some justification for protecting the City Centre and not allocating the Beehive as a centre. The Council does not consider it is appropriate for the Beehive Centre to be designated as a District Centre.

iv. Should the Trumpington Local Centre be re-designated as a District Centre and its southern boundary extended to incorporate adjacent retail development?

70. A Local Centre is defined as⁴⁶:

“A cluster of shops and other community facilities that satisfy local needs and are accessible on foot. Usually comprising a newsagent, a general grocery store, a sub-post office and occasionally other facilities such as a pharmacy, a public house and a hairdresser.”

71. Trumpington Local Centre does have a convenience store, post office and a number of other relatively small units that meet local needs. The Council considers that the centre at Trumpington meets the definition of a Local Centre. The Council considers that the centre does

⁴³ RD/Sub/C/010, Glossary

⁴⁴ RD/E/130, page 45, paragraph 6.8

⁴⁵ RD/E/130, page 57, paragraph 7.49

⁴⁶ RD/Sub/C/010, Glossary

Matter CC2 – City Centre and Areas of Major Change
Statement by Cambridge City Council

May 2016

not meet the definition of a District Centre (see paragraph 65 above), as it does not have a supermarket or any banks or building societies.

72. The existing Trumpington Local Centre is focussed around the parade of shops on the corner of Anstey Way and the units opposite this on Trumpington Road. The Local Plan proposes to extend this up the existing High Street to include a number of units including the doctor's surgery, Village Hall, a public house and a retail unit. This was considered a logical extension to include other shops and facilities at the edge of the centre, up the long-established High Street. A map showing the difference between the existing Local Centre boundary and that proposed in the emerging Local Plan can be found in the Cambridge City Council Issues and Options 2: Part 2: Site Options within Cambridge consultation document⁴⁷. An extract of this document can be found in Appendix 4 of this statement.
73. One new Neighbourhood Centre is planned to provide for the growth around Trumpington, this is in the Clay Farm development. The boundaries of this new centre are to be fixed once its development is complete⁴⁸.
74. The Council does not consider that extending the Trumpington Local Centre southwards, to include Waitrose, and upgrading it to a District Centre is appropriate. Extending the centre southwards would add a part to the centre that does not associate well with the rest of the Local Centre. The current centre (as proposed) is focussed around the parade of shops on the corner of Anstey Way; the units opposite this on Trumpington Road; and then stretches up the former High Street northwards. Waitrose is primarily accessed from the signalled junction to the south of the junction with Shelford Road, and 'faces away' from the existing centre. Accessing Waitrose from the main parade of shops in the centre involves crossing Trumpington Road (and either Anstey Way or Maris Lane), and then walking across Waitrose car park. The quality of these links is not good, and highlights the separation of Waitrose from the main centre.
75. The inclusion of a relatively large supermarket within a Local Centre would be out of scale with the rest of the centre and not be appropriate (the Glossary of the Local Plan defines District Centres as usually containing one supermarket, but does not mention supermarkets within Local Centres⁴⁹).
76. If Trumpington Local Centre to be upgraded to a District Centre, then inclusion of a supermarket could be appropriate⁵⁰. However, the non-retail services on offer in Trumpington Local Centre is relatively limited, while there is a restaurant, doctors and village hall, there are no banks or building societies, and the centre is not very busy. In the Council's opinion, the scale and variety of the sum of uses in Trumpington Local Centre, even including Waitrose, is not enough to warrant upgrading to a District Centre and it would not be comparable to other District Centres in Cambridge. This, combined with the "awkward" arrangement of the centre that would be created by incorporating Waitrose, means that it is not appropriate to upgrade the centre to a District Centre and/or to include Waitrose within the centre.

⁴⁷ RD/LP/270, page 149

⁴⁸ RD/Sub/C/010, page 260, ID 32

⁴⁹ RD/Sub/C/010, pages 466 and 471

⁵⁰ RD/Sub/C/010, page 466

Matter CC2C: Station Area West and Clifton Road Areas of Major Change

2C.1: Policy 20

Overview

77. Policy 20: Station Areas West and Clifton Road Area of Major Change focuses on the regeneration of the area around the Cambridge Railway Station and Clifton Road industrial estate. The aim of the policy is to create a vibrant, mixed-use area for the city, centred on an improved transport interchange.
78. Policy 20 is complemented by Policy 24: Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre Opportunity Area⁵¹. Policy 24 addresses the need for coordinated streetscape and public realm improvements and improved traffic movements along Hills Road. This policy will enable more effective sustainable transport movements between Cambridge Railway Station and the City Centre. Policy 24 is covered in Matter CC2G within this statement.
79. Progress towards the regeneration of the Station Area West (1) is already substantially underway on site allocation M14 (Site 9.10 in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006⁵²). This involves the regeneration of the Cambridge Station Area for mixed use development. More information on this can be found in the Council's response to Matter CC2C.3 (i).
80. Station Area West (2) includes redevelopment for B1 (a) and B1 (b) employment, residential use and a mix of uses in classes A1 – A5. Appendix B allocates Site R44 Betjeman House for 156 dwellings.
81. The final part of Policy 20 addresses the Clifton Road Area (Site M2). Appendix B allocates Site M2 for mixed use development of 550 dwellings, 2 hectares of employment, leisure related uses and open space.
82. In order to clarify the relationship between sites referred to in Policy 20 and in Appendix B: Proposals Schedule, a number of minor modifications are proposed in Appendix 2 to cross-reference the site reference numbers.
- i. Would the loss of existing office accommodation in the Clifton Road Area be adequately compensated for by the proposed B1 (a) and (b) allocations within the Station Areas West?**
83. The Clifton Road Area is primarily industrial in nature. The majority of the site is dominated by one road leading through the site past a number of single storey industrial units. The Royal Mail building and old railway sidings form the western part of the site. The site is allocated for a primarily residential mixed use scheme to regenerate the area and assist the Council in meeting its housing requirements.

⁵¹ RD/Sub/C/010, page 88.

⁵² RD/AD/300, page 151.

Matter CC2 – City Centre and Areas of Major Change
Statement by Cambridge City Council

May 2016

84. The existing office accommodation currently located within the allocation is at Rustat House, in the north east corner of the site. Rustat House sits on a site footprint of around 0.65 hectares. Allocation M2 allocates 2 hectares for B1 (a) and B1 (b) employment uses.
85. Furthermore, Station Area West (site M14), provides 71,700 square metres of office floorspace. This has already been approved. There remains some opportunity within the Station Area West 1 (M14) for the further provision of B1 (a) and (b) uses within Block G1. Appendix 5 sets out the progress made towards the delivery of Site M14.
86. As outlined in the Councils' Matter M4 statement⁵³, the Plan provides for a sufficient and flexible supply of employment land including B1 (a) and B1 (b) to meet needs during the plan period.
87. The Council considers that any loss of existing offices on the Clifton Road Area will be adequately compensated for by the re-provision of office space on the redeveloped Clifton Road Area, the new office space being provided on Station Area West and elsewhere within Cambridge.
- ii. Notwithstanding the Council's comments on page 6 of reference document RD/GEN/081 which relate to supplementary planning documents, the policy delegates a significant amount of detail in terms of the development schema for the Clifton Road Area to a future subsidiary document. Could the Council clarify if any progress has been made in respect of the preparation of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)? Should the policy contain a timeframe for the preparation of the SPD and indicate that no planning application will be submitted until the SPD has been adopted by the Council?**
88. Since the Local Plan was prepared in 2013, the Council and Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) have met on an ongoing basis to discuss the delivery of site allocation M2. A Statement of Common Ground was agreed by both parties⁵⁴ in March 2015. This statement outlines the commitment to preparing an SPD and the early workstreams relating to land ownership arrangements, including existing lease arrangements, masterplanning, viability, transport and access, infrastructure capacity and delivery, ecology, flood risk and ground contamination. A further letter of support for the allocation by USS is provided at Appendix 6.
89. The Council understands that USS is progressing discussions with other parties in relation to the development of Site M2. There is a willingness amongst the major landowners to work together and deliver the redevelopment of the site.
90. A timetable for the main preparation of the SPD will be agreed in due course, with a commitment to prepare in a timely manner as has been the case with the preparation of other site related SPDs. The Statement of Common Ground⁵⁵ agreed that the most likely timeframe for development is 2022 to 2031 with the longest lease expiring in 2025.
91. The Council does not consider that the policy should contain a timetable for the preparation of the SPD. This would not be in keeping with the approach the Council has taken in the Plan where the preparation of SPDs is required and would be overly restrictive.

⁵³ M4/CCC&SCDC

⁵⁴ RD/SCG/160.

⁵⁵ RD/SCG/160

92. It is important that the SPD is prepared in order to allow for the comprehensive regeneration of the area. If development proposals were to come forward on a piecemeal basis and before the preparation and adoption of the SPD, the coordination of development would not be possible. Without this comprehensive approach, this part of the area of major change would remain fragmented and the potential range of improvements would not be achieved.
93. Providing they do not conflict with the broad aims and objectives to be set out in the SPD, the Council considers that less substantive applications can be submitted and determined. On this basis, the Council is proposing a minor modification to Policy 20 in order to clarify the position. This can be found in Appendix 2.
- iii. With regard to criterion (q), is there potential to create an eastern access to the station for pedestrians and cyclists?**
94. Paragraph 3.85 of the supporting text to Policy 20 refers to the potential for improved or additional cycle/footbridges between the Station Area West and the Clifton Road area and states that they should be considered subject to appropriate locations for access and a feasibility analysis. Proposed minor modification PM/3/016⁵⁶ was also submitted at submission, which provided additional detail in criterion q:
- q. allow the potential for future improvements to the access for pedestrians and cyclists between Station Areas West and Clifton Road Area, including investigation of a possible foot and cycle eastern entrance to the railway station; and
95. The modification was introduced in response to representations made during the Proposed Submission consultation and to support effective access to the station.
96. There is potential to create an eastern access to Cambridge Railway Station through the development of the Clifton Road Area. The existing pedestrian and cycleway, which runs between the western end of Davy Road behind Rustat Avenue and the railway sidings, presents the opportunity to provide an eastern access to the station through Site M2: Clifton Road if extended to run through the allocation. This matter would be investigated as a part of the production of the SPD.
97. Rustat Road also provides an existing pedestrian and cycle access over the Carter cycle bridge to Cambridge Railway Station. The existing access point from the Carter Bridge is north of Cambridge Railway Station and will form part of the Chisholm Trail cycle route. The Chisholm Trail will allow for the improvement of access to employment centres such as the Cambridge Railway Station, Cambridge Science Park and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus by sustainable modes of transport.

⁵⁶ RD/Sub/C/050, page 10.

2C.2: Site M2

- i. **Are there any constraints which would negate the reasonable prospect of the site being developed within the lifetime of the Plan? For example, the site contains a significant number of occupied office units and its redevelopment would also necessitate the relocation of the Royal Mail's Cambridge Mail Centre.**
98. The Council is confident that Site M2: Clifton Road can be delivered in the plan period. There are no overriding constraints which would prevent the site being delivered. The principle of development has been established with the major leaseholder of the site and outlined in a Statement of Common Ground⁵⁷.
99. Early workstreams have been progressed relating to land ownership arrangements, including existing lease arrangements, masterplanning, viability, transport and access, infrastructure capacity and delivery, ecology, flood risk and ground contamination. These issues are addressed in the Council's Statement of Common Ground with USS.⁵⁸
100. In terms of land ownership, it is recognised that there are a number of existing landowners and occupiers on the site. Cambridge City Council is the major freeholder of the site. There are however other landowners with freehold interests on the site. These include Royal Mail Group and Network Rail. USS is a major long leaseholder of a major portion of the site. Most of the leases on the site are due to expire during the early part of the Plan period, with the last lease expiring in 2025. Existing lease arrangements are not therefore considered to present an overriding constraint to delivery of the site. Given the timescales, it is considered that there is sufficient time to complete the necessary site acquisition or vacant possession to deliver the allocation. Phased delivery of the allocation could allow for elements of the site to be delivered whilst negotiations progress and complete on other parts of the site. If the relocation of the Royal Mail Centre did need to take place, this would be factored into the phasing of the site's delivery.
101. There is a willingness between major landowners on the site to work together, produce an SPD and establish how the site allocation might be delivered. As noted in the Statement of Common Ground⁵⁹ at paragraph 5.9, the Council has substantial landholdings in Cambridge, including a commercial property portfolio. These landholdings, through redevelopment and/or densification could provide alternative locations for existing businesses from the Clifton Road area. It should also be noted that the site allocation itself offers scope for 2 hectares of B1 (a) and B1 (b) employment uses.
102. The Council considers that the allocation is compliant with the Framework's core principles of encouraging the effective reuse of land, actively managing patterns of growth and encouraging multiple benefits from the use of land. Furthermore, the Council considers that delivery of the allocation is consistent with paragraphs 7 and 15 of the Framework in delivering the three dimensions of sustainable development.

⁵⁷ RD/SCG/160

⁵⁸ RD/SCG/160

⁵⁹ RD/SCG/160

May 2016

ii. Would the creation of the proposed leisure related uses unacceptably prejudice the residential amenity of the residents of Rustat Road which borders the site?

103. The Cambridge Leisure Park adjoins Site M2 and already offers a range of leisure uses, including the Cambridge Junction venue, a multi-screen cinema and bowling alley. These are supported by food retail, restaurants and hotel uses. It is recognised that this site already operates as a destination for evening and weekend entertainment, which can give rise to amenity issues for neighbouring uses.
104. The Council has considered residential amenity through the plan-making process. As part of producing the SHLAA in 2012⁶⁰ and 2013⁶¹ and Technical Background Documents⁶², the Council consulted key stakeholders, including the County Council, to assess the effect of development. The Council considers that any potential impacts on residential amenity can be mitigated through the development of the site.
105. Most respondents to the Proposed Submission Consultation were concerned about the effect of further leisure uses on traffic, parking, access to the site and the impact of late night drinking and evening economy activities on the surrounding residential neighbourhoods.
106. The site assessment in the Technical Background Document Part 2 Supplement⁶³ indicates that impact on the local highway capacity could be appropriately mitigated by physical or soft (travel plan) measures⁶⁴. The site is of a scale that would trigger the need for a Transportation Assessment and Travel Plan, regardless of the need for a full Environmental Impact Assessment. S106 contributions and mitigation measures will be required, where appropriate. Any relevant Transport Strategy or other plans will also need to be taken into account. The site is within 400 metres of bus services that link to the City Centre and beyond, and 400 metres from Cambridge Railway Station and the Guided Busway, enabling the promotion of sustainable modes of transport to residential and leisure uses, the City Centre and the station⁶⁵. The potential for an eastern access to the station would also promote use of sustainable transport modes, thus reducing the traffic and parking impact on residential areas on and near the site. Parking controls, as referred to in paragraph 3.85 of the Local Plan, may also be required in order to improve residential amenity and support the free flow of traffic.
107. The development of the SPD will involve further analysis of land use and service provision in the surrounding area and the effect that this has on residential amenity. The Council considers that with wider improvements to provision for sustainable modes of transport, traffic and noise mitigation measures, the leisure facilities will not have an adverse impact on residential amenity. This is in compliance with paragraph 37 of the Framework⁶⁶, which requires that “Planning policies should aim for a balance of land uses within their area so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities.”

⁶⁰ RD/Strat/130

⁶¹ RD/Strat/140

⁶² RD/LP/260 and RD/LP/310

⁶³ RD/LP/310, page 83

⁶⁴ RD/LP/310, page 454

⁶⁵ RD/LP/310, page 460.

⁶⁶ RD/NP/010.

iii. Is it the intention that the site should be accessed solely from Cherry Hinton Road?

108. The only vehicular access to the site presently is from Cherry Hinton Road. Appendix B of the Local Plan⁶⁷ states that access onto Cherry Hinton Road will be subject to capacity analysis and assessment of links to the wider area.
109. The site was assessed by Cambridgeshire County Council in its role as the highway authority as part of the SHLAA⁶⁸. The site is not considered to have any significant issues⁶⁹ in respect of transport access. As outlined in the Statement of Common Ground⁷⁰, USS has engaged with Cambridgeshire County Council to discuss transport matters, with the approach to the proposed transport scope and modelling work being agreed.
110. Potential access routes to the site will be assessed further as part of the preparation of the SPD.

iv. Is the figure of 550 dwellings in criterion (n) the maximum residential capacity of the site and will the figure be replicated in the proposed SPD?

111. The Council considers that the density of the development is appropriate and justified in this location. The approach taken to calculating densities for site allocations in the Local Plan has previously been set out in Appendix 6: Approach to the Cambridge SHLAA and Technical Background Documents within the Councils' Matter 8 Hearing Statement⁷¹. Whilst the initial approach to calculating densities was based on the use of density formulae taking into account the location, accessibility, size and shape of sites, this was followed by assessment using a design led approach to test the robustness of the initial estimates. Factors for consideration included access, car parking, landscaping and building heights.
112. During Issues and Options 2 consultation, local residents expressed concerns about the residential capacity of the site. The Council considers that this density is achievable on site, having taken into account the specific site constraints and the parking and open space needs of the development. The Council and other landowners will test a variety of site layouts during the preparation of the SPD. This process will involve public consultation. The objective will be to ensure that the optimum site layout is put forward, which could achieve an appropriate density of development whilst ensuring appropriate access and levels of open space on site and address wider local amenity. This approach is compliant with the core planning principles set out in paragraphs 17 and 111 of the Framework which requires Councils to encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value.

⁶⁷ RD/Sub/C/010, page 248.

⁶⁸ RD/Strat/140

⁶⁹ RD/SCG/160, paragraph 5.14 & 5.15, page 6.

⁷⁰ RD/SCG/160

⁷¹ M8/CCC&SCDC

2C.3: Site M14

i. Could the Council clarify the state of progress of the development of the site which was granted outline approval in 2010?

113. A site plan, description of the outline permission (08/0266/OUT) and a table illustrating the progress on Site M14 has been provided in Appendix 5. Most development 'blocks' within the area have either been developed, approved, or have resolution to approve subject to the signing of a S106 agreement.
114. Blocks G1 (Office Use) and G2 (residential) are the only blocks yet to come forward for development.

2C.4: Site R44

i. Should the final paragraph of the policy text also make reference to the integration of the Flying Pig PH and the necessity to have regard to the effect on the setting and significance of the Grade 2*listed Botanic Gardens?

115. Site R44 is located on the western side of Hills Road opposite the junction with Station Road. It is currently made up of four office buildings: the new Botanic House; Ortona House; Betjeman House; and Francis House (including rear car park); together with the Flying Pig Public House.
116. Betjeman House, Broadcasting House, Botanic House and the Flying Pig Public House are already the subject of a partially implemented planning permission. The consent (06/00552/FUL) is for redevelopment to provide mixed use scheme comprising 156 residential units (including 40% affordable housing), B1 office use; retail / food and drink (Classes A1; A3 and A4 uses, including retention of 'Flying Pig' Public House), and new community use, together with associated basement car parking and servicing; amenity space (external and internal) with associated hard and soft landscaping; including re-location of the war memorial and provision of public art respectively. The application site did not include Francis House or its rear car park, which was acquired by the current landowner in September 2010.
117. A subsequent Section 73 planning permission (08/1058/S73) was granted on 23 October 2008 to vary various planning conditions to allow the office element of the approved scheme to be constructed as the first phase of the development (i.e. the now completed New Botanic House). These planning permissions have been implemented by virtue of the clearance of all relevant pre-commencement conditions and the construction of phase 1 of the development.
118. In terms of what is currently on the site, the Francis House building has recently been comprehensively refurbished and is now occupied by Siemens Plc, with their lease running until 2023. This part of the overall site will therefore not be available for redevelopment for some time. The Francis House part of the site, whilst currently in office use, is regarded by the landowners as being the most suitable for potential future residential use, subject to viability and prevailing market conditions.

119. Betjeman House is occupied less intensively on a short term lease basis by various companies. This building and its surrounding land, including Ortona House and The Flying Pig Public House, has been subject to very early draft proposals, which have already been the subject of initial discussions with the Council's Development Management Officers.
120. As a result of the delivery of Botanic House, the changes in landownership and the inclusion of Francis House, it is considered that the description of the allocation R44 in Appendix B: Proposals Schedule should be amended to reflect the mixed use nature of the scheme and to ensure consistency with Policy 20. As such, the Council proposes that the site be given an 'M' prefix and that the description of the site's indicative capacity should include B1(a) and B1(b) employment and retail uses. These minor modifications are set in Appendix 2.
121. Through their response to the Proposed Submission consultation, Historic England sought amendments to Policy 20 and Appendix B: Proposals Schedule to seek retention of the Flying Pig Public House and to have special regard to the setting of the Botanic Gardens. Historic England has noted in the Statement of Common Ground agreed between Cambridge City Council and Historic England⁷² that there is an extant and partially implemented permission which retains the Flying Pig Public House. If another planning application were to be submitted for this site which involved the loss of the Flying Pig, it should be noted that the site is safeguarded as a public house within Appendix C (PH091) of the Local Plan⁷³. However, Historic England would also expect any such application to consider the positive contribution that the existing building makes to the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area (in accordance with paragraph 72 of the 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act⁷⁴). The Council agrees that there are structures on this site that, by virtue of their character, quality and location, make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area even though they are not listed. The Flying Pig Public House is one such building and, in accordance with Policy 61 (b) regard would need to be had to the harm the loss of the building would cause to the character or appearance of the conservation area. The Council proposes a minor modification to Appendix B: Proposals Schedule to address this concern. This is set out in Appendix 2 of this statement.
122. Additionally, the Council proposes a minor modification to refer to the necessity to have regard to the effect on the setting and significance of the Grade II* listed Cambridge University Botanic Gardens. A minor modification is proposed in Appendix 2 of this statement.

⁷² RD/SCG/410

⁷³ RD/Sub/C/010

⁷⁴ RD/Gov/170

Matter CC2D: Mitcham’s Corner Opportunity Area

2D.1: Policy 21

Overview

123. Policy 21: Mitcham’s Corner Opportunity Area seeks to promote and coordinate the use of sustainable transport modes, contribute to a sense of place, and deliver local shops and services. Where redevelopment in the area occurs the policy promotes opportunities to provide a mix of uses. Opportunities for rebalancing the needs of pedestrians and cyclists over motor vehicles and restoring a more active street frontage are key aspects of this policy.
124. Further proposed modifications were submitted at submission⁷⁵, highlighting minor amendments to Policy 21. The minor modification PM/3/017 included the clarification of the use of materials in response to representations made to the Proposed Submission Consultation.

i. What planning status would the proposed masterplan have?

125. The Council is currently in the process of developing the Mitcham’s Corner Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The process for the development of the document will involve extensive public engagement and consultation with residents, landowners, ward councillors, Cambridgeshire County Council and other general and specific stakeholders as outlined in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012⁷⁶.
126. To ensure the coordinated development of the site, the Council considers that the document should be given the planning weight of an SPD in order for it to be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and in making decisions relating to investment in works within the public highway and public realm. This would not only mirror the approach taken for other Opportunity Areas in the Local Plan, such as the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area (Policy 22⁷⁷), but reflect the process of consultation and community engagement, which will be undertaken as part of the production of the document. This approach is also consistent with paragraph 155 of the Framework⁷⁸, whereby local planning authorities are encouraged to proactively engage with communities to create a collective vision and set of agreed priorities.
127. Active consultation with the local community, landowners and stakeholders has been ongoing since 2014. The Council aims to take the draft SPD to Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee in July 2016 for approval and agreement to consult upon. Public consultation would be scheduled between September and October 2016. It is anticipated that the Mitcham’s Corner Development Framework will be adopted as an SPD at the same time as the Local Plan is adopted.

⁷⁵ RD/Sub/C/050, page 10.

⁷⁶ RD/Gov/020

⁷⁷ RD/Sub/C/010, page 81.

⁷⁸ RD/NP/010

128. The Council is proposing a minor modification to clarify the status of the document. This can be found in Appendix 2.

ii. Would the proposed moratorium on the submission of planning applications pending the approval of the masterplan be consistent with paragraph 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework?

129. The Council is working collaboratively with landowners on the development of the SPD. This is especially important for the more substantive developments within the site, such as the Staples development (on the gyratory), Henry Giles House (Site R4) and the Westbrook Centre. Without the proper coordination of these large sites, the comprehensive and sustainable redevelopment of the Opportunity Area will be difficult to achieve.

130. The policy aims to deliver a series of coordinated streetscape and public realm improvements⁷⁹. If development proposals were to come forward on a piecemeal basis and before the preparation and adoption of the SPD, the coordination of development would not be possible. Without this comprehensive approach, the Opportunity Area would remain fragmented and the potential range of townscape improvements would not be achieved.

131. Providing they do not conflict with the broad aims and objectives to be set out in the SPD, the Council considers that less substantive applications can be submitted and determined. On this basis, the Council is proposing a minor modification to Policy 21 in order to clarify the position. This can be found in Appendix 2.

132. The Council considers that the policy is compliant with the Framework's core principles of encouraging the effective reuse of land, actively managing patterns of growth and encouraging multiple benefits from the use of land⁸⁰. Furthermore, the Council considers that achievement of the policy's objectives is consistent with paragraphs 7 and 15 of the Framework in delivering the three dimensions of sustainable development.

iii. Could the enhancement of more sustainable modes of transport be achieved without the revision or removal of the gyratory system?

133. The current layout of the gyratory includes five junctions, three of which are signal controlled, in addition to puffin and zebra crossings. From a transport infrastructure perspective, the gyratory system results in an unusually long length of heavily trafficked roadway and stop-start vehicle movement patterns. This is not conducive to using sustainable modes of transport.

134. The layout of the existing gyratory at Mitcham's Corner is confusing for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians and includes extensive signage, lane and direction changes and complex crossing arrangements. It is fragmented, which limits the accessibility of the area and increases journey times and travel times for cyclists and pedestrians. The disjointed nature of the existing gyratory also increases conflict between motorised traffic, cyclists and pedestrians. This is

⁷⁹ RD/Sub/C/010, page 78

⁸⁰ RD/NP/010, paragraph 17 bullets 8, 9 and 11

Matter CC2 – City Centre and Areas of Major Change
Statement by Cambridge City Council

May 2016

contrary to the core principles of the Framework⁸¹ which seek to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling.

135. Removing or revising the existing gyratory system would result in a more comprehensive pattern of vehicular movement with the potential to increase the active flow of traffic, reducing the potential for standing traffic and decreasing pollutants. The improvement of traffic flow will enable better flow of public transport, reducing journey times and encouraging public transport use. By improving the legibility of the area, it would also reduce the conflict between different road users, which would encourage pedestrians and cyclists to travel through the area.
136. Therefore, the Council considers that the enhancement of more sustainable modes of transport can only be achieved by the revision or removal of the existing gyratory system.
137. In terms of recent progress, workshops were held on 9 - 10 February 2016 to review the options, opportunities and constraints for future modifications and plans for Mitcham's Corner. The workshops included senior officers from both County and City Councils as well as consultants involved in the City Deal transport proposals. The workshops covered issues such as objectives, constraints, key design principles, likely options, precedent schemes and modelling and assessment options. A workshop event report has been prepared which summarises the main points arising and preferred options. This report will inform the choice of options to be modelled, including the revision or removal of the existing gyratory. The County Council has no objection in principle to the removal of the existing gyratory, but requires further more detailed traffic modelling to assess future impacts on the highway network prior to any detailed changes being made.
138. This modelling work will be undertaken in tandem with the Council's ongoing joint working with Cambridgeshire County Council on the Greater Cambridge City Deal proposals for Milton Road. The Councils are seeking to integrate designs for Mitcham's Corner with those for Milton Road⁸². Subject to detailed testing, the removal or alteration of the existing gyratory could greatly assist in improving conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport.
139. The City Deal scheme for Milton Road is part of tranche 1 of the City Deal and seeks to integrate transport improvements along the corridor. Work towards City Deal schemes are well advanced. WSP/ Parsons Brinckerhoff have been appointed to assess and evaluate options for improving access to and from the city by sustainable forms of transport along Milton Road. Work has involved liaison between City Deal partners and key stakeholders e.g. the emergency services and transport operators. In early 2016, public consultation took place involving a series of exhibitions. Following this, further technical work is being undertaken and will be presented to the City Deal Executive Board in June/July 2016. More detailed proposals will then be drawn up and further consultation undertaken. City Deal has an initial budget of around £24 million for the project.

⁸¹ Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework (RD/NP/010)

⁸² http://www.gccitydeal.co.uk/citydeal/info/2/transport/1/transport_projects_and_consultations/4

iv. Should the policy specifically promote measures to facilitate the coordinated provision of public transport to and from the opportunity area (OA) e.g. a modal interchange for bus services?

140. The provision of a modal interchange would be complementary to the revision or removal of the existing gyratory system. Currently, bus stops are peppered throughout the Opportunity Area. The potential to provide an interchange will be investigated as part of the modelling and assessment work being undertaken by the County Council.

141. The potential for a modal interchange is in keeping with the first paragraph of Policy 21. It has not been specified as further modelling work needs to be completed, and at this stage, it is not confirmed that a modal interchange is feasible. If considered feasible, the proposal would be included in the Mitcham's Corner Development Framework (SPD).

142. The current City Deal plans for Milton Road focus on the creation of more reliable, faster and frequent bus services increasing the attractiveness of bus usage along Milton Road and the potential to reduce the number of car trips. Better and more segregated foot and cycleways are also being investigated to improve safety, encourage more walking and cycling and reduce the number of car trips⁸³. This coincides with the objectives with Policy 21 and its aim to promote and coordinate the use of sustainable transport modes. Cambridgeshire County Council and Cambridge City Council are currently seeking to integrate any feasible designs for Mitcham's Corner with those for the Milton Road City Deal Scheme.

v. Would the policy enable a more balanced mix of commercial/residential uses in the OA?

143. Policy 21 seeks to reinforce the 'high street' feel of the area; maintain the vibrant community; and provide attractive places to live in, work in and travel through. Where redevelopment occurs, the policy specifies that opportunities should be taken to provide a mix of uses, including residential uses on upper floors. The Council has also allocated specific sites within and around the Opportunity area (Site R3 and R4) for residential uses to support a balanced mix of uses.

144. Mitcham's Corner is designated in the Local Plan as a District Centre⁸⁴. District Centres are second only to the City Centre in the Council's retail hierarchy. The District Centre is home to a wide range of A1 and A2 units, public houses, restaurants, student accommodation, offices and residential accommodation. The Cambridge Retail and Leisure Study Update 2013⁸⁵ noted that since 2008 there has been relatively little change in the health of the District Centre. Although performing well, the Council considers that there is scope for improvement. The Council has appointed a Mitcham's Corner Co-ordinator to work with local businesses and residents to improve the area. The active desire to improve the area is voiced by the Friends of Mitcham's Corner. The Council engages with the Friends of Mitcham's Corner regularly, and supports the enhancement of Mitcham's Corner through the planning of the area and the

⁸³ http://www.gccitydeal.co.uk/citydeal/info/2/transport/1/transport_projects_and_consultations/4

⁸⁴ RD/Sub/C/010, page 259

⁸⁵ RD/E/130, paragraph 5.3, page 36.

involvement of the Mitcham's Corner Co-ordinator in trading and community engagement activities.

145. As a result of its District Centre status, planning proposals within the Mitcham's Corner District Centre will also be guided by Policy 72: Development and change of use in district, local and neighbourhood centres. This policy requires that A1 uses do not fall below 55% (measured as a proportion within the 'A' use classes in the district). Proposals for other uses not defined in the 'Suitable Uses' table within the policy⁸⁶ would only be permitted if they complement the retail function and maintain or add to the vitality, viability and diversity of the centre⁸⁷.
146. The Council considers that Policy 21, in combination with the removal or revision of the gyratory and the wider work being undertaken by the Council's Mitcham's Corner Co-ordinator, would make the area more attractive to a wider range of uses, as a result of improved accessibility by sustainable modes of transport, increased legibility and linkages to all parts of the Opportunity Area and beyond. Working alongside Policy 72, the second paragraph of Policy 21 requires that where redevelopment occurs, opportunities should be taken to provide a mix of uses. This is compliant with Paragraph 69 of the Framework⁸⁸.
147. If the gyratory were to remain, the fragmented nature of the site would reduce opportunities for improving the vibrancy and attractiveness of the area to local businesses and shoppers.
- vi. Would there be any planning merit in amending the southern boundary of the OA so as to follow the riverbank between Victoria Avenue and Henry Giles House?**
148. The Council would support extending the boundary of the Opportunity Area to the South between Victoria Avenue and the existing boundary of the Opportunity Area adjacent to No. 1 Riverside Court. This could allow a future connection to the river and increase the scope for improvement of the Opportunity Area. Providing a link to the river from within the Opportunity Area opens up the possibility for improved access to the river for visitors and residents.
149. Furthermore, it is sensible to include the small stretch of riverbank south of the public toilets on Chesterton Road and the public house car park. This land is occupied by a number of trees and provides access to houseboats moored on the river. A minor modification to amend the southern boundary on Figure 3.8 has been proposed in Appendix 2 to reflect this.
150. A larger extension to the Opportunity Area has been put forward in representations. This included a part of the Protected Open Space (P&G28 Jubilee Gardens⁸⁹) which forms the riverbank to the right of the public toilets. The Council is not convinced that there is any planning merit in including this part of the riverbank in the Opportunity Area. This is already designated as a Protected Open Space under Policy 67 and Appendix C of the Local Plan⁹⁰ This means that there is a clear presumption against the loss of such Protected Open Space due to its environmental and/or recreational importance.

⁸⁶ RD/Sub/C/010, page 198

⁸⁷ RD/Sub/C/010, page 197, criterion (a)

⁸⁸ RD/NP/010, paragraph 69

⁸⁹ RD/Sub/C/010, Appendix C, page 272

⁹⁰ RD/Sub/C/010, page 184

2D.2: Site R3 (City Football Ground)

i. Would there be any planning merit in including this site within the OA?

151. Site R3 City Football Ground was subject to a planning application 14/0790/FUL in December 2014. The approved development will consist of 106 residential units, open space, hard and soft landscaping and car and cycle parking. As the site is currently under construction with 37 units occupied to date and all 106 units likely to be completed by December 2016, the Council does not consider that there is any planning merit in including the site within the Opportunity Area.

2D.3: Site R4

i. Would the proposed density of the development enable the site to be developed without harming the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding area?

152. Site R4 Henry Giles House, which lies within the Central Conservation Area, currently comprises offices and parking. Site R4 Henry Giles House is allocated for residential development in the emerging Local Plan. The indicative capacity of the site is for 48 dwellings at a density of 62 dwellings per hectare. The site lies in an established residential area which includes many terraced dwellings and flats. The Council considers that the density of the development is appropriate and justified in this location within a conservation area and close to the City Centre. This is compliant with the core planning principles set out in paragraphs 17 and 111 of the Framework which requires Councils to make effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value.

153. Cambridge City Council has undertaken a thorough Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)⁹¹ that searched for and assessed land for residential development. Cambridge City Council's Housing Land Supply Topic Paper⁹² summarises the SHLAA's approach to assessing sites.

154. Once the SHLAA had identified sites that were potentially developable, Cambridge City Council undertook further work assessing sites in the Cambridge Local Plan Technical Background Document Part 2⁹³ and its supplement⁹⁴, which fed into the development of the Local Plan. Throughout the development of the Local Plan, there were a number of opportunities for landowners, developers and members of the public to comment on the suitability of sites for allocation.

155. The approach taken to calculating densities for site allocations in the Local Plan has previously been set out in Appendix 6: Approach to the Cambridge SHLAA and Technical Background Documents within the Councils' Matter 8 Hearing Statement⁹⁵. Whilst the initial approach to calculating densities was based on the use of density formulae taking into account the location,

⁹¹ RD/Strat/130 & RD/Strat/140

⁹² Paragraphs 2.1 to 2.7, RD/Top/070.

⁹³ RD/LP/260

⁹⁴ RD/LP/310

⁹⁵ M8/CCC&SCDC

Matter CC2 – City Centre and Areas of Major Change
Statement by Cambridge City Council

May 2016

accessibility, size and shape of sites, this was followed by assessment using a design led approach to test the robustness of the initial estimates. Factors for consideration included access, car parking, landscaping and building heights. The site was assessed against a wide range of issues to ensure it can be developed.

156. The Council has assessed a number of sites within the close vicinity of the area in relation to their density (see Appendix 7: Surrounding Site Densities within this statement). This assessment illustrates that the indicative density for Site R4 Henry Giles House is in keeping with existing residential densities in the surrounding area.
157. The local character of the area comprises terraced houses with small gardens assessed at between 39 and 80 dwellings per hectare. The existing building is not in keeping with the residential nature of the surrounding area. The redevelopment of the site will ensure that the site complies with Policies 7, 21, 56 - 59 and 61 within the Local Plan which address the river, the Opportunity Area and the historic environment, and the Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Area Appraisal⁹⁶.
158. If an application came forward for the redevelopment of Site R4, Policy 4/11 Conservation Areas in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006⁹⁷ or Policy 61: Conservation and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment⁹⁸ in the emerging Local Plan would be applied in determining the application. Both of these policies require that conservation area appraisals should be referred to as a material consideration in making and determining applications.

ii. Would the loss of the Job Centre and the DVLA facilities be consistent with Policy 73 of the Plan

159. Site R4: Henry Giles House is already allocated by Policy 5/1 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 for residential development (Site 5.15) and been found suitable for residential development. Volume 2 of the Sustainability Appraisal⁹⁹ further illustrates the Council's assessment of the site and reallocation in the emerging Local Plan, which again found the site suitable for residential development.
160. The Council and Telereal Trillium, which acts for the DVLA and Department for Work and Pensions on this site, agreed a Statement of Common Ground¹⁰⁰ in March 2015. It was agreed in the Statement of Common Ground that Site R4: Henry Giles House will be delivered within the plan period. The principle of residential development on the site was also agreed. As the site is allocated, the principle of the loss of employment uses is established and the requirements of Policy 41¹⁰¹ do not apply.

⁹⁶ RD/NE/150. The Castle and Victoria Road Area forms part of the wider Central Conservation Area.

⁹⁷ RD/AD/300, page 54.

⁹⁸ RD/Sub/C/010, page 178

⁹⁹ RD/Sub/C/040, page 13

¹⁰⁰ RD/SCG/270

¹⁰¹ RD/Sub/C/010, page 138, Policy 41: Protection of business space

Matter CC2E: Eastern Gate Opportunity Area

2E.1: Policy 22

Overview

161. The Eastern Gate Opportunity Area lies to the east of the City Centre. It encompasses a sizeable area that stretches west to east from Wellington Street to the war memorial on Newmarket Road and to Cambridge Retail Park. To the south, the Opportunity Area includes the Crown Court on East Road, and the northerly side of Young Street and New Street. The Opportunity Area stretches up to the north past the Elizabeth Way roundabout and includes the residential and retail units that face onto and have immediate access to Newmarket Road. Figure 3.9 of Policy 22 and Figure 17 of the Eastern Gate SPD¹⁰² illustrate the Opportunity Area in more detail.
162. Policy 22 seeks to enhance the character of the Opportunity Area; develop buildings of a scale and massing that respond to context; and increase activity. Key projects are identified at criteria f – j within Policy 22 in order to improve traffic flow and connectivity.
163. Sites 7.01: New Street\Newmarket Road and 7.03: Coldham’s Lane/Newmarket Road were allocated in the Local Plan 2006¹⁰³. Site 7.01 (2.01 hectares) was allocated for employment, B1, housing, student hostels, whilst Site 7.03 (0.95 hectares) was allocated for mixed uses including housing and employment B1a (not exceeding existing B1a floorspace), hotel, student hostel and A1 non-food retail (not exceeding 50% of the site area).
164. To inform the development of sites 7.01 and 7.03 and the wider area, Cambridge City Council subsequently prepared the Eastern Gate Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)¹⁰⁴. This addressed the widespread recognition of the need to improve the physical environment of the wider area, which was fragmented by the large-scale highways interventions from the 1970s onward. It also considered the relationship of potential development sites (including sites 7.01 and 7.03) within the area’s wider context.
165. The development of the SPD involved extensive public engagement, consultation and research. It involved two main stages. Firstly, the Council produced a Visioning Document¹⁰⁵ in consultation with the local community, members and key stakeholders in early 2011. This document was then used to inform the production of the SPD. Now adopted¹⁰⁶, the SPD is used as a positive tool to guide development in the area and is used as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.
166. Within the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area, development has progressed significantly on both allocated and non-allocated sites. A large proportion of both sites 7.01 and 7.03 have been

¹⁰² RD/SPD/230, page 21

¹⁰³ RD/AD/300 – Appendix F – Proposals Schedule, page 148.

¹⁰⁴ RD/SPD/230.

¹⁰⁵ <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/docs/eastern-gate-visioning-document.pdf>

¹⁰⁶ The Eastern Gate SPD was approved at the Council’s Environment Scrutiny Committee on 4 October 2011.

successfully developed, or have planning permission. In these instances, the SPD has guided development as a material consideration.

167. However, there are still some sites within the wider Opportunity Area where the SPD can be applied to guide and shape the area's development. The Council considers the SPD to be a successful tool to guide development in this area. The Local Plan carries forward the Council's established approach to this area by developing Policy 22: Eastern Gate Opportunity Area¹⁰⁷. The SPD supports the implementation of Policy 22.
- vii. Paragraphs 3.4.21 and 3.4.22 of the SPD would seem to indicate that any future redevelopment of the Howard Mallett site would not necessarily be for community use. That being the case, is the policy in conflict with Policy 73 of the Plan in terms of the loss of community facilities? Would any conflict be adequately mitigated by the fact that paragraph 3.4.22 indicates the potential to enhance and increase the size of St Matthew's Piece (P&G20)?**
168. Paragraphs 3.4.21 and 3.4.22 of the SPD focus on how the Howard Mallett Centre site's built form (existing or proposed) should respond to the prevailing context of the wider area, rather than defining any future use of the Centre.
169. The key principles set out in paragraphs 3.4.21 and 3.4.22 present the opportunity to enhance St Matthew's Piece, should an application for redevelopment of the Howard Mallett Centre site come forward.
170. The Howard Mallett Centre site falls within the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area, but is not an allocation within either the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 or the emerging Local Plan. If an application came forward for the redevelopment of the site prior to the adoption of the new Local Plan, Policy 5/11: Protection of Existing Facilities in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006¹⁰⁸ would be applied in determining the application. Policy 73: Community, sports and leisure facilities¹⁰⁹ in the emerging Local Plan would be applied in determining the application once this Plan is adopted. Both of these policies require the applicant to address the need for the community facility.
171. The Council does not consider that the paragraphs of the SPD are in conflict with Policy 73 of the Local Plan 2014, as Policy 73 addresses land use in the form of community and leisure facilities. The paragraphs of the SPD which are referred to concern the built form of any redevelopment rather than the principle of such redevelopment or a range of appropriate uses. In dealing with any planning application, both the use of the site and how the proposal responds to its context would be matters for consideration.
172. The Council is aware that a planning application¹¹⁰ has recently been submitted on the site. The determination of application will take into account the existing and emerging Local Plan policies and the SPD as discussed above.
173. The application is for a change of use from the permitted use as a studio/cafe/bar/multimedia education centre and community facility to general education use within use class D1, including

¹⁰⁷ RD/Sub/C/010, page 81.

¹⁰⁸ RD/AD/300, page 54.

¹⁰⁹ RD/Sub/C/010, page 200.

¹¹⁰ 15/2372/FUL.

alterations to eastern and southern elevations, external landscaping and reconfigured cycle parking. It has not yet been determined.

viii. Having regard to paragraphs 3.3.10 and 3.3.11 of the SPD, would the policy enable the provision of student residential accommodation in the Opportunity Area subject to appropriate design arrangements?

174. The objective of Policy 22 is to enhance the character of the area, develop buildings of a scale and massing that respond to context and increase activity. The policy is not intended to comprehensively steer the land use requirements for the Opportunity Area.
175. Should an application come forward within the Opportunity Area for student accommodation before adoption of the new Local Plan, it would need to be considered in the context of Policies 7/8 Anglia Ruskin University East Road Campus; 7/9: Student Hostels for Anglia Ruskin University; and 7/10: Speculative Student Hostel Accommodation within the Cambridge Local Plan 2006¹¹¹ and Policy 46: Development of student housing of the emerging Local Plan. Policy 46 has not yet been discussed during the Local Plan examination. The Council is undertaking a study on student accommodation, which will inform the future development of this policy¹¹².
176. As sites within the Opportunity Area are in multiple ownership and can come forward for development independently, it is important that any application within the Opportunity Area also meets the requirements of Policy 56: Creating successful places¹¹³ of the emerging Local Plan. This policy and its supporting text seek a balance between the mix of uses within an area, movement, density, and clearly defined public and private open spaces. This is also a key requirement of paragraph 58 of the Framework.
177. For clarification, paragraph 3.3.10 of the SPD reiterates the requirements for land use on two specific sites 7.01 and 7.03 set out in Appendix F: Proposals Schedule¹¹⁴ of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 only. It does not add any further detail to land uses in the wider Opportunity Area. Both allocations specifically allow for student hostel development along with other uses.
178. Paragraph 3.3.11 focuses on the setting and context of buildings on Sites 7.01 and 7.03 within the Opportunity Area, highlighting that the development of such buildings would be subject to careful design considerations and does not preclude their development.
179. The SPD and relevant policies from the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 have been applied in the determination of two applications on site 7.01 and two applications on unallocated sites for student accommodation within the Opportunity Area in recent years. The approval of these applications demonstrates that student accommodation, if carefully designed, is deliverable within the Opportunity Area, taking into account appropriate design arrangements and other relevant policies within the Local Plan. To date, 272 student units have been approved within the Opportunity Area, 66 of which are completed or under construction (see Appendix 8).

¹¹¹ RD/AD/300, pages 78–82.

¹¹² RD/GEN/270.

¹¹³ RD/Sub/C/010, page 172.

¹¹⁴ RD/AD/300, page 148.

ix. Could the Council clarify its reference to block structure in the second paragraph of the policy? Is the term concurrent with the definition given in paragraph 3.3.3 of the SPD?

180. In response to a number of representations in relation to block structure, the Council clarified its reference to block structure in minor modification PM/3/018¹¹⁵. As a result, the second paragraph of the policy now reads as follows:

~~“The character of the area will be enhanced by developing buildings of a scale and massing that responds to context and reflects the predominantly residential nature of the area of a creating a block structure and developing building forms which moderate the scale and massing of new development in a manner that is responsive to their context and reflecting the finer urban grain of the area (building heights are indicated on Figure 3.9).”~~

181. Block structure is defined in the Glossary of the SPD¹¹⁶ and describes how development parcels are formed as a result of the main circulation and movement routes and how building frontages address them. An improved block structure can be used to enable development within the Opportunity Area to respond appropriately to its context. Block structure is defined as an “area bounded by a set of streets and undivided by any significant street.”

182. The proposed minor modification PM/3/018 to the second paragraph of Policy 22 illustrates how block structure can enhance the character of the area in line with the Glossary definition within the SPD without specifically mentioning the term block structure.

183. Paragraph 3.3.3 of the SPD is not a definition of block structure, but instead illustrates the benefits that an improved block structure can provide to open space, land use and activity, for example: block structure would “Improve the walkability of the area and access to existing open spaces”¹¹⁷. This approach is taken throughout section three of the SPD to illustrate the benefits that block structure can provide to the Development Area.

x. Given its more elevated position, should the maximum storey height indicated in Figure 3.9 in respect of the location of the West’s site be reduced?

184. Appropriate storey heights are referenced in both Figure 3.9 of the Local Plan and Figure 39 of the SPD. Paragraph 3.91 of the supporting text to Policy 22 of the Local Plan explains how to interpret the storey heights set out in Figure 3.9 of the Plan.

185. Paragraphs 3.4.6 to 3.4.9 of the Eastern Gate SPD¹¹⁸ discuss the storey heights illustrated in Figure 39 of the SPD and address the need to test storey heights in a robust manner, including the use of Computer Generated Images (CGI). The heights in Figures 3.9 and 39 are expressed as a range of figures including shoulder height and overall height. The building’s shoulder height is the sheer height of a building at the back of the footway up to the eaves or parapet height, whilst the overall height refers to the height of the building from pavement to the ridge of the roof or the top of any flat roof, including set-back floors. For example 3+1 signifies that the building heights should generally have a shoulder height of 3 storeys and an overall

¹¹⁵ RD/Sub/C/050, page 10.

¹¹⁶ RD/SPD/230, page 88.

¹¹⁷ RD/SPD/230, Paragraph 3.3.3, bullet one, page 37.

¹¹⁸ RD/SPD/230, paragraph 3.4.7, page 42.

building height of four storeys, providing that the upper floor is set back or within the building's roof space.

186. Figure 39¹¹⁹ of the Local Plan and Figure 3.9 of the SPD¹²⁰ are identical in respect of the storey heights for the West's site.
187. Any increase in the heights contrary to Figure 39 of the SPD requires that robust evidence be provided to justify an extension to these building heights¹²¹ as stipulated in paragraph 3.4.9 of the SPD.
188. The Council proposes a modification to Paragraph 3.91 of the supporting text to Policy 22 to clarify the building heights illustrated in Figure 3.9 of the Local Plan and how these building heights are tested to ensure continuity with the policy. This modification can be found in Appendix 2.
189. Significant progress has been made on the West's site since consultation took place on the Local Plan. Application 14/1154/FUL was received in July 2014 for 202 student rooms on the West's site. Council officers referred to paragraph 3.4.9 in the SPD when assessing the application. This paragraph notes that building heights may exceed the limits set out in the SPD but must be subject to robust testing. This testing involved use of CGI.
190. The application was reported to the Council's Planning Committee in May 2015 for approval. It was refused on the basis of the height and massing of the building. It was considered that the development would be poorly integrated into the locality, reading discordantly against the prevailing character of the north side of Newmarket Road.
191. An appeal was allowed on 18 March 2016 and the decision is attached as Appendix 9. The Council understands that the landowner is likely to implement this scheme.
192. It would therefore seem entirely appropriate for these heights to be maintained within the SPD.

¹¹⁹ RD/Sub/C/010, page 84

¹²⁰ RD/SPD/230, page 45

¹²¹ RD/SPD/230, paragraph 3.4.9, page 43.

Matter CC2F: Mill Road Opportunity Area

2F.1: Policy 23

Overview

193. The Mill Road Opportunity Area as outlined in Policy 23 in the emerging Local Plan seeks to maintain and enhance the distinctive character of the area. It provides opportunities to improve the public realm along Mill Road and successfully integrate key development sites (at R9, R10 and R21) into the urban fabric and the vibrant local community.
194. The area has two District Centres separated by the railway bridge; the Mill Road and St. Matthew's area to the west in Petersfield, and the Romsey Town area to the east.
195. Mill Road itself is notable for its wide range of independent shops and other facilities. One of the special features of Mill Road is the way in which the vast majority of its shop units have stayed the same size, rather than being combined. There are many cafés, bars and restaurants, mainly aimed at the night-time economy. Many of the shops are owned by families rather than by larger national chains, providing a special character to the area and real sense of community which is further enhanced by the rich ethnic mix. To either side of Mill Road are terraced residential streets, some of which have a high population of students or shared households.
196. Mill Road is also a busy, narrow road and there are conflicts between cars, buses, cyclists and pedestrians which the public realm improvements will need to address.
197. A number of representations relate to both the Policy 23 and the specific site allocations, and it is proposed as a minor modification to add the site reference numbers (R9, R10 and R21) to paragraph 3.97 to provide greater clarity of the link between Policy 23 and the allocated sites. This minor modification is set out in Appendix 2.
- i. Could the Council confirm that the identification in the Plan of this part of Mill Road as an opportunity area will have no effect on its designation in relation to the Central Conservation Area?**
198. The Central Conservation Area is a very large conservation area, which was first designated on 25 February 1969 and has since been extended on nine occasions. As the Central Conservation Area comprises a number of areas of different character, the area is gradually being split into smaller areas with their own Conservation Area Appraisals. The Central Conservation Area was extended in 1993 to include the Mill Road and St Matthew's area. The Mill Road and St. Matthew's area is now generally referred to as Mill Road Conservation Area, although it still forms part of the wider Central Conservation Area.
199. The most recent appraisal for the Mill Road Conservation Area was produced in 2011¹²². The Appraisal defines what is special about the Mill Road area and provides detailed information

¹²² RD/NE/150, available at <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/conservation-areas>

May 2016

about its spaces, buildings, landscape, public realm etc. It also identifies its negative features and provides guidance on the enhancement opportunities. This document is a material consideration for applications affecting the conservation area.

200. The Opportunity Area and Conservation Area designations are complementary. Given its aims in relation to enhancement of the public realm, the Opportunity Area designation is expected to deliver a positive effect on the preservation and enhancement of the Conservation Area. Any development that comes forward within the Opportunity Area will have to conform with the design and historic environment policies in the Local Plan and will be assessed in the context of statutory duties where are engaged in respect of development within a Conservation Area.
201. As the majority of the Mill Road Opportunity Area lies within the Conservation Area, it is proposed to add the Conservation Area boundary to Figure 3.10 and further supporting text in paragraph 3.93 to provide greater clarity to its importance in Policy 23 for the area. Appendix 2 shows these minor modifications.

ii. Should the policy give greater clarification of the type and nature of “events” in the road network as referred to criterion (c)?

202. In this context an “event” was intended to refer to a particular location, in this case along Mill Road, that signals something special, different or a place to support activity. In the case of Policy 23 it referred to a location with a high quality public realm which could be enjoyed by its users. For example, a special landscape treatment to an intersection or certain part of the road, or it could be a location which signals a change in use or a particularly important junction to get to another part of town.
203. However, it is now viewed that the term “event” could be modified to achieve greater clarity within Policy 23. Paragraph 3.95 of the Local Plan also refers to ‘events’ which potentially adds an element of confusion. It is therefore proposed to make the following modifications to Policy 23 and the supporting text:
- a. Amend criterion (c) of Policy 23 to refer to ‘public realm improvements based around junctions and crossings’ rather than events, and
 - b. Make an amendment to paragraph 3.96 to provide greater clarification on the type and nature of the public realm improvements.

These minor modifications can be found in Appendix 2.

2F.2: Site R9: Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road

Overview

204. Site R9 measures 1.23 hectares in total. The site was allocated in Cambridge Local Plan 2006 for housing¹²³. The Cambridge Local Plan 2014 Proposed Submission plan includes site R9 in the Proposals Schedule and has an indicative capacity of 43 dwellings¹²⁴

¹²³ RD/AD/300, Appendix F ‘Proposals Schedule’ Site 5.09 on page 147

¹²⁴ RD/Sub/C/010, Appendix B: Proposals Schedule, Site R9 on page 243

205. The site is in two parts with planning application 11/1294/FUL for residential development relating to 0.81 hectares of the total. The remaining third was the subject of a parallel application (11/1295/FUL) for the erection of a new depot building and external storage yard for use by the applicant, Travis Perkins.

i. Is the planning permission granted for planning application reference 11/1294/FUL still extant?

206. Planning application 11/1294/FUL was for the:

Demolition of existing depot building and redevelopment of site to provide: 43 residential units (comprising 18 2-3 bed houses, 6 2-3 bed coach houses and 19 1-2 bed flats), public open space including a play area, and associated works including landscaping, new access and parking.

207. The Planning Committee considered the application on 3 July 2013 and resolved to approve the application subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement. The S106 Agreement was signed on 19 March 2014 and the planning permission was granted on 8 April 2014. The permission is provided as Appendix 10 to this statement. The permission remains extant until 8 April 2017.

208. The housing trajectory in the 2015 Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) indicates that the site should come forward for delivery between 2018 and 2020¹²⁵.

2F.3: Site R10: Mill Road Depot and adjoining Mill Road properties

Overview

209. Site R10 measures 2.7 hectares in area. Appendix B: Proposals Schedule of the Cambridge Local Plan¹²⁶, as amended by the Addendum to the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 (March 2014), proposes an indicative capacity of 167 dwellings for R10¹²⁷.

210. The site comprises the Council's Mill Road Depot and a number of garages leased by the Council as landowner to other parties. It also includes the Cambridgeshire County Council owned Bharat Bhavan (Old Library and listed building) that is used by the local Indian community and the Regent English Language School. These facilities will be retained. All listed buildings, including the Old Library, have been added to Figure 3.10¹²⁸. Appendix 2 shows these minor modifications.

211. The Mill Road Depot includes the Council office space, commercial lettings, two community facilities and leased garages. In 2008, the Council as landowner began to assess the appropriateness of the depot use and explore if there were other sites which were suitable (Appendix 11). The decision was deferred whilst alternative Council organisational structures were considered with other local authorities.

¹²⁵ RD/AD/470, Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) 2014-15 Table C2: Existing Allocations R10

¹²⁶ RD/Sub/C/010, Appendix B: Proposals Schedule, Site R9 on page 243

¹²⁷ RD/Sub/C/050, PM/B/004 on page 34

¹²⁸ RD/Sub/C/050. PM/3/024 on page 11

212. In 2014, the Council as landowner decided to release the Mill Road Depot and relocate the waste and refuse functions to Waterbeach, following the creation of a single shared waste facility with South Cambridgeshire District Council. These functions have since relocated and the Garage/Fleet Service will follow in July 2016.
213. The redevelopment of Mill Road Depot requires that the remaining services based there be relocated by the end March 2017 and the commercial lettings at Mill Road Depot also be terminated by the same deadline.
214. A review of alternative locations for the relevant services identified Cowley Road as the preferred area for other elements of the depot, using an existing commercial building and vacant Park and Ride site for hard standing and eating facilities. The residual office accommodation needs will be subsumed within the Council's existing office space. The Council as landowner is currently implementing a plan to vacate the site by April 2017. These plans are discussed in Appendix 11.
215. This will free up the site for redevelopment. The Council as landowner aims to develop the site after that date. The site therefore presents a good opportunity to provide more homes to meet the growing demand for housing in Cambridge.
216. The submitted Local Plan allocates the site for an indicative capacity of 167 homes¹²⁹, as identified in the 2013 update to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)¹³⁰. The allocation is located within the Mill Road Opportunity Area and any potential redevelopment will be expected to support and strengthen the character and locally distinctive Mill Road area. The site was assessed through both the 2012 and 2013 SHLAAs¹³¹, was part of the consultation on the Cambridge City Council Issues and Options Two, Part 2 (Site Allocations within Cambridge)¹³², and is in the associated Cambridge Local Plan Technical Background document Part 2 which includes a full site assessment¹³³.
217. Allies and Morrison have been appointed on behalf of the Council as landowner to lead on the Mill Road Depot site. The Council as the Local Planning Authority has been working in partnership with Allies and Morrison to prepare a planning and development brief for the Mill Road depot site¹³⁴. The planning and development brief will help guide the redevelopment of the site for housing and will provide greater certainty and detail to support delivery of the allocation.
218. The draft Mill Road Depot Planning and Development Brief has been produced for public consultation. The document outlines the aspirations for the site, as well as the key issues, constraints and opportunities that will influence how future development on the site will take place. Detailed local and stakeholder consultation has taken place on two occasions, which has helped inform the drafting of the brief. The emerging Mill Road Depot Planning and Development Brief has sought to address the comments received to date constructively and

¹²⁹ RD/Sub/C/010, Appendix B: Proposals Schedule, Site R10, page 243

¹³⁰ RD/Strat/140, tables, pages 134 and 155

¹³¹ RD/Strat/130, Ref 47, page 45, and RD/Strat/140 page 114

¹³² RD/LP/270

¹³³ RD/LP/260, pages 138-140

¹³⁴ RD/SPD/260

creatively and balance the practical need of site delivery with the context of the local housing market and the council's own objectives.

219. The draft planning and development brief was considered by the Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee on the 14 March 2016¹³⁵ and was agreed for public consultation. Public consultation has a target start date of 3 June 2016 for six weeks. In order to ensure sufficient weight can be given to such a brief, the document is being prepared to allow it to be adopted by the Council as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

i. Are there any constraints which would negate the reasonable prospect of the site being developed within the lifetime of the Plan?

220. There are no particular constraints which will negate the reasonable prospect of delivery within the plan period.

221. Chapter 2 in the draft Mill Road Depot Planning and Development Brief analyses the site and its context in detail and Figure 2.6 provides a summary of the constraints¹³⁶.

222. The main constraints are considered below:

Community Facilities:

223. The development framework has been designed around the retention of the existing Language School and listed Bharat Bhavan buildings. The Women's Resource Centre, currently housed in a building on the north-east corner of the site, may require future re-location (either off or on-site).

Existing Privately Leased Garages:

224. The site has a number of privately leased garages at the northern end of the site. Given the relatively long lease that remains on some of these garages (understood to be up to 60 years in some cases), the framework plan and related plans in the draft planning and development brief are tailored to enable the garages to remain at least in the short/medium term. The long-term illustrative approach outlined in the draft planning and development brief proposes the phased future redevelopment of these garages. In the event of the termination of garage leases and removal of the garage structures, the land upon which they are located could then be re-developed for housing fronting Hooper Street as part of the wider redevelopment. The garages lie outside of the 167 homes allocation and their redevelopment is expected to be beyond the Local Plan period.

Ground Contamination:

225. Elevated concentrations of various contaminants have been identified associated with made ground across the site, which would not be suitable for use within proposed domestic garden or landscaped areas. More localised contamination was identified within the northern part of the site, especially surrounding the underground fuel storage tanks. Impacts to soil and groundwater from fuels were identified within this area which will require further assessment. The contamination will require remediation and mitigation measures which will be a cost on the development rather than a fundamental constraint to its delivery.

¹³⁵ RD/CR/560, Agenda Item No.6

¹³⁶ RD/SPD/260

Potential impact of sound pollution from the railway on development:

226. A noise assessment will be required to identify the potential impact of noise levels from the railway on the amenity of new residents of the Mill Road Depot site. Attenuation measures may be necessary and innovative design solutions sought. A number of measures can be introduced to control the source of, or limit exposure to, noise and vibration as necessary. Suitably orientated flats are proposed for eastern boundary of the site closest to the railway line.
227. A number of other constraints are described in other parts of this statement. The impact on the Conservation Area was considered in answer to Question (i) on the Mill Road Opportunity Area above. The building heights are discussed in the context of the development density and relationship to surrounding area in Question (ii) below. The access and transport issues are addressed in the response to Question (iv) below.
228. None of these constraints or issues negates the reasonable prospects of delivery and positive opportunities that the site offers and the outputs/outcomes that it will deliver. The Council intends to bring forward the site for delivery as soon as possible following its vacation in April 2017 and the housing trajectory in the 2015 AMR indicates this will be between 2022 and 2027¹³⁷.

ii. Would the proposed density of the development enable the site to be developed without harming the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding area?

229. The character and form of an area is the combination of the layout of buildings and streets, the height and appearance of the buildings, the amount and distribution of open space, and the density of a development.
230. The main characteristic of the Mill Road Conservation Area is the dominant building type, the narrow (one or two bays wide) two storey late Victorian terraced houses built from brick and slate roofs. They create long lines of buildings lying directly at the back of the pavement built forming a traditional terrace street grid pattern with relatively high densities. The houses are interspersed with public houses, industrial buildings, stable blocks, and workshops, many now in residential use. Whilst individual groups have slightly varied details, their overall form, height and relationship to the street gives the area a cohesive and attractive appearance, assisted by the preservation of many of the original details and materials.
231. The approach taken to calculating densities for site allocations in the Local Plan has previously been set out in Appendix 6: Approach to the Cambridge SHLAA and Technical Background Documents within the Councils' Matter 8 Hearing Statement (M8/CCC&SCDC)¹³⁸. Whilst the initial approach to calculating densities was based on the use of density formulae taking into account the location, accessibility, size and shape of sites, this was followed by assessment using a design led approach to test the robustness of the initial estimates. Factors for consideration included the access, car parking, landscaping and building heights.
232. The proposed densities were then considered through detailed analysis and testing of the site during preparation of the draft Mill Road Depot Planning and Development Brief which took into

¹³⁷ RD/AD/470, Table C2: Existing Allocations R10, page 107

¹³⁸ M8/CCC&SCDC

account the Mill Road Conservation Area Appraisal and analysis of the built and landscape environment, and made assumptions on parking, open space, building heights etc.

233. To guide the site's implementation, the proposals schedule in the emerging Local Plan states for R10:

“Scale, massing and density considerations in the design and disposition of new and existing housing will be expected to have regard to the character of the existing area”. Addendum to the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission document (July 2013) Schedule of Proposed Changes following Proposed Submission Consultation March 2014¹³⁹

234. Furthermore, the proposed Policy 23 for the Mill Road Opportunity Area requires any potential re-development to support and strengthen the character and local distinctiveness of the Mill Road area and the local community.

235. As a result the draft Mill Road Depot Planning and Development Brief proposes:

- street and block patterns to reflect the orientation and surrounding context;
- terrace typologies, with tight streets and mews, to be consistent with the surrounding conservation area;
- street grain and approach to massing to respond to the terraced character and form that exists in streets in the surrounding conservation area;
- a range of low, medium and high housing densities across the site;
- retention of the existing Council office building on the western boundary with potential for adaptive reuse - mostly residential;
- relatively low rise 2-3 residential storeys on most of the site and especially along the residential boundaries with Hooper Street to the north and Kingston Street to the west, with potential for taller (4 storey) flats on the east side of the site along the rail line because of the different aspects, and one localised opportunity for a taller building (5-storeys) in the south-eastern corner of the site, subject to more detailed design work (see Figure 43¹⁴⁰). Together it will create a sustainable mix of types and sizes;
- the incorporation of small open space areas to fit in with the surrounding very dense development form and meet the needs of the development and the wider local community.

236. As such the proposed development framework promotes a density and design that reflects the needs of the local community, whilst not harming the character and local distinctiveness of the area in keeping with the requirements of policies on design and character within Section 7 of the Local Plan.

iii. Would there be planning merit in requiring a masterplan to guide the redevelopment of the site?

237. Since the plan was prepared in 2013, it has been agreed that a Planning and Development Brief be prepared for the Mill Road Depot site, and this will be adopted by the Council in due

¹³⁹ RD/Sub/C/050, Addendum to Proposals Schedule, Proposed Modification PM/B/004 on page 34

¹⁴⁰ RD/SPD/260

course¹⁴¹. This is consistent with the approach taken on other key sites in the Plan e.g. Ridgeons (R12).

238. The draft planning and development brief for the Mill Road depot site is intended to provide a framework for change and sets out the key principles and parameters (movement, open space etc.) for the future development. This is brought together in Figure 28 as a Site Framework Plan¹⁴².
239. The draft planning and development brief also includes an illustrative masterplan (Figure 44¹⁴³) which demonstrates how the site capacity can be achieved. This indicative illustration shows how a scheme could be delivered in response to the various parameters and supporting guidance in the planning and development brief. No development can take place until the brief has been approved.
240. The draft planning and development brief is due to go out to public consultation for 6 weeks on the 3 June 2016.
241. The Council as landowner intends to appoint a developer to bring forward the site for development. The developer will bring forward the planning application for the site, which will include a detailed masterplan.

iv. Would the site be accessed from Mill Road?

242. The existing main site access to the Mill Road Depot is off Mill Road and functions with a high number of commercial vehicle movements daily (Figures 11 and 15 in the emerging planning and development brief for the Mill Road depot site¹⁴⁴). Whilst Mill Road is a very busy road and the access to the site currently suffers from poor visibility, opportunities exist to improve the junction as part of any future redevelopment.
243. The Addendum to the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 Proposed Submission Document (July 2013): Schedule of proposed changes following proposed submission consultation¹⁴⁵ proposes that the vehicular access will be from Mill Road only, subject to detailed testing. The Council is reviewing and testing this primary access point in close consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council (as highway authority) to consider the basic requirements for safe ingress and egress to the site¹⁴⁶. This is likely to include improvements to the access junction (e.g. sight-lines) and a low level of on-site parking. The draft planning and development brief has more information, but does not set out a specific parking ratio and instead promotes lower car parking ratios overall. A more detailed junction concept and assessment will be required as part of any future planning application. A minor modification is proposed to Figure 3.10 to highlight the need to address the junction of the depot site with Mill Road appropriately.

¹⁴¹ RD/SPD/260

¹⁴² RD/SPD/260

¹⁴³ RD/SPD/260

¹⁴⁴ RD/SPD/260

¹⁴⁵ RD/Sub/C/050

¹⁴⁶ RD/SPD/260

2F.4: Site R21: 315-349 Mill Road and Brookfields

Overview

244. Site R21 measures 2.9 hectares in total¹⁴⁷. The Cambridgeshire Community Services NHS Trust has identified a need for up to 1ha of employment floorspace including healthcare. This would leave a residual site area of 1.9 hectares for residential development. The Council has reassessed the site's capacity as a result this need for employment/healthcare.
245. The Council has considered other sites within the local context. The nearby Jane's Court development is considered to be an appropriate low rise, high density scheme for the local prevailing character and has a density of 60.7 dwellings per hectare (dph). Using 60 dph for the 1.9 hectare site gives a total of 114 units as the sites capacity. This results in a reduction of just 14 units from the 128 units in Appendix B: Proposals Schedule of the Cambridge Local Plan¹⁴⁸, as amended by the Addendum to the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 (March 2014)¹⁴⁹ (Appendix 2 shows these modifications).
- i. Has planning permission been granted for planning application reference 14/1496/FUL?**
246. Planning application 14/1496/FUL was for student housing development consisting of 270 rooms, communal areas, bicycle parking, refuse store, plant room, office, new substation, infrastructure and access.
247. The Planning Committee considered the application on 4 March 2015 and refused the application on a number of grounds including housing need, prematurity in relation to the emerging Local Plan, insufficient open space, the lack of a public art delivery plan, and the failure to secure a S106 planning obligation.
248. The applicant (McLaren (Mill Road) Ltd and The Co-operative Group Ltd) appealed against the decision and a Public Inquiry was held in December 2015.
249. The Planning Inspector allowed the appeal on 25 January 2016¹⁵⁰.
250. The planning permission has been granted, but not yet implemented. As such the allocation remains as outlined in paragraphs 244 and 245.

¹⁴⁷ The site area was checked through the measuring of the GIS shape file and the 2.78 hectares listed for R21 on page 249 in Appendix B: Proposals Schedule of the Cambridge Local Plan was found to be incorrect and corrected to 2.9 hectares.

¹⁴⁸ RD/Sub/C/010, Appendix B: Proposals Schedule, Site R21, page 249

¹⁴⁹ RD/Sub/C/050, Proposed Modification PM/B/007, page 35

¹⁵⁰ RD/H/740

Matter CC2G: Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre Opportunity Area

2G.1: Policy 24

Overview

251. The objective of Policy 24: Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre Opportunity Area is to promote and coordinate the use of sustainable transport and deliver and reinforce a sense of place and local shops and services. The policy focuses on key projects that can improve the streetscape and public realm and connectivity within this busy corridor which connects the railway station to the City Centre.
252. This Opportunity Area has come about as a result of work undertaken to support Project Cambridge¹⁵¹, which focussed on sustainable transport and public realm infrastructure improvements. The CB1 redevelopment around the station and creation of the new transport interchange will significantly improve the first impression of Cambridge. The vision, originally set in Project Cambridge, will be realised through a series of key projects that, when linked together, will either create or facilitate the creation of a high quality pedestrian and cycle route from the Station into the City Centre.
253. Further proposed modifications were made at submission¹⁵², highlighting minor amendments to Policy 24. The modification PM/3/025 (see Appendix 2) included the clarification of the use of materials in response to representations made to the Proposed Submission Consultation.
- i. Would there be any planning merit in amending the boundary of the OA so as to include Queen Anne Terrace car park and Kelsey Kerridge buildings?**
254. The boundary of the Opportunity Area has been drawn to have regard to the key transport corridor from the Cambridge Leisure Park via Cambridge Railway Station to the City Centre. Currently, streets and junctions along this route are heavily congested with vehicular traffic, cyclists and pedestrians.
255. The Council considers that there is no planning merit in including Queen Anne Terrace and Kelsey Kerridge buildings within the Opportunity Area as they are outside the scope of the main corridor addressed by the Hills Road Opportunity Area. In addition, extending the boundary would require the inclusion of properties that are located between Hills Road and Gresham Road and which are also not directly related to the Hills Road corridor.
256. Further improvements to Gonville Place, the street adjacent to Queen Anne Terrace Car Park and Kelsey Kerridge are addressed by Policy 5: Strategic transport infrastructure. This Policy links strategic priorities to the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire¹⁵³ (TSCSC), in particular *Policy TSCSC 9*¹⁵⁴: *Access to jobs and services* which proposes measures to improve transport movements by increasing benefits for bus users, pedestrians

¹⁵¹ RD/CC/360

¹⁵² RD/Sub/C/050, page 11.

¹⁵³ RD/T/120

¹⁵⁴ RD/T/120, page 4-7

May 2016

and cyclists. Gonville Place¹⁵⁵ is identified in Figure B.2 as a potential site for cycle improvements¹⁵⁶.

ii. Would there be any planning merit in amending the boundary of the OA so as to include 1 Regent Street and Furness Lodge?

257. The Council considers that 1 Regent Street and Furness Lodge could be included within the Opportunity Area. The site lies at the intersection of Regent Street/St Andrew's Street with Park Terrace, and the Opportunity Area could be extended to include this site, thereby allowing any redevelopment of the site to contribute to improvements to the opportunity area. .

258. A minor modification to amend the boundary of the Opportunity Area has been proposed in Appendix 2 to reflect this.

iii. Would criteria (d) and (h) encompass a review of the number, location and phasing arrangements of the existing pedestrian crossings in Hills Road?

259. Criteria (d) and (h) are targeted at improving and simplifying pedestrian movement and crossings along Hills Road. Any future design for improving this corridor would in all likelihood include a review of the number, location, design and phasing arrangements of the existing pedestrian crossings on Hills Road.

260. The Council will work with Cambridgeshire County Council to assess the viability and effectiveness of such proposals when required. It should be noted that the Hills Road corridor is considered a project for the second tranche of Greater Cambridge City Deal projects. Hence Policy 24 is complementary, and supportive of, the wider transport strategy.

261. The objectives of both the City and County Councils to improve traffic movement and barriers to pedestrian movements on Hills Road is also supported by Policy 5: Strategic transport infrastructure. This policy links strategic transport priorities to the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSCSC). Improvements of the public realm along the Hills Road Corridor have been considered jointly in conjunction with Cambridgeshire County Council, including via a Government bid for a Tax Increment Finance (TIF) bid in 2009. A list of interventions have been identified in the TSCSC which include bus priority measures on Hills Road¹⁵⁷ and the identification of a project that will significantly improve the experience for pedestrians and cyclists travelling between the city centre and Cambridge Railway Station, including a much improved public realm¹⁵⁸.

iv. Would the proposed enhancements set out in criterion (k) include the improvement of the existing open space within the Cambridge Leisure site? In this regard, is any part of the open space designated as Protected Open Space?

262. The proposed enhancements set out in criterion (k) do not expressly include the improvement of existing open space within the Cambridge Leisure site and it is unlikely that it would be

¹⁵⁵ The road on which Kelsey Kerridge and Queen Anne Terrace Car Park sit.

¹⁵⁶ RD/T/120, page B-17

¹⁵⁷ RD/T/120, Figure 5.2, page 5-5.

¹⁵⁸ RD/T/120, page B-7

included given that the main objective of the Opportunity Area relates to those areas that are predominantly part of the public highway.

263. The open space within the Cambridge Leisure Development is designated as protected open space (CIV 04) as indicated in Figure 3.11 of Policy 24 and in Appendix C of the Local Plan. As such, the site would be protected by Policy 67: Protection of Open Spaces of the emerging plan and is currently protected by Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006¹⁵⁹. In the cases of both policies, development proposals would not be permitted if they were to harm the character of, or lead to the loss of open space of environment and/or recreational importance.
264. Cambridge Leisure Park comprises convenience shopping, a bowling alley, restaurants, a gym, a popular music venue and a hotel amongst its uses. Due to the nature of the Cambridge Leisure site, footfall in the area is high. It is not only used by visitors to access Cambridge's Leisure facilities, but is also used extensively by students for recreational purposes and by local residents for their convenience shopping needs. As such, CIV 04 Cambridge Leisure Park is a valuable resource to Cambridge and the local community.
265. Policy 4/2 in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and Policy 67 of the emerging Local Plan do not preclude the intention to make improvements to open space CIV 04¹⁶⁰ if it were to enhance the recreational, environmental or amenity value of the open space. Such schemes would add to the recreational nature of the site, thus improving the open space and would therefore be considered acceptable. However, redevelopment of the open space to include the provision of additional permanent buildings would not be considered compliant with the Policy or the nature and usage of the site.
- v. Would the policy be consistent with the proposals for Hills Road as set out in the County Council's Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, March 2014(RD/T/120)?**
266. The policy is consistent with the proposals for Hills Road as set out in the County Council's TSCSC.
267. The intention of both Councils is to improve traffic movement and barriers to pedestrian movements on Hills Road is established through Policy 5: Strategic transport infrastructure. This policy links strategic transport priorities to the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSCSC). As noted earlier, public realm improvements along the Hills Road corridor have been previously discussed and assessed in conjunction with Cambridgeshire County Council. A list of interventions have been identified in the TSCSC which include bus priority measures on Hills Road and the identification of a project that will significantly improve the experience for pedestrians and cyclists travelling between the city centre and Cambridge rail station, including a much improved public realm .
268. Any further progress towards transport and public realm improvements will be considered together with the County Council

¹⁵⁹ RD/AD/300, page 34.

¹⁶⁰ Also identified in the Cambridge Open Space and Recreation Strategy (RD/NE/050), pages 41-42

2G.2: Site E5

i. Would there be any planning merit in amending the allocation to include 1-4 Hills Road and Drosier House, Harvey Road; and to consider a mixed use approach with potential for retail and leisure uses providing more active frontages onto Hills Road?

269. The Council considers that this question has been raised by the Inspectors in relation to representations made by Cambridge Assessment (representation 27445). The summary text of the representation does request the inclusion of 1 - 4 Hills Road and at 13 Harvey Road (Drosier House). After further investigation into the full text of the submitted representation, the Council considers that Cambridge Assessment have requested the inclusion of 1 - 4 Gonville Place and 13 Harvey Road within the Opportunity Area and within site Allocation E5.
270. 1 - 4 Gonville Place and 13 Harvey Road are owned by Cambridge Assessment who own the site allocated as E5.
271. 1 - 4 Gonville Place and 13 Harvey Road are currently in B1 (a) usage and as such would be protected under Policy 41: Protection of business space. If development for further employment use were to come forward on these sites, any application would be considered on its merits.
272. 1 - 4 Gonville Place and 13 Harvey Road lie outside the City Centre boundary at one of the city's busiest junctions. The sites also lie outside the Hills Road Local Centre. The Council does not consider that a mixed use approach for retail and leisure uses with more active frontages onto Hills Road would be appropriate in this location.
273. Furthermore, 1 - 4 Gonville Place and 13 Harvey Road are both referenced in the New Town and Glisson Road Area Conservation Area Appraisal as buildings important to the character of the area. This is also illustrated on the Newtown and Glisson Road Conservation Townscape analysis map for the area¹⁶¹.
274. If any development were to take place including 1- 4 Gonville Place and 13 Harvey Road, consideration would need to be given to the potential harm to the character of the area, with reference to conservation area appraisals as a material consideration in making and determining applications.
275. At this time, the Council does not consider that there is particular merit in amending the allocation to include 1 – 4 Gonville Place and 13 Harvey Road as the buildings are already in employment use and they are considered to be important to the character of the conservation area.

¹⁶¹ RD/NE/150, page 70.

2G.3: Site M5

i. The reference in Appendix B states that the area site is 0.5ha. The capacity of the site however indicates ‘20 dwellings residential over 0.5ha employment’. Is the site therefore capable of accommodating this level of development and, if so, is the quantum and mix of uses the most sustainable solution for the site?

276. The Council considers that site M5 is capable of accommodating the proposed level of development and the associated housing mix is appropriate and justified in this location in compliance with paragraph 182 of the Framework¹⁶².

277. Cambridge City Council has undertaken a thorough Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)¹⁶³ that searched for and assessed land for residential development. Cambridge City Council’s Housing Land Supply Topic Paper¹⁶⁴ summarises the SHLAA’s approach to assessing sites.

278. Once the SHLAA had identified sites that were potentially developable, the Council undertook further work assessing sites in the Cambridge Local Plan Technical Background Document Part 2¹⁶⁵ and its supplement¹⁶⁶, which fed into the development of the Local Plan. The Council’s Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan – Volume 2¹⁶⁷ illustrates the process of assessing the site and its capacity.

279. The approach taken to calculating densities for site allocations in the Local Plan has previously been set out in Appendix 6: Approach to the Cambridge SHLAA and Technical Background Documents within the Councils’ Matter 8 Hearing Statement¹⁶⁸. Whilst the initial approach to calculating densities was based on the use of density formulae taking into account the location, accessibility, size and shape of sites, this was followed by assessment using a design led approach to test the robustness of the initial estimates. Factors for consideration included access, car parking, landscaping and building heights. The context for this site, Hills Road, is changing as a result of new development and includes a range of mixed uses for employment, retail and residential use. A typical building along this corridor can reach four storeys and twenty dwelling units in a mixed-use building would not be out of context or impossible to deliver, subject to detailed design. The Council considers that this quantum and mix is entirely suitable, and sustainable in this location, especially given the site is located on a key transport corridor, close to the main railway station in Cambridge.

280. The Council considers that its approach to this site is in compliance with paragraph 58 of the Framework¹⁶⁹ which requires Local Plans to optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses.

¹⁶² RD/NP/010.

¹⁶³ RD/Strat/130 and RD/Strat/140.

¹⁶⁴ Paragraphs 2.1 to 2.7 RD/Top/070.

¹⁶⁵ RD/LP/260

¹⁶⁶ RD/LP/310

¹⁶⁷ RD/Sub/C/040, page 37.

¹⁶⁸ Housing Land Supply and Delivery (M8/CCC&SCDC).

¹⁶⁹ RD/NP/010, paragraph 58, bullet 3