

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**Matters and Issues for Cambridge City Local Plan specific hearing sessions**

**Matter CC1 - Heritage Policies – Protecting and Enhancing the Character of Cambridge**

**CC1A - Design and the Historic Environment**

Cambridge Local Plan 2014, Section Two

**Issues:**

**1A.1 Policy 7 The River Cam**

- i. In addition to criterion (b), should the policy specifically require new development to preserve or enhance the setting of the river within the historic core having regard to paragraph 2.71 of the policy and the findings of the Cambridge Historic Core Appraisal (2006)?
- ii. Should the policy make specific reference to 'The Cam Too Project' given its close association with the river?

**1A.2 Policy 8 Setting of the City**

- i. Should the footnote 7 refer specifically to the most up to date Green Belt review document?
- ii. Does criterion (a) accord with the provisions of Policy 4 of the Plan in terms of the requirements for development in the Green Belt? In this regard, should the policy draw a distinction between proposals for development in the countryside and proposals within the Green Belt given the substantial weight that the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) accords to harm to the Green Belt?
- iii. Is the wording of criterion (a) too prescriptive in terms of development on the urban edge? Is the criterion out of step with paragraph 58 of the Framework which requires that whilst development should respond to the character, identity and history of the local surroundings this should not prevent appropriate innovation?
- iv. Should criterion (a) also make specific reference to conserving and enhancing important views of the city and its skyline so as to align with Policy 60?

**1A.3 Does the Plan demonstrate a positive strategy for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development as required by paragraph 57 of the Framework?**

- i. **Policy 56:** Should the final sentence of paragraph 7.9 of the policy make reference to compliance with the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document (2010) as that document covers a whole range of matters including scheme viability?
- ii. **Policy 57:** Should criterion (h) be more strongly worded in order to positively promote biodiversity?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

- iii. **Policies 56 to 58:** Do the policies accord with paragraph 60 of the Framework which requires that planning policies should not impose architectural styles or particular tastes which could stifle innovation, originality and initiative but seek to promote local distinctiveness?
- iv. **Policy 60:** Should the definition of tall buildings in the policy be consistent with the definition in paragraph F.9 of Appendix F of the Plan?
- v. **Policy 60 and Appendix F:** Will the Council's Cambridge skyline guidance document remain relevant following the adoption of the Plan?
- vi. Should the views of Cambridge's spires and towers from the Coton footpath and from the M11 be included in paragraph F.20d and Figure F.2 of Appendix F?
- vii. Should paragraph F.35 of make direct reference to the setting and significance of heritage assets?
- viii. Should paragraph F.45 also make reference to the need to ensure that any overshadowing of the public realm should not cause unacceptable harm to amenity?

**1A.4** Does the Plan demonstrate a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of Cambridge's historic environment as required by paragraph 126 of the Framework?

- i. **Policy 61:** Is the "historic core" clearly defined in the Plan? Is it concurrent with the area delineated as the city centre on the Policies Map (July 2013)?
- ii. **Policy 61:** Should the wording of the policy provide greater clarity in respect of the requirements for designated heritage assets and other heritage assets. For example, criteria (a), (b) (d) and (e) in particular would appear to relate principally to designated heritage assets as reflected in paragraphs 132-134 of the Framework? Similarly, in **Policy 9**, should criterion (c) differentiate between designated heritage assets and non-designated assets, as the text sets out the statutory test for the former?
- iii. **Policy 61:** In order to fully accord with statutory test, should the wording of criterion (a) be amended to "preserve or enhance" and the second bullet point of paragraph 7.24 be changed to "character or appearance"?
- iv. **Policy 61:** Should the stricture requiring full planning applications only for proposed development in conservation areas contained in the extant 2006 Plan be included in the supporting text of the policy?
- v. **Policy 62 and Appendix G:** Does the policy properly reflect paragraph 135 of the Framework which requires a balanced judgement to be made when considering applications for non-designated heritage assets which may cause harm or loss to the significance of the asset?
- vi. Is there a specific reason for identifying the year 1840 in paragraph G.3 (a)?
- vii. Should the criteria be broadened to include structures, features and gardens?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**CC1B- Open Space and Natural Environment**

Cambridge Local Plan (2014) Section 7, Policies 56 to 71 and Appendices C and I (where relevant)

**Issues:**

**1B.1** Does the Plan adequately set out a strategic approach, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure as required by paragraph 114 of the Framework?

- i. **Policy 67:** The Council's Open Space and Recreation Strategy and the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy were both prepared in 2011 having regard to then extant Planning Policy Guidance 17: *Planning for open space, sport and recreation* which pre-dated the Framework. Nonetheless, does the Council consider that the documents are consistent with paragraph 73 of the Framework which requires that planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space and sports and recreation facilities?
- ii. **Policy 67:** Is the policy too onerous in relation to the proximity requirement for replacement open space?
- iii. **Policy 67:** Is the inclusion of the term "educational need" in the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of the policy overly restrictive? Is its inclusion necessary or should it be clearly defined? Should any definition include student accommodation?
- iv. **Policy 68:** Is the Policy requiring new development to address existing deficiencies in open space provision rather than to respond to the actual impact of the development? If so, is this an acceptable approach? If not should the wording be clarified?
- v. **Policy 69:** Does the policy accord with paragraph 113 of the Framework which requires that criteria based policy should distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites and provide protection which is commensurate with their status and gives appropriate weight to their importance?
- vi. **Policy 69:** Should the policy make clear that any proposal that adversely affects a European site or a Site of Special Scientific Interest would not be permitted?
- vii. **Policy 70:** Should the policy specifically promote and secure the enhancement of the natural environment and the creation and enhancement of ecological networks in accordance with paragraph 117 of the Framework? Is the Council relying on the Cambridgeshire Biodiversity Action Plan in this regard?
- viii. **Policy 71:** Would the wording of the policy be clearer if it was stated in the negative e.g. that "*development will not be permitted which involves felling.....*" as this would then harmonise with the latter text "*unless there are demonstrable public benefits.....*"?
- ix. **Policy 71:** Is the policy sufficiently strong in its intent to avoid felling, significant surgery and root damage to existing trees as a consequence of new development? For example, would the inclusion of the word "clearly" in front of the text "*outweigh the current and future amenity value of the trees*" give greater clarity to the decision maker when balancing the competing considerations?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**1B.2 Appendix C: Designations Schedule (Policy 67)**

Abbey Ward

- i. Does the Peverel Road allotments site (A26) off Barnwell Drive meet the criteria for designation as Protected Open Space (POS)? Is it in use as an allotment as it has a lapsed permission for a B2 use?
- ii. Should Coldham's Common which is designated as P&G be more properly referred to as common land?

Castle Ward

- iii. Should the Magdalene College Grounds (P&G29) be reviewed against the criteria for designation as POS in respect of its potential conflict with Policy 26 relating to student accommodation?
- iv. Should the Westminster College (AGS60) be reviewed against the criteria for designation as POS in respect of the whole college site and the accuracy of the assessment of the environmental and recreational importance of the site?

Newnham Ward

- v. Should the Newnham College Sites (AGS62, P&G40 and SPO33) be reviewed against the criteria for designation as POS in respect of the College's need to expand its current facilities?
- vi. Should the Meadow Triangle site (NAT19) be reviewed against the criteria for designation as POS in respect of its location and amenity value?
- vii. Should the Ridley Hall Grounds (P&G37) be reviewed against the criteria for designation as POS in order to restrict the POS to the central lawned area relating to the quadrangle?
- viii. Should the Gonville and Caius Fellows Garden (P&G38) be reviewed against the criteria for designation as POS in respect of the current protection already afforded to the site within the Central Conservation Area?
- ix. Should the Robinson College Gardens (P&G53) be reviewed against the criteria for designation as POS in order to restrict the POS to the formal gardens?
- x. Should the Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club (SPO06) and the Emmanuel College Playing Field (SPO16) be reviewed against the criteria for designation as POS in respect of the proposed residential development and replacement recreational facilities?

Petersfield Ward

- xi. Should the Howard Mallet site be considered for designation as a POS in association with St Matthews Piece (P&G20)?

Queen Edith's Ward

- xii. Should the Bell School site (P&G17) be reviewed against the criteria for designation as POS in respect of its boundary?

**Local Plan Examinations  
Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

- xiii. Should the description of SPO59 (Cantabrigian Rugby Football Grounds) be amended to "Hills Road Sixth Form College Playing Field" in order to reflect the current ownership of the land?
- xiv. Should the Perse School for Boys Playing Field and Perse Preparatory School site (SPO37 and SPO62) be reviewed against the criteria for designation as POS in respect of the potential school expansion?

Trumpington Ward

- xv. Should Anstey Hall (P&G51) be reviewed against the criteria for designation as POS in respect of recent, consented development?

**1B.3 Appendix I: Open Space and Recreation Standards (Policy 68)**

- i. Should the contribution to sustainable modes of transport such as walking and cycling as well as providing safe wheelchair and mobility scooter routes be considered as a criterion in assessing the importance of open space in paragraph 1.1 of Appendix I?
- ii. Should the definition of informal open space in Table 1.1 of Appendix I also make reference to high quality public hard surfaces in urban locations such as the Areas of Major Change?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**Matters and Issues for Cambridge City Local Plan specific hearing sessions**

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

**CC2A City Centre**

Cambridge Local Plan 2014, Section Three, Policies 9, 10, 11

**Issues:**

**2A.1 Policy 9**

- i. Should the policy include a further requirement to ensure that residential amenity is not prejudiced by development associated with the night time economy?

**2A.2 Policy 10**

- 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?
- ii. Is the cap on the proportion of non-Class A1 within the primary frontage too prescriptive thereby restricting the range of prospective occupiers? Should the cap be lowered to from 70% to 50%?
- 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?
- 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?

**2A.3 Policy 11**

- 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?
- 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?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**CC2B Hierarchy of centres and retail capacity**

Cambridge Local Plan 2014, Section Two, Policy 6

**Issues:**

**2A Policy 6**

- 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 viability and vitality?
- 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?
- iii. Should the Beehive Centre be re-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?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**CC2C Station Area West and Clifton Road Areas of Major Change**

Cambridge Local Plan 2014, Section Three, Policy 20; Sites R44, M2 and M14

**Issues:**

**2C.1 Policy 20**

- 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?
- 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?
- iii. With regard to criterion (q), is there potential to create an eastern access to the station for pedestrians and cyclists?

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

**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?

**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?



**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**CC2D Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area**

Cambridge Local Plan 2014, Section Three, Policy 21 and Appendix B, Site R4-Henry Giles House

**Issues:**

**2D.1 Policy 21**

- i. What planning status would the proposed masterplan have?
- 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?
- iii. Could the enhancement of more sustainable modes of transport be achieved without the revision or removal of the gyratory system?
- 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?
- v. Would the policy enable a more balanced mix of commercial/residential uses in the OA?
- 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?

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

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

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

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**CC2E Eastern Gate Opportunity Area**

Cambridge Local Plan 2014, Section Three, Policy 22 [supported by the Eastern Gate Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) adopted in October 2011-RD/SPD/230]

**Issues:**

**2E.1 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)?
- 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?
- 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?
- 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?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**CC2F Mill Road Opportunity Area**

Cambridge Local Plan 2014, Section Three, Policy 23; Sites R9, R10 and R21

**Issues:**

**2F.1 Policy 23**

- 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?
- ii. Should the policy give greater clarification of the type and nature of "events" in the road network as referred to criterion (d)?

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

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

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

- i. Are there any constraints which would negate the reasonable prospect of the site being developed within the lifetime of the Plan?
- 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?
- iii. Would there be planning merit in requiring a masterplan to guide the redevelopment of the site?
- iv. Would the site be accessed from Mill Road?

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

- i. Has planning permission been granted for planning application reference 14/1496/FUL?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

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

Cambridge Local Plan 2014, Section Three, Policy 24; Sites E5 and M5

\*Site R44 is also included in the Opportunity Area (OA) but, as it also forms part of Policy 20: Station Area West and Clifton Road Areas of Major Change, it has been considered under that policy.

**Issues:**

**2G.1 Policy 24**

- 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?
- ii. Would there be any planning merit in amending the boundary of the OA so as to include 1 Regent Street and Furness Lodge?
- iii. Would criteria (d) and (h) encompass a review of the number, location and phasing arrangements of the existing pedestrian crossings in Hills Road?
- 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?
- 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)?

**2G.2 Site E5**

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

**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?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**Matters and Issues for Cambridge City Local Plan specific hearing sessions**

**Matter CC3 Climate Change**

**CC3A - Responding to Climate Change and Managing Resources**

Cambridge Local Plan 2014, Section Four, Policies 27 to 39

**Issues:**

**3A.1 Policy 27: Carbon reduction, community energy networks, sustainable design, and water use**

- i. Does the policy accord with the provisions of the Deregulation Act 2015 which requires that local planning authorities should not set any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction or performance of new dwellings?
- ii. Does the policy accord with Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) 009 Ref ID: 6-009-20150327 which states that *local requirements should form part of a Local Plan following engagement with appropriate partners, and will need to be based on robust and credible evidence and pay careful attention to viability*. In this regard, the approach to viability assessments for Local Plan policies is set out in PPG paragraph 005 Ref ID: 10-005-20140306.
- iii. Does the policy accord with PPG paragraphs 014 Ref ID:56-014-20150327 and 015 Ref ID:56-015-20150327 which indicate that where there is a clear local need then a local planning authority can set out Local Plan policies requiring new developments to meet the tighter Building Regulations' optional water efficiency requirement of 110 litres/person/day?
- iv. Does paragraph 4.7 accord with the Government's Productivity Plan which has withdrawn the requirements for zero carbon policy initiative?

**3A.2 Policy 28 Allowable solutions for zero carbon development**

- i. Does the policy accord with the Productivity Plan as referred to above?

**3A.3 Policy 31: Integrated water management and the water cycle**

- i. Should the wording of criterion (f) be more flexible in terms of the size of a particular flat roof and in respect of buildings with specific uses such as a laboratory or an operating theatre where a brown/green flat roof would not necessarily be appropriate?
- ii. Should criterion (k) also make reference to groundwater protection?

**3A.4 Policy 33: Contaminated land**

- i. Does the wording of the policy, including the supporting text, require strengthening in order to protect ground water given the importance and vulnerability of aquifers in and around Cambridge?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

- ii. Does the policy accord with paragraph 122 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which clearly delineates between the role of the local planning authority, as described in paragraphs 120 and 121 of the Framework, and the role of other pollution control authorities?

**3A.5 Policy 35: Protection of human health from noise and vibration**

- i. Does the policy restrict itself to the provisions of paragraph 123 of the Framework or does it place requirements on new development that are in the domain of other pollution control authorities?

**3A.6 Policy 36: Air quality, odour and dust**

- i. Does the policy restrict itself to the provisions of paragraph 124 of the Framework or does it place requirements on new development that are in the domain of other pollution control authorities?
- ii. Is criterion (c) too onerous or does the previous introductory paragraph provide sufficient flexibility in terms of the application of the criterion in any particular case?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**Matters and Issues for Cambridge City Local Plan specific hearing sessions**

**Matter CC4 - Supporting the Cambridge Economy**

**CC4A – Employment land**

Cambridge Local Plan 2014, Section Five, Policies 40 and 41 and Appendix B site M1: Proposals Schedule

**Preamble**

- 1) Omission sites (i.e. sites which are being promoted as new allocations for employment use but have not been included in the Plan) have been considered/will be considered at a separate hearing and will not therefore be considered under this Matter.

**Issues:**

**4A.1 Policy 40: Development and expansion of business space**

- i. Could the source of the figures in Table 5.2 in respect of West Cambridge be clarified?
- ii. Should the proposed Green Belt site allocations GB3 and GB4 provide the option for mixed use development including some residential accommodation and a local centre?
- iii. Would the policy as currently worded enable the adequate provision of floor space for knowledge based, high tech businesses seeking to be located within or close to the city centre?
- iv. Should the wording of the policy be amended to provide greater clarity in terms of the cross referencing with the proposed site allocations in Appendix B?
- v. Have the proposed employment site allocations in Appendix B been tested in relation to their availability, suitability and deliverability in order to ensure that the overall quantum of land earmarked for employment uses would be sufficient?
- vi. Does the absence of larger scale site allocations for employment uses render the Plan unsound?
- vii. Does the Plan allocate sufficient space for B1(b) Research and Development uses on the edge of Cambridge?

**4A.2 Policy 41: Protection of business space**

- i. Is the wording of the policy sufficiently flexible to accommodate needs not anticipated in the Plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances in accordance with paragraph 21 of the National Planning Policy Framework?
- ii. Should the policy enable appropriate temporary changes of use from employment uses especially to appropriate sui generis uses which could also support economic growth?
- iii. Is the imposition of a blanket 12 month marketing period overly restrictive? Could the provisions in criterion (b) of Paragraph K8 in Appendix K be considered pertinent in this

**Local Plan Examinations  
Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

regard?

- iv. In respect of flexibility, does wording of the policy appropriately reflect the recent government initiatives to boost the supply of housing e.g. the introduction of permitted development rights to enable changes of use from office to residential use?
- v. Should the wording of the policy be amended in order to confirm that a proposed allocation of a site in the Plan for residential development which is currently in employment use, e.g. site R17, Mount Pleasant House, negates the need to comply with the criteria in the policy?

**4A.3 Appendix B: Proposals Schedule**

- i. Site M1 [379-381 Milton Road]: Has part of the site already been granted planning permission for employment use? Does the residential allocation relate to the rest of the site?



**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**CC4B Higher Education**

Cambridge Local Plan 2014, Section Five, Policies 43, 44 and Appendix B Site U3

**Preamble**

Omission sites (i.e. sites which are being promoted as new allocations for employment use but have not been included in the Plan) have been considered/will be considered at a separate hearing and will not therefore be considered under this Matter.

**Issues:**

**4B.1 Policy 43: University faculty development**

- i. Should the policy also make reference to the preparation of the proposed master plan for the New Museums Site; and include any other existing sites with faculty development potential in the city centre?
- ii. Is the reference to site U2 in Appendix B in relation to the retention and improvement of listed buildings sufficient or should the need to protect the heritage assets within the New Museums Site be reinforced by the policy?
- iii. Should the policy also make reference to the continued development of the Sidgwick site outside the city centre?
- iv. Should the wording of criterion (b) make clear that reductions in car parking provision should not prejudice "Blue Badge" holders' parking requirements?
- v. Would the further expansion of Anglia Ruskin University on the East Road site represent sustainable development particularly in terms of the housing mix in that part of the Petersfield area?
- vi. Should the development of the university sites in the Eastern Gateway and East Road be primarily focussed on faculty development?

**4B.2 Policy 44: Specialist colleges and language schools**

- i. Would the policy unfairly discriminate against specialist schools as there is no imperative in the Plan for other educational establishments to demonstrate adequate provision of residential accommodation for students as a precursor to development? In this regard, Policy 46 of the Plan: *Development of student housing* appears to be less prescriptive in terms of the provision of student residential accommodation.
- ii. Is the policy too restrictive in that it does not adequately take account of the evolving market for the provision of student accommodation?
- iii. For the avoidance of doubt, should the policy specifically state that the use of family dwelling houses to accommodate students only will not be permitted?

**4B.3 Appendix B: Proposals Schedule**

- i. Site U3 [Grange Farm]: Should the provisional issues identified also include biodiversity in respect of wildlife habitats?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**Matters and Issues for Cambridge City Local Plan specific hearing sessions**

**Matter CC5 – Services and Local Facilities**

**CC5A Services and Local Facilities**

Cambridge Local Plan (2014) Section Eight, Policies 72 to 79, Appendix C: List of Protected Public Houses and List of Neighbourhood, District and Local Centres, and Appendix K: Marketing, Local Needs and Viability Appraisal

**Issues:**

**5A.1 Policy 72: Development and change of use in district, local and neighbourhood centres**

- i. The policy indicates a reduction in the minimum proportion of Use Class A1 (shops) in district centres compared to the extant 2006 Plan. Would this change unacceptably diminish the retail offer in the centres?

**5A.2 Policy 73: Community, sports and leisure facilities**

- i. Has an appropriate location for a community stadium facility, as referred to in paragraphs 8.13 and 8.14 of the supporting text, been identified by both Councils?
- ii. Should the policy recognise waste management as a community service and include the provision of waste and recycling in the definition of community facilities in Table 8.1? [The inclusion would be consistent with Policy SC/4: *Meeting Community Needs* in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan proposed submission].
- iii. Should the policy include the need for community development strategies to be prepared for large development sites?
- iv. Is it the Council's view that the Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2011) sets out a robust and up-to-date assessment of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities across the city in order to inform its policy making as required by paragraph 73 of the National Planning Policy Framework?
- v. Is it the intention of the policy that the requirements relating to the loss of a facility will apply to the allocated sites in Appendix B where facilities would be lost in order for the allocation to proceed?
- vi. In respect of the loss of facilities should criterion (i) of the policy also require compliance with Sports England and the Level Playing Fields Association guidance on accessible sports venues?
- vii. The wording of paragraph 8.22 in the supporting text and paragraph K11 of Appendix K is very similar and covers the same ground, is this duplication therefore necessary?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**5A.3 Policy 75: Healthcare facilities**

- i. Should the second paragraph of the policy make direct reference to the NHS Property Company and NHS England which also have commissioning responsibilities?
- ii. Should there be an additional criterion (d) included in the policy requiring that new or enhanced healthcare facilities are fully disability compliant?

**5A.4 Policy 76: Protection of public houses**

- i. Is criterion (b) sufficiently flexible in requiring that all diversification options have been explored as the range of both Use Class A and Use Class D1 facilities is quite broad and could therefore require extensive research by an independent assessor in any particular case? Is this approach therefore too prescriptive?

**5A.5 Appendix C**

- i. Would the extension of the Trumpington Local Centre result in the inclusion of uses that are inappropriate in a local centre and create an arrangement that would be poorly related to the existing centre?

**5A.6 Appendix K**

- i. Paragraph K8: Should the requirements of criteria (c) and (d) be applied more flexibly considering each application on its own particular merits, particularly in respect of owners/landlords of smaller facilities?
- ii. Paragraph K12: Is it the intention of the paragraph that the asking price recommended by the independent valuer would be accepted by the Council?
- iii. Paragraph K13: Is it acknowledged that a freehold cannot be sold as tied as the product supply agreement relates to the lease or tenancy agreement rather than the property?
- iv. Paragraph K14: Does the paragraph unnecessarily duplicate the "Community Right to Bid" provisions in the Localism Act 2011?
- v. Paragraph K17: Should the requirements of the paragraph be applied more flexibly considering each application on its own particular merits?
- vi. Paragraph K18: Should criterion (a) require the applicant *to take all reasonable steps* to carry out the notification process within the 400m radius?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**Matters and Issues for Cambridge City Local Plan specific hearing sessions**

**Matter CC6 - Maintaining a Balanced Supply of Housing**

**CC6A Specialist Colleges and Language Schools, Student Housing, Housing in Multiple Occupation**

Cambridge City Local Plan (2014) Section 5, Policy 44 and Section 6, Policies 46 and 48

**Issues:**

**6A.1 Policy 44: Specialist colleges and language schools**

- i. Is the requirement that residential accommodation for all non-local students should be provided concurrently with the education facilities justifiable given that there is no such requirement for the Cambridge University colleges or the Anglia Ruskin University?

**6A.2 Policy 46: Development of student housing**

- i. Does the policy accord with paragraph 159 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as the policy is based on the necessity for the applicant to demonstrate the need for any development which would provide student accommodation rather than to meet the objectively assessed need established through the Local Plan process?
- ii. Is criterion (a) [and criterion (c) by implication] of the policy too restrictive as the criteria tie any proposed student accommodation to the educational institution which is seeking to provide it whereas paragraph 14 of the Framework requires that the Plan should meet objectively assessed needs with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change?
- iii. Is criterion (a) too inflexible to enable alternative models of student accommodation to be provided as some students may not wish to live in cluster style accommodation?
- iv. Would compliance with criterion (f) be determined on a case by case basis?
- v. Are the requirements of the final paragraph of the main policy text too onerous in respect of those educational institutions such as specialist schools where students do not necessarily attend full time courses for one academic year?

**6A.3 Policy 48: Housing in multiple occupation**

- i. Would the policy have an adverse effect on meeting housing need as it could prejudice people who would be unable to afford to purchase a house in Cambridge but would not have access to affordable housing provision, e.g. university staff?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

- ii. Should the wording of criterion (a) be expanded to clarify how the term “over concentration” would be measured or defined?
- iii. Should the final sentence of paragraph 6.20 be expanded to clarify in what respects smaller houses in multiple occupation would be treated as similar to dwellinghouses in planning terms?

**CC6B Affordable housing, Specialist Housing and Residential Moorings**

Cambridge Local Plan (2014) Section Six, Policies 45, 47, 54 and Site RM1

**Issues**

**6B.1 Policy 45: Affordable housing and dwelling mix**

- i. Is the policy consistent with the Written Ministerial Statement, November 2014 (as amended in March 2015) [WMS]? If not, are there any local circumstances that would justify a departure from the WMS, and additionally, could it be fully demonstrated that an alternative level of affordable housing provision could be justified on viability grounds?
- ii. Has the case for 40% affordable housing requirement for development for 15 dwellings or more been conclusively demonstrated in respect of the lower value levels as described in Appendix 2 of the Draft Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document which will provide guidance on viability testing?
- iii. Does the policy provide sufficient flexibility to take account of changing market conditions over time as required by third bullet point of paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework?
- iv. Should the reference in the fifth paragraph of the policy to exceptional circumstances make clear that such circumstances would have to be demonstrated through viability testing?
- v. Does the policy take account of the planning policy guidance relating to Starter Homes which were introduced by the Written Ministerial Statement in March 2015?
- vi. Can the arrangement for the provision of affordable housing in order to meet employment needs as set out in paragraph 6.7 of the policy be fully justified?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**6B.2 Policy 47 Specialist housing**

- i. Should paragraph 6.16 also include respite, rehabilitation and convalescent accommodation in the interests of clarity?

**6B.3 Policy 54: Residential Moorings**

- i. Should the policy be based on an assessment of the potential need for residential mooring spaces during the lifetime of the Plan?
- ii. Should the Plan be supported by a residential and visitor mooring strategy?

**6B.4 Site RM1: Fen Road**

- i. Is it proposed that this site will be developed concurrently with the adjacent site referred to in Policy H/6 of the South Cambridgeshire Plan?

**CC6C Technical Standards, Protection of Garden Land and Flat Conversions**

Cambridge Local Plan (2014) Section 6, Policies 50, 51, 52 and 53

**Issues:**

**6C.1 Policy 50: Residential space standards**

- i. Do the internal residential space standards set out in the policy accord with the Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard (THS) introduced by the Written Ministerial Statement in March 2015?
- ii. Should paragraph 6.30 give greater clarity as to how the calculation of the external space requirements relating to the number of bedspaces could be demonstrated as being proportionate for a particular proposal?

**6C.2 Policy 51: Lifetime Homes and Lifetime Neighbourhoods**

- i. Is the policy consistent with the Written Ministerial Statement dated March 2015?

**6C.3 Policy 52: Protecting garden land and the subdivision of existing dwelling plots**

- i. Should criteria (a) also make reference to the density of the proposed development in relation to that of the surrounding area?

**6C.4 Policy 53 Flat Conversions**

- i. Where a new dwelling unit is created should criteria (a) be amended so as to relate to the minimum gross internal floor areas set out in the THS?
- ii. Should paragraph 6.41 also include a bullet point relating to the potential worsening of disabled person access arrangements?
- iii. Would the car parking survey referred to in paragraph 6.43 represent an unacceptably onerous requirement for small scale conversions?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**Matters and Issues for Cambridge City Local Plan specific hearing sessions**

**Matter CC7 - Site Allocations outside of Areas of Major Change and Opportunity Areas**

**CC7A Site R12 Ridgeons, 75 Cromwell Road**

Cambridge Local Plan 2014, Appendix B

**Issues:**

**7A.1 Site R12: Ridgeons, 75 Cromwell Road**

- i. Is the proposed high density of the development and the associated housing mix justifiable in this location?
- ii. Is there a realistic prospect of achieving an acceptable level of open space provision on the site in an area of open space deficiency given a proposed residential development density of 75 dph?
- iii. Would the proposed allocation put an unacceptable strain on existing services and facilities in the Romsey area?
- iv. Would a housing mix at the proposed density result in a development that would be unacceptably out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area which includes the Central Conservation Area immediately to the south of the site?
- v. Would the ingress and egress to and from the site be solely from Cromwell Road?
- vi. Should the site be included in the Mill Road Opportunity Area to the south?
- vii. Given its edge of centre location should the nature of the allocation be changed to a mixed use arrangement with potential commercial uses as well as residential?

**Local Plan Examinations  
Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**CC7B Site R17 Mount Pleasant**

Cambridge Local Plan 2014, Appendix B

**Issues:**

**H Site R17: Mount Pleasant House**

- i. Would the development of the site for 50 dwellings at a density of 88 dph represent the most effective use of the land?
- ii. Given the proximity of the site to a number of Cambridge Colleges should the residential nature of the allocation be changed from dwellings to student accommodation? Would this approach represent more effective use of the land?



**Local Plan Examinations  
Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**Matters and Issues for Cambridge City Local Plan specific hearing sessions**

**Matter CC8 - Omission Sites**

Cambridge Local Plan (2014)

**Issues:**

**CC8B Cambridge Tennis & Hockey Club SP006 and Emmanuel College Playing Field SP016**

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

**CC8C Newnham College Sites**

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

**CC8D Grange Farm, West Cambridge**

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